



Prognostic Problems of the Public and Power Organization of the Russian Society: Archetypes and Sociocultural Basis of Functioning and Development

Alexey Y. Mamychev¹, Valentin Y. Lyubashits², Sergey O. Shalyapin³, Maria K. Filippova^{4*}

¹Vladivostok State University of Economy and Service, Vladivostok, Russia, ²Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia, ³Northern (Arctic) Federal University, Arkhangelsk, Russia, ⁴Vladivostok State University of Economy and Service, Vladivostok, Russia. *Email: buharina-masha@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

The modern prognostics appeals to the analysis of the archetypic bases, which are the cornerstone of sociocultural basis of the society public and power organization, that is, according to the authors, the base for construction and evolutionary development of the socio-political and right cultural environment in any society. The author's concept is based on the basis of the multidimensional analysis of evolution as public process, with inclusion of discussion of the accident and regularity philosophical questions as the defining factors of stable reproduction of public and imperious interaction in society. The need to foretell the future was aware of all times. However, especially great need for projections is in the XXI century with its rapid pace of social development. Now social changes happen more often, and objectively before the person there is a need to find ways of adaptation to changes which already arose and which would be, but till certain time are still unknown. The work content observes the difference, relationship and interaction between the archetypes and related socio-cultural phenomena.

Keywords: Archetype, Archetypic Structures, State, Culture, Right, Public and Power Organization

JEL Classifications: K49, D71, H55

1. INTRODUCTION

The multiple-factor analysis of the society public and power organization, the steady trends research of its development, and the functioning political and legal institutes' specifics, are solved with the realization of theoretical and practical tasks among which the important place is occupied by:

1. The deficiency of knowledge formal and rationalistic forms and methods;
2. The restoration of archetypic bases of the concrete society evolution;
3. The problems "transfer" from the logical and methodological problems research on the research of essentially new strategy of knowledge of the public and power organization considering a spiritual and moral background and the sociocultural environment, transformations of institutional and standard bases of the public and power organization.

Research of archetypic (sociocultural) bases of the public and power organization acts as the fundamental elements of development, which, we believe, are demanded in formation of the development steady strategy of the institutional and power organization corresponding to public processes.

Therefore, "the development logic" corresponds to not only institutes as that, but also "to a way of reflection about them. In other words, the reflexing consciousness transfers property of logic to an institutional order (Berger and Lukman, 1995)." According to Merton, logic of functioning of the public and power organization and functional competence of these or those institutes and structures is mediated by the public environment and specifics of sociocultural interaction (Merton, 2006). However, institutes, which do not correspond to logic of the sociocultural environment development, cause dysfunctions in the institutional organization and the society development (Agamirov et al., 2015).

Their functioning in the public and power organization conducts to “institutional distortions,” to interaction unsustainable and unstable public imperious interaction in the system: Person – society – state, and finally to institutional and standard crisis.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Some mistakes in the theory and practice of forecasting represent, in fact, recurrence of approaches, typical of the past, – approaches, which insolvency was proved by historical practice and was overcome during the subsequent development of science (Karepova et al., 2015). The unsatisfactory knowledge of the history subject has an adverse effect on work of the public and power organization of society, leading to different social cataclysms (Osipov et al., 2016). At the same time in concepts of the past contained forecasts, much instructive and useful to development in modern conditions. Today researchers isolate four approaches to the analysis of the public and power organization (Baranov et al., 2015). So:

1. The public and power organization researches of in the structurally functional plan (G. Almond, K. Doych, E. Durkheim, D. Iston, G. Kelzen, K. Marx, R. Merton, T. Parsons, P. Sorokin, etc.);
2. The conceptual versions with the attention accentuation on institutional and standard treatment of the public power institutes (H. Arendt, M.I. Baiting, I.N. Gomerov, V. Ya. Lyubashits, A.F. Maly, D. Nort, J. Wallice, V.E. Chirkin, etc.);
3. The political, sociological and government doctrines with orientation to understand the political organization as the public and imperious relations specific system (N.N. Alekseev, P. Blau, N. Luman, G.V. Maltsev, L.S. Mamut, A. Yu. Mordovtsev, A.I. Ovchinnikov, V.A. Podoroga, O. Harkhordin, E. Yunger, etc.);
4. The public and power organization analysis as the certain type of political and legal rationality (J. Agamben, M. Weber, P. Burdyo, K. Crouch, M. Foucault, etc.), or as the certain social mental set (B. de Jouvenel, I.A. Ilyin, M.N. Korkunov, I.L. Solonevich, etc.) or as the mass political image (real or virtual), representation, simulacrum, archetypic installation, etc. (Zh. Bodriyyar, D.V. Ivanov, I.A. Isaev, Yu. Evola, M. Eliade, Zh. Ellyul, etc.), which organize the socio-political actors thinking activity and processes of the public-powerful space institutionalization.

Modern researchers focus attention on problems of political ethnology, ethno-sociocultural and archetypic bases of social thinking activity, the political relations development and the successive transformation of the political organization more and more. It should be noted that complex researches of the theoretical, methodological, and conceptual bases of the sociocultural paradigm, the legal archetype theory in the theory of policy and methodology of political researches until now was practically not existed.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Methodologically, our study is based on principles as:

1. Amendments to the understanding of the political actors' behavior specifics;

2. “The understanding interpretation,” i.e., the concept of the archetypal foundations of public power organizations is built by the methods of understanding and explanation in accordance with the heuristic settings post-non-classical (understanding) science;
3. The socio-cultural conventionality in the action of the values and normative systems in the context of concrete historical and social-communicative nature;
4. The integrity as the systematic and organic unity methodological principle, interaction and interdependence of all elements of the socio-political ethno-cultural life of society;
5. The principle of objectivity as the methodological orientation for the reconstruction of existing concepts and characteristics of the political world, cognitive systems, styles of political thought and interaction, independent of the will and consciousness of a single individual;
6. The accuracy of the analytical and empirical data as well as socio-cultural and ethno-national context;
7. The instrumental and political realism in the knowledge of socio-cultural factors and ethno-political landmarks.

Investigating political life of the individual, ethnos, people or any other sociocultural unity, first, we have to understand and learn multicomponent system of his real valuable preferences defining political outlook, political consciousness and socio-political thinking activity.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the center of research programs with orientation to reconstruction of archetypic bases, there is a description of the “core,” round which the specific institutional organization is built or based on which is interpreted the special welfare type, national dominants, psychophysiological constants and other. For example, according to psychologists, “in each society there is one dominating type of the individual, which can be revealed by means of psychological techniques and which defines all cultural manifestations of society” (Lurie, 1994). Other researchers believe that features, both national character, and behavioral, institutional genesis “are equated to modal personal structure (modal personality structure), that is reflect individual variations in this society” (Lyubashits et al., 2015).

In the middle of the twentieth century. E. Shiels has proved that changes and continuity in the social organization development, based on socio-cultural foundation, which “represents the concentration of values and beliefs ... It is the center because the outside and does not reduce. The Center is also the basis for action. It is a structure of activities, roles and people within the framework of institutions” (Shils, 1961). This central area according to Shiels performs an important social function, has sense-thinking value as integrates institutional norms in society and organizes social interaction.

In every society operates “the central zone” (Demetradze, 2012), where is fixed the society traditional value-normative system, serving the basis for the socio-cultural and institutional development (Fedulov et al., 2015). Barulin and Sikevich write

about primary normative structuring social interaction and its specificity (Barulin, 2000), and Mordovtsev – about the “pre-legal codes of behavior” and styles of socio-cultural/national ideology, way of thinking and evaluation of the processes occurring events, etc. (Mordovtsev and Popov, 2007). Therefore, at the heart of the national character are “primary rules of human interaction, depending on the nature of the society in which the nation lives,” and the national character is an alloy, “a combination of natural and social principles” that form the base (foundation) of a particular society (Ovchinnikov et al., 2015).

The archetypic foundations of the public power organization are the foundation of any society, they cement the social and cultural framework of public interaction (the main types, models and pre-legal/pre-standard codes of interaction), and play in the society psycho-physiological and social universe to ensure the adaptation mechanism, the individual and society development forming the motivational structure, styles and forms of understanding what is happening (Karabulatova, 2013).

Thus, the last represent labile structure that the researcher reconstructs for further social and institutional forecasting of changes in society. Social groups, according to B. Latour, “are not silent objects, but temporary generation of the constant rumble created by millions of voices arguing what it is the group and who to what group belongs.” Each social group establishes various connection and interrelations, concrete borders and its definitions (Mkrtumova et al., 2016). “Construction material” of these communications and interrelations is “archetypic material” of the society to which images, symbols, rituals, cognitive and emotional predispositions belong.

Archetypal basics necessary to differentiate with related phenomena. Thus, the socio-cultural archetypes are included in the structure of the national political and legal mentality of the more complex categories, but they have an independent meaning. In recognition of “enrollment” archetype, its impact goes to “an end” and is assimilated by consciousness. The archetypes are the essence of forms, patterns and filled with a specific personal content only when exposed to a certain consciousness. So, if the mentality connects highly rationalized forms of consciousness to the world of the unconscious structures with unconscious cultural codes (archetypes), the set of archetypes is the “prototype” (Jung, 1991), motifs, themes, characters, forming a “reinforcement” (K. Levi-Stross) of all political and legal culture of the nation. If the mentality preserves and reproduces the shape and style of the publicly-imperious thinking, archetypes characterize the emotional and psychological predispositions, orientation, motives and subjects of these forms and styles of understanding of the political or legal reality.

The use of the “archetype” category (its literal value – the preexisting form) in legal researches has the considerable heuristic potential as promotes the identification and scientific assessment of the basic psychosocial factors providing stability of the society national and legal development and gives the chance to define civilization prospects and limits of the institutional innovations going in the globalization context. Archetypes

express installations of the anticipation and formal schemes of the concrete collective experience, being some kind of the “pre-consciousness intuition” causing mental activity and social behavior (Ovchinnikov et al., 2008). Thus, the most important of them are depicted as images of ethno-confessional, legal, sociocultural and political consciousness. So, for example, in conscious legal and political behavior of the individual steady motives, images, plots of public and imperious interaction which have an autonomy from subjective political and legal consciousness reproduce everywhere, being in this context a certain manifestation something steadier, unconscious (or according to Jung – “collective unconscious”). It is necessary to understand that sociocultural archetypes are not identical to legal customs and political traditions of society. They illustrate basic sociocultural model in the form of invariable legal spirit, political psychology of the nation, which is reproduced from generation to generation. Therefore, those archetypes take a significant place in the cultural genesis of the concrete society. The appeal of scientists to an irrational mental basis of legal culture will give the chance to reveal its fundamental qualities.

There is no doubt that the archetypes are the integral part of the general social and environmental regulatory continuum of the right cultural environment of the society where along with them customs, traditions, ethical and religious standards, national habits function. Archetypes are the “social and cultural reservoir” to all the above, integrating the most successful, were approved in the course of the legal evolution of the social system, forms, designs and models, which over time are fixed as unconscious archetypal “code” of behavior, cognitive systems of knowledge and perception of legal phenomena and processes, etc. Archetypes create psychogenic and psychosocial basis of the person legal culture. Therefore, the Mask helps quicker to adapt for the new installations of legal life. The Wise man archetype helps to create open system of legal axiological. Other archetypes that are also allocated by K.G. Jung perform their function in the legal culture development of the person. Therefore, the Shadow is one of psychogenic sources of negative qualities of the personality. Influence of this archetype very considerably for the “choice” of the subject of the legal culture models. Researchers allocate a number of the ethno-cultural archetypes influencing the legal culture development of the Russian citizens. As the national kernel, cultural basis of the society legal culture development, act the legal archetypes, or the right cultural codes of the development, defining national and cultural dominants of legal development, reproduction of socially significant forms and models of interaction in the system individual – society – state, defining motives and a plot of national legal thinking, ways of legitimation and an assessment of these or those state and legal phenomena and processes of modern reality (Ovchinnikov et al., 2008).

The ratio of an archetype and the political and legal experience has the system character, i.e., similar interaction represents system of feedback – the repeating experience forms certain collective dominants of interaction (nodal points) which become archetypic structures or cultural codes (archetypes) of the political and legal thinking development (installation, samples, habits, etc.) and

activity (a form and model of interaction). At the same time, these archetypic structures influence our representations and experience, seeking to organize them according to already existing models (for example, models of the interaction perception and assessment in the system individual – society – state, as forms originality and specificity of national political and legal processes, influences crystallization of a certain type of the state, legal system and other).

Psychosocial basis of the “global” tendency of the legal culture system formation is the collective unconscious with a set of universal archetypes. With great certainty, it is possible to claim that sources of the natural right are in this “layer” of mentality. After all, for humanity the rights for freedom, property, safety, voluntary association and personal privacy are universal. The same installations make a basis of globalization of legal culture, legal activity and all legal human life.

At the same time, archetypes are not similar to symbols. The archetypic stereotype is shown and fixed in symbolization, values system, representations and social institutes that influence process of political and legal socialization, the individual’s inclusiveness in the developed socio-political and right cultural universum. In this respect, they present some kind of internal disposition that makes identical political and legal representations, and in a coverage represent tendencies to motives formation, “which can fluctuate considerably in details, without losing thus the basic scheme” (Jung, 1991). The universal installations of legal culture, which are based on archetypes collective unconscious, contribute to the strengthening of communication links promoting not only understanding by the individual of need to adhere to norms of public life, but also to its positive change.

Inherently, the legal archetype is the reflection of constantly recurring social experience on regulation of human relations. Its main function is the reproduction of the same ideas about the legal life. This “image” is a determinant of the legal evolution of the person bringing it to fixing of internal reaction to pressure of external forces. The archetype can cause in the individual exaggeration, obsession and “inflation” in assessing themselves and their social group. Thus, it “captures” sense of justice of the person and can compel it to go beyond moral rules and norms.

We should not identify the archetype as the instinct because if instincts represent poly-variability of natural reactions, the archetypes support monotony and regularity of our perceptions. If the randomness is norm for instincts, for the archetype stability is rated. In relation to the image, the archetype “is directed up,” connected with ideas, values, spirituality. In turn, in relation to instinct archetype “sent down,” then the archetypal theory is accent the ethnological features of the person and human communities.

The modern legal nihilism promotes substitution by empty and vague concepts. Moreover, by means of speculative ideological designs try to manipulate consciousness of the person who to please the external forces and under their influence can refuse the existential interests and requirements (Karabulatova et al., 2016). However, these existential are genetically connected with the natural rights and freedoms put in the archetypic matrix of justice.

5. CONCLUSION

Thus, the archetypes of justice constitute psychogenic (at the level of the collective unconscious) and psychosocial (at the level of the personal unconscious) legal basis of the person culture. If the archetypes of the collective unconscious fit well into the modern “market” model of legal behavior, the system of ethno-cultural archetypes of man is in constant evolution. Archetypes of the public power organization have a fundamental principle, a prototype of the socio-political and right cultural environment, they mediate (through its manifestations) specific evolution and stability of the political and legal culture. If instincts have individual measurement, the collective archetype, inherent to the whole nation, epoch. Only harmonized with the archetypal state of the values system and meaning axiological, perceived by man in the process of socialization, making it a holistic sense of justice and normal as well as possible co-existence of the subject with others. Such psychological features of the person, as its “multi-subjectivity” greatly complicates the management of the legal socialization processes, since it is necessary to consider not only the impact of rational and valuable components of its sense of justice, but also the archetypal matrix created by the “image” of the collective and personal unconscious, which by their nature irrational. Archetypal structure prejudices being socio-politically relevant attitudes, norms, and models.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The research is done with funding from granting by the President of Russian Federation as part of research project “Archetypal (socio-cultural) bases of Russian governmental organization and its evolution in XXI century” № MD-6669.2016.6.

REFERENCES

- Agamirov, A., Mordovtsev, A., Mamychev, A., Sarychev, I. (2015), Legal mindset as a factor in the study of national law and the state in the XXI century. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3S6), 235-240.
- Baranov, P., Ovchinnikov, A., Mamychev, A. (2015), The state authority constitutional legitimacy in modern Russia. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(5S3), 201-208.
- Barulin, V. (2000), *Russian Man in the Twentieth Century, Losses and Finding Oneself*. Saint Petersburg: Aletheia.
- Berger, P., Lukman, T. (1995), *Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge*. Moscow: Medium.
- Demetradze, M. (2012), The central zone of the traditional socio-cultural values as the information-communicative phenomenon, new approaches to the study of tradition and traditionalism (for example, Russia), Moscow: Nota Bene.
- Fedulov, A., Karepova, S., Sovetovna, K., Akhmetova, B., Istamgalin, R. (2015), The Phenomenon of “Russian Soul” as a Reflection of Traditional Russian Conservatism: New Theoretical and Methodological Approaches and Ordinary Perception of Conservatism. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Science*, 6(6S3), 113-121.
- Jung, C. (1991), *The archetype and the symbol*. Moscow: Renaissance.
- Karabulatova, I. (2013), The problems of linguistic modeling of new Eurasian linguistic personality in multilingualistic and mental environment (by example of on omasphere). *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 17(6), 791-795.

- Karabulatova, I., Akhmetova, B., Shagbanova, K., Loskutova, E., Sayfulina, F., Zamalieva, L., Dyukov, I., Vykhrystyuk, M. (2016), Shaping positive identity in the context of ethnocultural information security in the struggle against the Islamic State. *Central Asia and Caucasus*, 17(1), 84-92.
- Karepova, S., Karabulatova, I., Novikov, V., Klemovitsky, S., Stratan, D., Perova, A. (2015), New approaches to the development of methodology of strategic community planning. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Science*, 6(3S6), 357-364.
- Lurie, S. (1994), *Metamorphoses of the traditional consciousness. Experience in developing the foundations of ethno-psychology and its application to the analysis of historical and ethnographic material.* Saint Petersburg: Typography Named by Kotlyakov.
- Lyubashits, V., Mamychev, A., Mordovtsev, A., Vronskaya, M. (2015), The socio-cultural paradigm of studies of state authority. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3S6), 301-306.
- Merton, R. (2006), *Social Theory and Social Structure.* Moscow: The Guardian.
- Mkrumova, I., Dosanova, A., Karabulatova, I., Nifontov, V. (2016), The use of communication technologies of oppose political-religious terrorism as an ethnosocial deviation in the contemporary information-digital society. *Central Asia and Caucasus*, 17(2), 791-795.
- Mordovtsev, A., Popov, V. (2007), *Russian Legal Mentality.* Rostov-on-Don: Publishing House of the SFU.
- Osipov, G., Karabulatova, I., Shafranov-Kutsev, G., Kononova, L., Akhmetova, B., Loskutova, E., Niyazova, G. (2016), Ethnic trauma and its Echo in today's mental picture of the world among the peoples of the post-soviet states: An interethnic conflicting discourse unfolding in Russian's ethnolinguistic information space. *Central Asia and Caucasus*, 17(2), 87-94.
- Ovchinnikov, A., Mamychev, A., Mamycheva, D. (2015), Sociocultural bases of state – Legal development coding. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3S4), 67-74.
- Ovchinnikov, A., Mamychev, A., Manastyrny, A., Tyurin, M. (2008), *Legal archetypes in the legal policy of Russia.* Rostov-on-Don: Publishing House of SFU.
- Shils, E. (1961), *Centre and periphery.* Polanyi M. *The Logic of Personal Knowledge: Essays.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.