



Mass Intellect Control in Modern Epoch: Focus on Russia

Anastasiia A. Kostareva¹(✉), Evgeniaya V. Yakutova¹, Kirill V. Prozumentik¹,
and Victoria S. Gritsenko²

¹ Perm State University, Perm, Russia

² “ITBuro”, Voronezh, Russia

v.gritsenko@htsts.ru

Abstract. Neo-liberal epoch is often characterized as a market society, where everything serves the interests of global market (or, better to say, trans-national corporations, that subdued the global market). Although we stand on the basis of class analysis of modern capitalism (as we showed while investigating the question of mass intellect control), these cases lead us to an attempt to apply the general framework of the world-system analysis with its division among the core, semi-periphery and periphery to the development of general intellect [9]. In the following paper we attempt to discuss in what sense this may have some kernel of truth, although taking the Marxist position we can't defend the very idea of such replacing. So, we see our target as following: we need to analyze what happens with the social conscious and wider – with intellect itself – in modern epoch and what consequences the changes may bring, cause our main aim was of course focus on Russia and its mass intellect control special aspects.

Keywords: Market society · Mass intellect control · General intellect · Gender study · Feminism

1 Introduction: Marx's General Intellect in Modern Epoch

Contemporary society undergoes considerable changes. It is often named post-industrial or informational society, because these terms reflect the urgent role of information and knowledge in all spheres of life and social progress. Some argue that knowledge and therefore intellect determines it all now instead of material labour as it was always regarded by historical materialism. In the following paper we attempt to discuss in what sense this may have some kernel of truth, although taking the Marxist position we can't defend the very idea of such replacing. So, we see our target as following: we need to analyze what happens with the social conscious and wider – with intellect itself – in modern epoch and what consequences the changes may bring.

Marx defends what can hardly be called a “Marxist” thesis [20]. He claims that, due precisely to its autonomy from production, abstract knowledge – primarily yet not only of scientific nature – is in process of becoming no less than the main force of production and will soon replace fragmented and repetitious labor. This is the knowledge

objectified in fixed capital and embedded in the automated system of machinery. Marx uses an attractive metaphor to refer to the knowledges that make up the epicentre of social production and preordain all areas of life: *general intellect*. “The development of fixed capital indicates to what degree general social knowledge has become a direct force of production, and to what degree, hence, the conditions of the process of social life itself have come under the control of general intellect and been transformed in accordance with it.” [14] *General intellect*: this English expression of unknown origin is perhaps a rejoinder to Rousseau’s *volonté générale*, or a materialist echo of the *nous poietikos*, the impersonal and separate “active mind” discussed by Aristotle in *De Anima*. Given the tendency for knowledge to become predominant, labor-time becomes a “miserable foundation”: the worker “steps to the side of the production process instead of being its chief actor.” The so-called law of value (that value of a commodity is determined by the labor time embodied in it) is regarded by Marx as the base of modern social relations, yet it crumbles in the face of the development of capitalism. Nonetheless capital continues undeterred to “want to use labor time as the measuring rod for the giant social forces thereby created” [21]. Watch out here: Marx says that capital does this, but we could also add it does so with the aid of the organized working class movement, because the latter has turned wage labor into its own solid reason for being. At this point Marx suggests an emancipatory hypothesis radically different from those in his more familiar texts. In “The Fragment on Machines” the crisis of capitalism is no longer ascribed to the disproportions inherent in a mode of production based in reality on the labor time supplied by individuals (and therefore, it is no longer due to the imbalances related to the full workings of the law of value, for example, the falling rate of profit). What comes to the foreground is instead the rending contradiction between productive processes that now directly and exclusively rely on science, and a unit of measure of wealth that still coincides with the quantity of labor embodied in the product. According to Marx, the development of this contradiction leads to the “breakdown of production based on exchange value” and therefore to communism. In the Post-Fordist period we discover the full factual realization of the tendency described by Marx, but with no revolutionary or even conflictual consequences. Rather than a plethora of crises, the disproportion between the role of knowledge objectified in machines and the decreasing relevance of labor time that gives rise to new and stable forms of domination [21]. Disposable time, a potential wealth, is manifested as poverty: forced layoffs, early retirement, structural unemployment and the proliferation of hierarchies. The radical metamorphosis of the concept of production itself is still tied down to the idea of working for a boss. Rather than an allusion to the overcoming of the existent, the “Fragment” is a sociologist toolbox. It is the last chapter of a natural history of society. It describes an empirical reality that is now before all eyes. So, at the end of “The Fragment” Marx claims that in a communist society, the whole individual will enter the productive process, without mutilations. That is, the individual who has changed as a result of a large amount of free time, cultural consumption and something like an increased “capacity to enjoy.” No one can fail to recognize that the Post-Fordist labor process actually takes advantage in its way of this very transformation, albeit depriving it of all emancipatory qualities. What is learned, carried out and consumed in free time is then utilized in the production of commodities and becomes a part of the use value of labor power and is computed

as profitable resource. Even the greater “capacity to enjoy” is always on the verge of being turned into a laborious duty. In order to grasp the mainspring of conflict in this new situation we need to level a fundamental criticism at the “Fragment.” According to Marx, general intellect [14] fully coincides with fixed capital, which is the “the power of knowledge, objectified” in the system of machinery. Marx thus neglects the way in which general intellect manifests itself as living labor.

The analysis of Post-Fordist production compels us to make such criticism. In the “second-generation autonomous labor” – but also in the operations of radically innovated factories such as Fiat in Melfi – it is not difficult to see that the relation between knowledge and production is articulated in the linguistic cooperation of men and women and their concretely concerted action, rather than being executed by the system of machinery. In Post-Fordism, conceptual and logical schemata plays a decisive role and cannot be reduced to fixed capital in so far as it is inseparable from the interaction of a plurality of living subjects. The “general intellect” includes formal and informal knowledge, imagination, ethical tendencies, mentalities and “language games” [21]. Thoughts and discourses function themselves as productive “machines” in contemporary labor and do not need to take on a mechanical body or an electronic soul. The matrix of conflict and the condition for small and great “disorders under heaven” must be discerned in the progressive rupture between general intellect and fixed capital that occurs in the process of the formers redistribution within living labor. Let us refer to all Post-Fordist living labor (and not only some particularly qualified tertiary sector) as *mass intellect*, in so far as it is the depository of cognitive competences that cannot be objectified in machinery. Mass intellect is the preeminent form in which general intellect is manifested today. The scientific erudition of the individual worker is not questioned here. What come to the fore as primary productive resources are only (but this “only” is crucial) the most generic aptitudes of the mind: the faculty of language, the disposition to learn, memory, the power of abstraction and correlation and the tendency towards self-reflexivity. General intellect needs to be understood literally as intellect in general: the faculty and power to think, rather than the works produced by thought (a book, an algebraic formula etc.). In order to represent the relationship between general intellect and living labor in Post-Fordism we need to refer to the act through which any speaker draws on the inexhaustible potential of language to execute contingent and unrepeatable statements.

Like the intellect and memory, language is the most common and least “specialized” conceivable given. A good example of mass intellect is not the scientist, but the simple language speaker. Mass intellect has nothing to do with a new “labor aristocracy; it is its exact opposite. In so far as it organizes the production process and the “lifeworld”, general intellect is certainly an abstraction, but a *real abstraction* with a material and operative function. However, general intellect comprises knowledge, information and epistemological paradigms, so it also sharply differs from the real abstractions type of modernity, the ones that embodied the principle of equivalence. [15] While money as the “universal equivalent” in its independent existence embodied the commensurability of products, labors and subjects, general intellect establishes the analytical premises for any kind of praxis. The models of social knowledge do not turn varied laboring activities into equivalents; rather, they present themselves as “direct productive force”. They are

not units of measure; they constitute the immeasurable presupposition of heterogeneous operational possibilities.

This change in the nature of “real abstractions” – the fact that social relations are ordered by abstract knowledge rather than the exchange of equivalents – has significant repercussions on the realm of the affects. [15] More precisely, it constitutes the basis of contemporary *cynicism* (i.e. atrophy of solidarity, belligerent solipsism, etc.). The principle of equivalence was the foundation of the most rigid hierarchies and ferocious inequalities, yet it ensured a sort of visibility of social links as well as a simulacrum of universality, so that, in an ideological and contradictory manner, the prospect of unconstrained mutual recognition, the ideal of egalitarian communication and various “theories of justice all clung to it”. While determining with apodictic power the premises of different production processes and “lifeworlds, general intellect also occludes the possibility of a synthesis, fails to provide the unit of measure for equivalence and frustrates all unitary representations”. Today’s cynicism passively reflects this situation, making a virtue of necessity. Cynic recognizes the primary role of certain *epistemic models* in his specific context, as well as the absence of real *equivalents*; he/she repeals any aspiration to transparent and dialogical communication; from the outset, he/she relinquishes the search for an inter-subjective foundation to his/her praxis and withdraws from reclaiming a shared criterion of moral judgment. Cynic dispels any illusion of prospects of “mutual recognition” between equals. The demise of the principle of equivalence manifests itself in cynic conduct as the restless abandonment of the demand for equality. The cynic entrusts his self-affirmation to the unbounded multiplication of hierarchies and inequalities that the centrality of knowledge in production seems to entail. Contemporary cynicism is a form of subaltern adaptation to the absolutely central role of general intellect. According to the tradition that goes from Aristotle to Hanna Arendt, thinking is a solitary activity with no exterior manifestation. Marx’s notion of general intellect contradicts this tradition. To speak of a “general intellect” is in fact to speak of a *public intellect*. We can identify at least two main effects of the public character of the intellect.

The first one concerns the nature and form of political power [21]. The peculiar public character of the intellect indirectly manifests itself in the state through the hypertrophic growth of the administrative apparatus. The heart of the state is no longer the political parliamentary system but the administration. The latter represents an authoritarian concretion of general intellect, the point of fusion between knowledge and command and the reversed image of social cooperation. This indicates a new threshold, beyond the long-debated growing weight of bureaucracy in the “political body and the priority given to decrees over laws”. We are no longer confronted with the well-known processes of rationalization of the state; on the contrary, we now need to oppose the accomplished stagnation of the intellect. For the first time, the old expression “raison d’état” acquires more than a metaphorical significance. The second effect of the public character of the intellect concerns the very nature of Post-Fordism. While the traditional process of production was based on the technical division of tasks (the person making the pinhead did not produce its body, etc.), the laboring action of general intellect presupposes the common participation in the “life of the mind the preliminary sharing of generic communicative and cognitive skills”. The sharing of general intellect becomes the actual foundation of all praxis. The forms of concerted action based on the technical division of

labor therefore contract. When fulfilled under a capitalist regime, the end of the division of labor translates into a proliferation of arbitrary hierarchies and forms of compulsion no longer mediated by tasks and roles. The effect of putting intellect and language, i.e. what is common, to work, renders the impersonal technical division of labor spurious, but also induces a viscid personalization of subjection. The unescapable relationship with the presence of another entailed by the sharing of the intellect manifests itself as the universal re-establishment of personal dependency. It is personal in two respects: first, one is dependent on a person rather than on rules invested with an anonymous and coercive power; second, what is subordinated is the whole person, the very aptitude of thought and action, in other words, each persons “generic existence or *species being*”. Finally, our question is whether the peculiar public character of the intellect, which is today the technical requirement of the production process, can be the actual basis for a radically new form of democracy and public sphere that is the antithesis of the one pivoting on the state and on its monopoly on political decision. There are two distinct but interdependent sides of this question: on the one hand, general intellect can affirm itself as an autonomous public sphere only if its bond to the production of commodities and wage labor is dissolved. On the other hand, the subversion of capitalist relations of production can only manifest itself through the institution of a public sphere outside the state and of a political community that hinges on general intellect.

2 The Rise of General Intellect and the Contradictions of Cognitive Capitalism

The emergence of general intellect as a force of production increases significantly the importance of education and of educators for the cultivation of students’ consciousness and personality. It should be stressed here that the work of educators constitutes an activity of general intellect par excellence – of consciousness. Educators work precisely as bearers of knowledge, feelings, mental capabilities, moral principles, aesthetic criteria, philosophical worldviews, social ideals, etc. Therefore, educators are intellectuals by definition.

The definition of educators as intellectuals is connected with the necessity for them to reflect upon the social, political, institutional – organizational conditions and the cultural, cognitive content of their work to be able to combine theory and practice achieving a real control over the purposes and conditions of their activity, on principles and processes of the curriculum, at the service of the students’ growth as personalities. [15] Educators are intellectuals by definition (but unfortunately not always *in esse*), not simply because they are bearers of a certain knowledge, but because in order to teach they need to understand deeply and evaluate critically its content. In order to teach, he/she must be in a position to reflect upon the dominant forms of knowledge in relation to the whole reflection upon social reality (on the needs, problems, contradictions of the epoch) and to the comprehension of the personalities he/she teaches. As a relationship between subjects, the educational process forms not only the students but the educators as well. Its success which is the growth of the students as personalities is feasible only if it is accompanied by the growth of the educators’ personalities. Educators’ work, like every work relying heavily on general intellect, is decisively determined by the extent to which labour

conditions are favorable to the development of their intellect – consciousness and the degree to which they are conducive to their self-actualization. As optimal conditions for the fruition of the educational work are reckoned those that assure its realization on the basis of the principle of creativity: of the strongest possible manifestation and cultivation of the educators’ intellectual capabilities and wider cultural wealth of their personalities. Therefore, if education is a determining field for the formation of multifaceted developed personalities, both students and teachers, its most fundamental element appears to be solidarity and cooperation between the two sides, the development of a deeply moral relationship between teachers and students. As Paulo Freire puts it, “Education must begin with the solution of the teacher – student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously teachers and students” [15]. So apart from its purely cognitive aspects the authentic education as a highly communicative activity, as moral relationship par excellence, consists in the cultivation of sociality of students and teachers, in the development of their social essence and of the forms of consciousness which are the psychic –ideal expression of this essence.

Taking into account the above assumptions, we can claim that the educational activity, like any other activity relying on general intellect, is by its nature opposed to the relations and practices of alienated labour. This is however, if we encounter the inevitable contradictions of capitalism, which make up its essential relations and indicate their limits. The contradictory character of modern bourgeois society lies in the fact that, on the one hand, the conversion of scientific knowledge into a direct productive force greatly increases the significance of education in social life, rendering continuous learning necessary. On the other hand, from the moment that the workers become alienated from their own labour capabilities, their work does not belong to or serve them, become also alienated from their education, in the sense that the acquisition and use of knowledge and qualifications is determined, in principle, by the capital’s needs and not theirs. The limit of humans’ education, as wage workers in the capitalist society is their formation as bearers of the commodity “labour power” [15]. Any education, cultivation or growth they may have is subjected, more or less, to the necessity of forming a tradable labour power, i.e. a series of capabilities and skills which must be useful for capital. While scientific and technological progress mark a trend towards a significant increase of workers’ leisure time, under the conditions of capitalist production relations this trend takes on the bleak dimension of a fast growing mass unemployment (in its many obvious and hidden forms), which, on the one hand, poses a threat to the very sustenance of people, and on the other, in the case of protracted deprivation of labour activity and labour relations, it entails painful frustrations, loss of meaning of life, decay of the consciousness and personality. *Life-long learning under these circumstances is tantamount to a life-long agonizing effort to ensure the tradability of ones’ labour capabilities which become fast obsolete as a consequence of permanent scientific and technological reversals.* However, under the dominance of the modern global capitalist market no one is in a position to know which special skills will maintain their exchange value and which ones will lose it, while a large number of those who have academic degrees are faced with the imminent threat of losing their jobs. In the so-called Post-Fordist reality of continuous technological and productive innovation, fierce global competition between transnational corporations, neo-liberal generalized deregulation of the economy, the

utmost shrinking of public goods, the precarious employment and the decadence of relationships and collectivities humans' sociality itself shrinks and becomes distorted. The outcome of this is that social consciousness, the psychic forms in which social bonds are reflected, is seriously undermined and destroyed. The global domination of market, economic and social antagonism, the absence of clear life prospects, the loose and fleeting social links, all contribute to the formation of a very fragmented consciousness. People trapped in the routine of modern capitalism lose more and more how to form a concrete and integral image of the world and equally lose how to place themselves in it, to acquire self-knowledge. Richard Sennet refers to the "corrosion of character". When life crumbles in short term activities in conditions where everything seems uncertain, alien and threatening, the general picture of the reality formed by the everyday consciousness can only be chaotic and irrational. While the bourgeois society proclaims its loyalty to science, at the same time it fosters the wide spreading of irrational consciousness. Of course, the capitalist society rationalizes various spheres of the system of production and of social life. It uses scientific knowledge and technological applications in a wide range of human activities, and aims at fostering through education a rational, calculating mind, so that people are able to handle technical means in order to live in a cultural environment that requires precise actions based on specific, logical links and rules. At the same time, the capitalist society through the global, unregulated, antagonistic and destructive movement of its economic forces reproduces in an ever-large scale a universally irrational reality within which it becomes increasingly difficult to understand the fundamental interactions between aspects of the system, the laws regulating social relations. So, the various rationalizations of the capitalist economy and society coexist with universal irrationality reflected in a spontaneous and widespread irrational everyday consciousness. That is why, quite often modern individuals are to make decisions concerning particular issues of their life on the base of a technical rationality, using parts of scientific knowledge and at the same time they adopt irrational beliefs of society and the world as a whole, of the universal forces and laws that govern their lives. From this point of view the triumph of scientific rationality and of scientific education in modern capitalism, which seems to be the catalytic triumph of the spirit of Enlightenment are accompanied by their total defeat. It must be emphatically stated that the decline of social links, the destruction of sociality entail inevitably the destruction of consciousness, of general intellect, which is something that undermines the formative potential of education. The decadence of education in modern capitalism, which claims its "cognitive" nature, is further aggravated by the decadence of the educational institutions, to the extent that they are alienated more and more from the needs of society, being subjected to the needs of capital. A crucial aspect of this process is the conversion of education into a series of tradable services and the restructuring of public educational institutions into independent market agents competing with each other in order to increase their client base. This is exactly the quintessence of the neo-liberal educational strategy. The result of the neo-liberal deformation of education is an ever growing alienation of educators from their work due to the bureaucratic control exercised over it. The implementation of educational work is increasingly distanced from its planning which is made over to administrative bodies – taken away from the educators. Standardized teaching models with detailed outlines of duties and tasks are imposed on the teachers,

greatly restricting their capacity for initiative taking. Apart from that, in the name of educational services' quality assurance, educational institutions and teaching staffs are submitted to a continuous supervision – assessment of their work, thus coerced into a competitive performance race, the results of which determine, more or less, their funding and employment prospects. Of course, employment conditions of educators in all grades are characterized by their growing destabilization, occupational insecurity and important pay cutbacks [21]. It should be pointed out that the more antagonistic and estranged the teachers become among themselves, the more the aggravation of their professional insecurity and anxiety, the more the margins for real collegiality and cooperation shrink as well as those of mutual enrichment via an exchange of their ideas and knowledge. As Andy Hargreaves notes, “competition prevents schools and teachers from learning from one another. People keep their best ideas to themselves” [15]. The dominant forms of assessment of educational workers and institutions in many aspects manifest the capitalist ideology which sees in the abstract quantitative evaluation of their performance the decisive driver of educational progress. The evaluation as quantitative assessment of the intellectual, educational labour indicates the treatment of this kind of labour as part of the universal form of abstract labour and indicates the abstraction from any elements of specificity and uniqueness of the intellectual-educational labour, reflecting the diverse socio-cultural conditions in which it occurs and the particular personalities involved in it. Owing to the fact that the creations of general intellect (scientific theories, philosophic worldviews, aesthetic forms, educational programs) reflect the uniqueness of consciousness, the specificity of the personality of their creators, they are inherently unique and despite their many common points, they are inherently non-comparable. Their “value” lies precisely in their originality rather than in their uniformity. Subsequently, their creators can not be treated as comparable and exchangeable, as mere agents of abstract labour. Based on the above we can claim that the rise of general intellect in the contemporary capitalist system signals and accentuates an insurmountable contradiction. On the one hand, the more this system is obliged to use knowledge and intellectual labour for material production, the more it must ensure the best possible conditions for the development of personality of knowledge workers, scientists, artists and of course educators. It must also ensure the proper conditions for the development of the overall cognitive powers of society, including scientific and technological progress that in our times is not the affair of some individuals alone, but depends on the overall educational and cultural level of a society and on the overall state of social consciousness. The conversion of general intellect to a direct productive force makes necessary a life-long multifaceted education and development of every human. Of course, a task of this magnitude would require the corresponding radical restructuring of labour relations and social relations at large in a collaborative-comradeship way. To the extent however that the capitalist society will remain capitalist, founded on the law of capital accumulation, i.e. exploitation of wage workers, treated as the means of surplus-value production, it will inevitably continue to undermine the development of their personality, reducing the possibilities for them to reveal and exercise their creative capabilities. The dominant relations of alienation and competition bring about a decline in people's sociality, their general intellect and consciousness, and hence a decline of their creativity. The rise of general intellect is an indicator of the trend towards the maturing of the social character of labour. In its

technical dimension the mature social character of labour is defined by the automation of production, by the elimination (or at least by the great reduction) of the direct physical involvement of humans in the production process as servants – operators of hand tools and machines. In its human dimension the mature social character of labour is defined by replacing the worker who is the bearer of primarily physical forces and skills by the worker who is the bearer of general intellect, social conscience and is involved in production as a collective director of automated means of production, and of production processes. The rise of general intellect in modern capitalism points at and brings to a culminating point the fundamental contradiction between the maturing social character of labour and the yet dominant capitalist exploitation of it. As opposed to manual labour, which through various forms of control over the worker's body could be carried out in conditions of class exploitation and yet be relatively productive, intellectual labour in its authentic and permanently improving version, as a par excellence social, collaborative, creative activity exceeds the limits of class exploitation and alienation of labour. When this kind of labour is performed under conditions of exploitation, then it inevitably loses its qualities. Intellectual labour (including educational labour) in a knowledge society means labour of emancipated workers, linked together by bonds of comradeship and solidarity. In human history until now the development of the system of production has been connected with the sacrifice and destruction of a large part of workers' forces and abilities, the distortion of their personality.

Now, in the conditions of the dynamic development of the intellectual – social character of labour the only way to social progress goes through the radical change of social relations, the creation of an emancipated classless society in which “the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all” [14]. The last global economic crisis having catastrophic consequences for the working class, including a significant proportion of knowledge workers, condemning them to unemployment and poverty, further promoting flexible employment relations, privatization of all public goods (including education), further undermining the social relations, causing enormous damage on peoples' consciousness, proves the impossibility for capitalism to become an authentic cognitive society. Therefore we should underline that the fundamental interests of knowledge workers, as bearers of the most developed form of the social character of labour, stand in an inescapable opposition to the dominant capitalist relations of production. Awareness of this opposition on behalf of knowledge workers (including educators) would mean their crucial, for the prospects of class struggle, conversion from class in itself to a class for itself and for all humanity. This requires the awareness of their social interests as identical with the general class interests of the people of wage labour, with the objective of universal social emancipation from all forms of class exploitation and alienation. In our opinion, the prospects for the rise of a genuine cognitive society are now definitely connected with the great cause of transgressing capitalism towards the socialist reconstruction of all human relations.

3 General Intellect Control: Framework Concept

Today we are living in the informational society where any information you need can be found in the Internet resources or in mass media. But despite these availability and

openness, we face with the withholding of the truly important information [14]. People, who can be easily affected have the false (second) conscious mind formed, as the massive information flow influences on their unconscious mind. This impact is possible by mind control. Manipulation is a type of social influence that aims to change the behavior or perception of others through abusive, deceptive or underhanded tactics [2].

Modern science recognizes two forms of manipulation: 1) overt or biological - “the use of electrodes in the “correction” of behavior, lobotomy, exposure of psychotropic rays or gases” [5]; 2) covert or psychological. In this paper we will consider the *psychological manipulation as a method that is used to influence on the broad social sectors*, creating this way a Plato’s cave, as this type of manipulation is more dangerous.

In the modern world people can be divided into three types: 1) people who acknowledge the fact of consciousness manipulation and support it. They believe that people are big babies, therefore, they need a wise mentor who will help to navigate through the endless diverse information flow; 2) people who know about the manipulation but oppose it, explaining that free will and clear human mind are a higher value; 3) people who do not even know about the consciousness and behavior manipulation.

The modern definition can be formulated as following: manipulation is programming the opinions and aspirations of the masses, their moods, and even the mental state in order to provide a behavior necessary for those who own the methods of manipulation [5].

The object of manipulation are the mental structures of human personality.

Generic signs of this phenomenon are:

1) Spiritual, psychological impact.

2) Impact in an implicit, covert form. Manipulation in most cases means a mental impact, which is made secretly, and, consequently, to the detriment of those who were affected by it. The simplest example of this is advertising. “The success of manipulation is guaranteed, when the manipulated people believe that everything happening is natural and inevitable” [5].

3) Availability of a sufficiently high level of skill and knowledge.

4) Treating people, whose minds are manipulated, not as individuals, but as things, because manipulation is a part of the technology of power.

The condition for successful manipulation is that the overwhelming majority of citizens do not want to spend either moral or mental force, or their time to doubt the messages simply. In many respects, this happens because it is much easier to plunge passively into the information flow than to process each signal critically.

The mind manipulation is a historical phenomenon that arises only with class society and, as a consequence, the state, because “the state is nothing but a machine for suppressing one class by another” [10]. The task of manipulation is to change the opinions, motivations, and goals of people in the needed for the government direction.

In many ways, the manipulation of public consciousness resembles the war of a small well-organized and equipped army against civilians, who are not ready for this war. Sometimes they say that the mind control is the “colonization of the state’s own people” [5]. Gradually, systems of “weapons” had been created in this special war, as knowledge about the person and his/her behavior had been accumulated and doctrines of mind control had been developed. Since the “war” is secret, and the success is determined

by the ability of the “colonizers” not to allow organized resistance, the main doctrines of manipulators are expounded in a vague, veiled form, in connection with particular indirect questions.

Becoming a part of bourgeois revolutions, the mind control from the very beginning received generous financing from the capitalist class. When this class came to power and created its fundamentally new bourgeois state, mind control activity was supported and protected by the state. In this “war” we can distinguish several basic stages:

- 1) Putting pressure on those who direct;
- 2) Taking under control the two main spheres of man’s spiritual activity: knowledge and communication;
- 3) Eliminating “...the stabilizing block of traditions from consciousness, which will sharply increase the vulnerability to manipulation” [10];
- 4) “Disconnect” a more systematic and “rational” knowledge – historical memory. This memory contains information and symbols that connect people in society and ensure the presence in it of a common language and stable channels of communication.

As for the methods of manipulation, they are usually described as following:

1) Direct lie. The media replace “political censorship” (the obvious distortion of information) by “psychoanalytic” censoring: they use subthreshold cultural phenomena. These phenomena in the socio-dynamics of culture are understood as the constant curvature of the sociocultural space. The stream of messages is so intense, that it captures the audience, and its short-term memory is turned off so completely that the exposure of the “yesterday’s” lie is already of no interest to anyone. For example: nowadays we see that the United States impose sanctions against Russian Federation and Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. These sanctions relate to the most sensitive issues in global politics and the United States interests in these issues.

This method can now be revealed from the philosophical and scientific environment. It manifests itself in relation to the scientific community, to the economic theory of Marx and to all Marxism as a whole. For example, Zbigniew Brzezinski in his book “Grand Failure: The Birth and Death of Communism in the Twentieth Century” writes that Marxism died at the end of the 20th century. But at the same time, despite the statement of death, he appreciated it, noting that the Marxist understanding of history is part of the world’s intellectual heritage [4]. Liberal-minded scholars consider Marxism not a science, but an ideology that is aimed at suppressing democracy and freedom and undermining the effectiveness of a market economy. They deny the fundamental political and economic ideas of Marx (labor theory of value, the theory of surplus value, etc.), substituting them with market principles (free economic activity, free competition, etc.) [4].

All this criticism and “discredit” of Marxism is conducted with one single goal – to hide the shortcomings and failures of the now dominant economic system.

2) Not a direct lie, but non-disclosure. This method is used both in large-scale campaigns (for example, the silence on the goal of reform, timing, and social price), and in small-scale ones.

3) Non-disclosure of purpose, “price” and timing of the change. The most important means (and sign) of mind control in politics is the hidden goal of the project. In other words, a politician who gathers citizens under his/her banner deliberately does not talk

about the purpose of his/her election project. All his/her obvious propaganda boils down to exposing the enemy, and to exposing mainly his/her personal defects. The expressions describing this are always targeted on feelings: trampling on freedom, drinking people's blood, robbing the poor, encouraging injustice, lying, etc. From all this denouncing it follows that under the new regime such evils will not exist, and freedom, justice, morality, sobriety, etc. will reign [3].

4) Decrease the value of the problem. Substitution of the fundamental, vital issue by its secondary, private side.

5) "Trojan horse". This technique is a fragmentation and the gradual introduction of the informational patterns necessary to the manipulator, between or mixed with the neutral or objective information or with the one that is not a part of manipulation [5]. Let us distinguish its several features using the early post-soviet mass propaganda. Firstly, the mixture of neutral and manipulative information offsets the usual rhythm of the logical perception of a person and does not allow him/her to analyze the information received soberly. Secondly, while organizing manipulation in this way, the meaning of the subject under discussion becomes blurred and incomprehensible. For example, in the information campaigns of the initial period of "reforms", there was a covert advertisement of the US, capitalism, and Western values. Mentions of the "industrially developed Western world", about the advantages of the market economy over the planned one are quoted regularly in the media (in articles, broadcasts, and speeches of individuals). But they are separated from each other by other information flows that surround a person in the modern world. And it starts with small things: competition is effective and improves the quality of goods, unemployment stimulates a high culture of work, etc. Gradually, "the degree is rising": there are statements like "we should do just as well", "we need to introduce elements of a market economy", "there is no reason for us to compete with the US – we can learn so much from them" [10].

It follows that the US is a bulwark of democracy and an earthly paradise, and our country is worthless, backward and worthy of a complete restructuring. The effectiveness of this manipulation is so high that many people still adhere to such views, although any political propaganda has its own ideological and economic roots and liberal policy in fact transfers the costs of the crisis from the capital and its bureaucratic system to the lower classes.

Summing up the analysis of the theory of manipulation, we can draw the following conclusions.

Mind control is a closed knowledge by its nature, but we can distinguish a number of features by which it can be identified:

1) A special language. If politicians or announcers often use the words and language constructions incomprehensible for wide masses, such as "voucher" or "sequestration" in their speech, that means the high probability of manipulation.

2) Pressure on feelings. Another sign of manipulation is the apparent pressure on feelings. In this case, we should always try to rationalize our emotions.

3) Sensationalism and urgency. This is a technology of general action, providing noise and the necessary level of nervousness, undermining psychological defense. However, sometimes creating an artificial background of sensationalism serves a specific purpose, most often for distraction.

4) Repetition. You can suspect the mind control if suddenly the same topic is started to be covered daily or the same verbal combinations are begun to be used. Repetition effects the subconsciousness, and it is almost impossible to control it.

5) Splitting up. The politician who manipulates our consciousness presents us a small part of a complicated problem instead of the whole and even splits it into parts so that we can not comprehend the whole problem or make a choice, or it would be very difficult to do this. The problem can be presented in the form of an integral organism, “it has a prehistory (“parents”), it arises and develops, it acquires a “family and descendants”-problems related to it or the problems it engenders. When it is resolved (“dies”), a new cycle begin, the life of the next generation is the future” [10].

6) Walking in the authorities’ shadow. When the argument in support of some statement is credibility and respect, won in a completely different sphere, not related to this statement, it most likely means manipulation.

4 General Intellect Control in the Core and Periphery of the World-System

Taking into account that modern capitalism is not the same in different countries, we need to investigate the specifics of general intellect development and control in the different capitalist systems. Let us turn to the world-system approach in this case. Created by I. Wallerstein, S. Amin, G. Arrighi and the others, it cannot be regarded as an “orthodox” Marxist method of analysis, but is very useful to understand the differences among countries and regions within the capitalist world. What is more, we’ll try to show how this approach can be interpreted from the materialist position and what conclusions can be drawn of such an interpretation.

I. Wallerstein states the question: what then makes a production process core-like or peripheral? And answers: “It came to be seen that the answer lay in the degree to which particular processes were relatively monopolized or relatively free market. The processes that were relatively monopolized were far more profitable than those that were free market. This made the countries in which more core-like processes located wealthier. And given the unequal power of monopolized products vis-a.-vis products with many producers in the market, the ultimate result of exchange between core and peripheral products was a flow of surplus-value (meaning here a large part of the real profits from multiple local productions) to those states that had a large number of core-like processes” [22]. In the world market conditions, the exchange between the periphery and the core turns out to be unequal: trying to get an access to domestic markets of the core countries, the countries of the periphery are compelled to compete among themselves, lowering costs of manufacturing goods. The best mechanism to reach these targets is, in full accordance with the labor theory of value, the toughening of labor exploitation. This can be done by reducing the value of working force (through reduction of wages and decrease of quantity and quality of the worker’s “necessary amount of the means of subsistence”), and by worsening of working conditions through increase of the working day, and so on. While in the core countries the production of relative surplus value dominates (which is the result of exploitation of the periphery as well as of long and hard workers’ struggle, according to this logic), in the peripheral and semi-peripheral countries the production

of absolute surplus value remains. The process results in the continuous flow of surplus value from the periphery to the core of the world-system and its assumption by the core countries capital without an equivalent. What's more, it touches not only the production of the surplus value of ready-made goods, but also the coinciding distribution of different parts of value chains.

Proceeding from Vladimir I. Lenin's theory of uneven and combined development and Rosa Luxembourg's concept of the accumulation of capital Ruslan S. Dzarasov concluded that K. Marx's discovery of the mechanism of turning of surplus value into profit (or turning of the labour value into the price of production) should form the basis of the world-system approach. Surplus value is created in proportion to embodied labour, but it is distributed in proportion to the invested capital. This approach helps to investigate the essence and reasons of forming the core – periphery relations in modern capitalism and to link them to the expenses of labour and capital. The global shift of material production from the core to the peripheral countries can be fixed with the help of the “value chain” approach [1]. It argues that the production process is sliced into separate chains or links that differ from each other by the value added. “Then the labour-intensive chains with low value added are moved abroad, while the so called ‘key competencies’ with high value added – R&D, marketing, promotion and sales – are retained at home... An important characteristic of ‘value chains’ is that TNCs enter the market for supplies as monopolies, while their suppliers are compelled to compete with each other (which says a great deal about the ideological meaning of the free market doctrine). This phenomenon is of prime importance for reducing the relative prices of intermediate goods imported to the US from low-wage countries” [6]. In practice this means that the core countries appear as the centers of the accumulation of capital due to the compensation free transfer of the labour value created in the periphery. We may add the external debt and credit, politics of the “double standards” held by the international organizations such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, World Trade organization and others, the “Washington Consensus” foundations to the list of mechanisms of formation and fastening of the core – periphery relations. The “breakthrough strategy” under such circumstances is only possible as the “development by invitation” [22], i.e. the situation when the core countries transfer their production to the peripheral countries with cheap labour and open their domestic markets to the exports of the labour intensive commodities of these countries.

Ruslan S. Dzarasov finds that the evident economic growth of the South-East Asian countries could be described by the T. Ozava's “flying geese” model. This model appears as a bright empirical confirmation of Marx's idea of turning of the labour value into the price of production. Following Ozava, Dzarasov shows that Japan was the first to go all the technological development way from labour intensive (agriculture and textile) to capital and knowledge intensive production in the “geese flight formation”. The technological steps Japan passed were sequentially transferred then to the four “Asian tigers”: South Korea, Singapore, Hong-Kong and Taiwan. In their turn, taken hold of relatively capital intensive productions, these countries transferred the labour intensive ones to the ASEAN countries: Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand and Philippines. Finally, the practice turned off in China and Vietnam. This model seize the process of the global value chains creation. On each step the developed countries invest into labour

intensive production of less developed, but reserve the most profitable production stages that create the most of value added for themselves. However, the main beneficiary is the USA, cause the “flying geese” relations demands the strict hierarchy, where the strong exploit the weak, and the weak trying to go forward are forced to search for the weaker in order to transfer the labour intensive production. The evident depletion of such a model of development emerges as the crises of capital over-accumulation and financial bubbles.

The core – periphery relations as we see it determine much of the differences in public conscience, values and purposes of people. The classical examples of this is the difference between traditional and modern values, authoritarian and liberal attitudes, views on women’s role in society, etc. Let us concentrate on the differences in the general intellect control in the core and periphery.

Comparing mechanisms rather than incidental examples, we should state, that as the core societies sustain the higher level of education and civil rights in general, they are required to apply more delicate mechanisms of the intellect control than the peripheral societies. The most interesting case is the semi-peripheral societies, where, on the one hand, we see quite authoritarian regimes unavoidable if one needs to provide the compensation free transfer of the significant amount of the labour value created there to the core, and on the other hand – their evident attempts to overcome their dependency.

At the same time, as we consider the complexity of general intellect itself and the vast list of ingenious mind control mechanisms, we don’t claim to describe all the ins and outs and details of it. Let us just point out some determinative practices that may be concretized in future analysis.

First of all, we regard the connection between manipulation, mass media and democracy, cause it is the first thing that comes to one’s mind while discussing mind control in the core countries is of course the mass media which is originally produced there and proliferated all over the world.

Mass media technologies, like any other technologies, serve the interests of big business and provides its point of view. Broad literature – from H. Markuse and E. Fromm to J. Rifkin, S. Aronowitz, W. De Fazio, B. Sherman and Ph. Judkins – shows that media had never been really independent from capital. On the other hand, these authors underline the crucial role of media and information in constructing public opinion and attitude to different social processes.

N. Gannaway states that in the UK, for example, Rupert Murdoch’s News Corporation owns 37% of the daily newspapers and in the US 75% of newspapers are now owned by corporate chains [8]. She finds out that instead of truly free discussion and multiple opinion exchange they channel public interest to the multiplicity of entertainment. “It is impossible to separate the various media in advanced industrial countries from their enormous advertising base. The companies that provide the advertising revenues that now sustain most mass media have a stake in the established economic and political order. The resulting conservatism refutes the notion that media inherently serve democracy. Advertising does, however, introduce a constantly changing array of fresh images into everyday life and in this respect it fosters democracy” [8]. So we should conclude that even in the core countries democracy is limited and general intellect is suppressed by the private interest.

Another – and much more intricate way of general intellect control in the core countries is the notorious idea of political correctness. It is the way of thinking when one needs to transform his/her mind and speech in order to be or just look polite and show respect. Some right-wing authors investigate, that although there is nothing wrong with politeness and respect by themselves, the essential meaning of political correctness as the aim of behavior is “an insidious frontal attack on common sense and conscience through language manipulation” or even “an assault on the freedom of the human mind” [13]. D. Kupelian writes: “At its core ... political correctness is nothing more nor less than the unjust intimidation of others into thinking and speaking a certain way. As such, it is pure totalitarian mind control” [13].

Let us turn to more complicated examples of semi-periphery. The bright occurrence of a semi-periphery with the great role of mind control is our own country, so we’ll regard the manipulation in Russia.

5 Economic Sphere

Let’s consider some extraordinary examples of the discrepancy between official information and real statistical data (citing the work of Vasily (László) Szimcsera “In Russia, there is a lot in small, and little in big” [19]. Although the work itself is rather obsolete, the very story of its publishing is crucially important. Szimcsera headed the Research Institute of the Russian Federal State Statistics Service for 10 years and in 2010 resigned the leadership with the words “Enough lie!” He then published several articles comparing the true data that the Institute collected and the data the Institute was forced to publish. Let us observe some key data according to these sources.

1. Underestimation of Russia’s national wealth

- officially: \$4 trillion
- really: \$40 trillion [19]

Underestimation of official data by 10 times is done in order to sell oligarchs and foreigners the remains of former public property for a song and make the population believe that we live no worse than we work.

2. GDP growth rate (%)

- officially: 6
- really: 4 [19]

By overestimating the GDP growth rate by one and a half times, the authorities try to convince the public that the announced doubling in 2003–2010 could have taken place had it not been for the world crisis. In fact, in 2003–2008, the economy grew by only a quarter.

3. Inflation growth rate (% per year)

- officially: 6–8
- really: 18–27 [19]

It has long been known that the growth of prices for essential goods in Russia is much faster than the average for all goods and services. Therefore, inflation for the poor (social inflation) is much higher than for the rich. And the poorer the family is, the faster rise the prices for the goods it buys. Statistics show that prices for those goods and services that are bought by the least well-off citizens of the country rise by 18% per year.

4. Income gap between rich and poor (times)

- officially: 16
- really: 28–36

5. Regional development gaps (times)

- officially: 14
- really: 42 [19]

Socially, Russia has long ceased to be a united country. If Moscow lives at the level of the Czech Republic, then the Republic of Tyva is at the level of Mongolia. The federal government dumps more and more social obligations in the regions and simultaneously draws more and more money from them in order to invest in the financial sphere of foreign securities.

6. Share of declassed population groups (%)

- officially: 1,5
- really: 45 [19]

According to the Institute of Statistics data, there are 12 million alcoholics in the country, over 4.5 million addicts, and more than 1 million street children. Not surprisingly, the official data understates these by 30 times: nearly half of the declassed in the richest country is evidence of the complete failure of the economic and social policy of the authorities.

7. Proportion of unprofitable enterprises (%)

- officially: 8
- really: 40 [19]

Considering the data above, we can draw the following conclusion. In terms of natural indicators, Russia's modern economy has lagged behind the Soviet Russia's one, and taxes on the real sector, unlike taxes on personal incomes of billionaires, are huge.

8. Degree of fixed asset depreciation (%)

- officially: 48.8
- really: 75.4 [19]

When the depreciation of fixed assets is $\frac{3}{4}$, the logical question then becomes for what purpose we entered the World Trade Organization. After all, the WTO is not required for the export of raw materials, and there is nothing more to export yet. As a result, the remnants of domestic production is finishing off. The transnational capital is becoming a full lord in the country.

9. Share of foreign capital in the Russian economy (%)

- officially: 20
- really: 75 [19]

If the data of the Institute of Statistics is correct, in the economic sense we are turning from semi-periphery into a colony at the same time screaming loudly that we rise from our knees! There is also an interesting fact that the government “is afraid” of foreign grants (according to official information), but at the same time quietly takes foreign loans and encourages the sale of our enterprises to trans-national corporations. According to Szimcsere, since the collapse of the Soviet Union, $\frac{2}{3}$ of the manufacturing industry has been sold this way.

If we look at the economic activity within the social sphere, everything is not so transparent either. Alexey Simoyanov said the following: “In Russia, the social sphere has been in the position of a poor relation of the financial sector, distributing cash flows” [18].

Here are a few illustrative examples. The growth of budget revenues from the export of energy resources and mineral raw materials allowed the country in the early 2000s to escape from the social catastrophe of the 1990s and begin to pay social obligations to the people, but all this extended to payments of the basic needs of socially unprotected layers of the population.

Another important indicator is the underestimation of poverty in the country. Official statistics put Russia and Germany on one level in terms of poverty. Yes, outwardly it looks very positive, however, those who are engaged in these calculations, are silent about the method they use - for income and consumption - is used by the UN for the developing countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. If we use the calculation method for European and developing countries - the method of calculating the family’s share of costs for food, transportation, housing and communal services, the poverty level of the population of Russia fluctuates around 60–70% [18].

An underestimated amount of poverty artificially understates the base of possible recipients of state social assistance.

6 Social Sphere: Education, Medicine Culture and Gender Stereotypes

Today, the ruling elites declare about the reformation of education and medicine, but behind the loud words they hide pretty sad weekdays, that will be shown next.

If in the Soviet Union the system of education, health and culture worked productively for the main strategic goal of “creating and developing a powerful socio-cultural and intellectual potential of the country” [18], today it is oriented towards market principles. Social rights are replaced by “social services”, an increasing part of which citizens are forced to receive under market conditions. These spheres are becoming increasingly focused on individual consumption of citizens. However, taking into account individual opportunities, the consumer does not always correlate price and quality correctly, so the latter often suffers.

However, social sphere liberal reforms can not be reduced to its commercialization, they often destroy the objects and entire structures of the social sphere, changing their legal basis for functioning. As a result, social institutions become much more dependent on federal and regional authorities. Thus, these reforms “limit the responsibility of the state for the development and reproduction of society” [18]. In other words, the state no longer considers schools, hospitals, museums, etc. as structures necessary to implement a common system of social values, but target them on implementing “social services” within the framework of the state order.

The next important point, which should be indicated, is the optimization of social institutions. The ruling elites say that this is a necessary action, which will lead to the improvement of the work of social institutions. However, they forget or simply do not want to disclose what is actually meant by “optimization”. Under the pretext of optimization, there is a direct destruction of “inefficient” schools, hospitals, universities, museums, and libraries [18]. As a result, there are social institutions, managers, and employees who spend most of the time on adaptation to new working conditions and management parameters. Another significant disadvantage of “optimization” is the fact that the population of remote locations is being cut off from social and medical assistance, education and culture. This happens when small schools and clinics are closed in villages and towns because they are recognized “inefficient”. And instead of them, large centers are created, and it is difficult for “injured” residents to get there, while transportation costs are not envisaged either in the budgets of settlements or in the budget of the center.

Summarizing the “exposure” of social reforms, the following conclusion can be drawn. Today, in fact, we are to point out to the redirection of public spending from the development of society to ensuring the conditions for its degradation.

The one more interesting example, which we will alias in this article is stereotype of the impossibility of women occupying top leadership positions.

The participation of the unconscious in the life of society is an important aspect of interaction between people, most often we turn to the unconscious when we talk about stereotypes that, on the one hand, are designed to facilitate the decision-making and actions of a person, a citizen, and on the other hand, strongly distort reality, which tends to develop and change [16]. A striking example of such a manifestation can be considered the existence of gender stereotypes, which are firmly rooted in the consciousness of the individual and allow you to accept, evaluate and act on the basis of unconscious

mechanisms. Various movements and organizations help to cope with this imbalance of interaction between conscious practices and the unconscious, that is, stereotypical thinking, in particular, we are talking about feminism and feminist organizations that fight stereotypes about women, interaction between the sexes and the established patriarchal foundations.

Consider this hypothesis by the example of the stereotype of the impossibility of women occupying top leadership positions, today is gradually losing its relevance, but the opinion is still especially relevant for Russia that it is difficult to imagine a woman president in the modern conditions of our country, as in the military-defense sphere, where the majority the highest positions are held by men [16].

This example proves the existence of the so-called “glass ceiling” that most women in the Russian Federation face.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

We consider that Karl Marx’s bright concept of general intellect is very useful for understanding modern society. First of all, if the informational epoch is real, it should be based on a historically new type of labour – universal labour. Its technical side is automation, so we may say that automated labour comes to replace (or at least push out to the periphery) hand labour and machine labour as the previous types.

General intellect is a complicated phenomenon explored by various Marxist scholars. We assume that Post-operaismo school had come closer than anyone to the essence of general intellect? cause its analysis emphasizes the link between the increasing automation and ‘general intellect’ or the ‘social brain’, as they put it. Another term they use to describe it – ‘immaterial labour’ – is used to underline such types of intellectual, affective or communicative work, that becomes the basis of a ‘multitude’ capable of re-appropriating the fruits of the general intellect [16].

In his latest writing “Cyber-Proletariat” Nick Dyer-Witford (one of the most influential Post-operaist follower today) admits: “In contrast, our analysis suggests that immaterial labour is itself now being cast out of the system it has created. The ‘general intellect’ is now in the process of automating itself, as it moves on from decimating assembly lines and routine office labour to replacing journalists with news aggregators, translators with translation programs, lawyers with precedent-searching expert systems, photographers with photo-bots, pop stars with virtual holographic performers and stockbrokers with swarming artificial intelligences. This interpretation of ‘general intellect’ emphasizes, not the empowerment of immaterial labour, but the explosive proletarianization and re-proletarianization that arises as huge tranches of the global population are rendered surplus to requirements by an increasingly automatic capitalism” [7]. This analysis shows that the emerging phenomenon is full of contradictions and should be put into a broader context of neo-liberal capitalism.

Neo-liberal epoch is often characterized as a market society, where everything serves the interests of global market (or, better to say, trans-national corporations, that subdued the global market). Although we stand on the basis of class analysis of modern capitalism (as we showed while investigating the question of mass intellect control), these cases lead us to an attempt to apply the general framework of the world-system analysis with

its division among the core, semi-periphery and periphery to the development of general intellect. We revealed the difference between the core and semi-periphery, cause our main aim was of course focus on Russia and its mass intellect control special aspects.

Concluding, we need to emphasize that all these problems: general intellect, mass intellect control, difference between core and semi-periphery – are being discussed today. Neither we, nor anyone else today is ready to say that this discussion is over. So, we've just tried to offer our mite.

References

1. Bair, J. (ed.): *Frontiers of Commodity Chain Research*. Stanford University Press, Stanford (2009)
2. Birch, A.: *30 Covert Emotional Manipulation Tactics: How Manipulators Take Control in Personal Relationships*. AB Admin (2015)
3. Braiker, H.B.: *Who's Pulling Your Strings? How to Break the Cycle of Manipulation and Regain Control of Your Life*. McGraw-Hill Professional, New York (2004)
4. Brzezinski, Z.: *The Grand Failure: The Birth and Death of Communism in the Twentieth Century*. Macmillan USA, New York (2007)
5. Coons, C., Weber, M.: *Manipulation: Theory and Practice*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2014)
6. Dzarasov, R.: *The Conundrum of Russian Capitalism*. PlutoPress, London (2014)
7. Dyer-Witheyford, N.: *Cyber-Proletariat: Global Labour in the Digital Vortex*. PlutoPress, London (2015)
8. Gannaway, N.: *Mind Control and the Media* (1997). http://www.converge.org.nz/pirm/mind_con.htm
9. Mikhachenkova, N.A.: *Political determinants of public policy in the sphere of higher education: the ratio of global and national: dissertation thesis: 23.00.02 Saint Petersburg* (2017)
10. Kara-Murza, S.G.: *Mind Control*. Aletheia, Saint-Petersburg (2000)
11. Anastasia, A.K., Vladimir, V.O.: *The problem of influence for our irrationality. New ideas in philosophy*, pp. 28–40 (2017)
12. Kostareva, A.A., Orlov, V.V.: *Theory of manipulation of “unconscious” on the example of Russian society. Herald of the Eurasian academy of administrative sciences*, pp. 68–74 (2017)
13. Kupelian, D.: *‘Political correctness’ is totalitarian mind control* (2012). <http://www.wnd.com/2012/05/political-correctness-is-totalitarian-mind-control/>
14. Marx, K.: *Grundrisse* (1973). https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_Grundrisse.pdf
15. Pavlidis, P.: *The Rise of General intellect and the meaning of education* (2011). <http://www.jceps.com/wp-content/uploads/PDFs/10-1-03.pdf>
16. Tatyanya, R.: *Gender stereotypes and gender stereotyping: a methodological approach* (2010). <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/gendernye-stereotipy-i-gendernaya-stereotipizatsiya-metodologicheskie-podhody/viewer>
17. Simon, G.K.: *In Sheep's Clothing: Understanding and Dealing with Manipulative People*. Parkhurst Brothers Publishers Inc., Chicago (2010)
18. Simoyanov, A.: *Ministry of finance dictate – social consequences of austerity. Left Policy* **22**, 22–42 (2014)
19. Szimcsere, L.: *In Russia in small is visible much, and in big – it is not enough* (2012). http://www.za-nauku.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=6416&Itemid=39

20. Smith, T.: The 'General Intellect' in the Grundrisse and beyond. <https://documents.tips>
21. Virno, P.: General Intellect (2010). <https://philpapers.org/rec/PAOGI>
22. Wallerstein, I.: World-System Analysis: An Introduction. Duke University Press, London (2004)