

UDC 351/354:167.7

**Sushyi Olena Vladimirovna,**

*Doctor of Science in Public Administration, Head of the Laboratory of Methodology of Psychosocial and Political-Psychological Research, Institute of Social and Political Psychology of the NAES of Ukraine, 04070, Kyiv, Str. Andriivska, 15, tel.: +38 (067) 910 99 26, e-mail: a\_s\_y2000@yahoo.com*

ORCID: 0000-0002-4364-7571

**Сушиий Олена Володимирівна,**

*доктор наук з державного управління, завідувачка лабораторії методології психосоціальних і політико-психологічних досліджень, Інститут соціальної та політичної психології НАПН України, 04070, м. Київ, вул. Андріївська, 15, тел.: +38 (067) 910 99 26, e-mail: a\_s\_y2000@yahoo.com*

ORCID: 0000-0002-4364-7571

**Сушиий Елена Владимировна,**

*доктор наук по государственному управлению, заведующая лабораторией методологии психосоциальных и политико-психологических исследований, Институт социальной и политической психологии НАПН Украины, 04070, г. Киев, ул. Андреевская, 15, тел.: +38 (067) 910 99 26, e-mail: a\_s\_y2000@yahoo.com*

ORCID: 0000-0002-4364-7571



---

## **SOCIAL ARCHETYPIC IN THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION PROBLEM FIELD: CONTEMPORARY STATE AND PROSPECTS OF DEVELOPMENT**

**Abstract.** This article surveys the development process of social archetypes as a new direction for interdisciplinary research in the public administration problem field, that implemented in the framework of scholarly sessions of Ukrainian School of Archetypes (USArch), namely: International Theoretical and Methodological Seminars and International Competitions for Young Scholars “Archetypes and Public Administration” (2010–2018), International Lectures Cycle “Patterns and Characteristics of Ukrainian Social Transformation” (2016), Internet discussions and skype conferences. Program sessions themes of the listed scholarly forms are summarized as well as prospects for further movement of USArch and development of social archetypes as a new direction for interdisciplinary research are defined.

Attention is drawn to the fact that the post-soviet scholarly community doesn't have a sufficiently developed opinion on social archetypes as an interdisciplinary field of research and its methodological foundations. The basis for criticism is an ambiguous attitude both to the teachings of K. Jung about the archetypes of the collective unconscious, and to the psychoanalytic trend as a whole. It is suggested that reducing the degree of critical attitude to social archetypes as an interdisciplinary field of research in the subject field of public administration depends on a number of conditions. Firstly, using the common formulation and interpretation of the ideas that influenced its formation and development. Secondly, from an adequate understanding of both the possibilities of social archetypes which are determined by its original methods of explanation and methods of analysis of subtle social phenomena which can serve as a key point for further theoretical and empirical research, and the theoretical and practical limitations of the archetypal approach. That is why social archetypes is positioned as an interdisciplinary research area.

I argued that the social archetypes is not a universal scholarly apparatus and not an orthodox inheritance of the ideas of Jungianism. Finally, it is a methods that allows us to establish patterns and features of modern social development, the practical application of which expands the possibilities of public-management's activity. At the same time, it is a metaphor through which the researcher is invited to plunge into the wider psychosocial and sociocultural context of social phenomena and processes.

**Keywords:** social archetypes, Ukrainian School of Archetypes, public administration, Ukraine, social and cultural practices.

### **СОЦІАЛЬНА АРХЕТИПІКА У ПРОБЛЕМНОМУ ПОЛІ ПУБЛІЧНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ: СУЧАСНИЙ СТАН І ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ РОЗВИТКУ**

**Анотація.** Розглянуто процес становлення та розвитку соціальної архетипіки як нового міждисциплінарного наукового напрямку у проблемному полі публічно-управлінської науки, що реалізовано у процесі ініційованих Українською школою архетипіки (УША) та у формах наукової комунікації: міжнародні теоретико-методологічні семінари та конкурси молодих науковців “Архетипіка і державне управління” (2010–2018), міжнародний лекторій “Закономірності та особливості української трансформації” (2016), Інтернет-дискусії та скайп-конференції. Узагальнено тематичні напрями роботи зазначених наукових форматів, визначено перспективу подальшого поступу УША та розвитку соціальної архетипіки як міждисциплінарного наукового напрямку.

Звертається увага, що пострадянська наукова спільнота не має достатньо сформованої думки щодо соціальної архетипіки як міждисциплінарного напрямку досліджень та її методологічних засад. Підставою для критичних суджень є неоднозначне ставлення як до вчення К. Юнга про архетипи колективного несвідомого, так і до психоаналітичного напрямку в цілому. Вису-

нуто припущення, що зниження градусу критичного ставлення до соціальної архетипіки як міждисциплінарного напряму досліджень у предметному полі публічного управління залежатиме від низки умов. По-перше, від коректного використання та інтерпретації ідей, які вплинули на її становлення й розвиток. По-друге, від адекватного розуміння як можливостей соціальної архетипіки, які визначаються її оригінальними способами пояснення й методами аналізу важковловимих соціальних явищ, що може стати орієнтиром для подальших теоретичних та емпіричних пошуків, так і теоретичної й практичної обмеженості архетипного підходу. Саме тому соціальна архетипіка позиціонується як міждисциплінарний напрям досліджень.

Стверджується, що соціальна архетипіка — не універсальний науковий апарат і не ортодоксальне наслідування ідей юнгіанства. Насамперед, це — науковий інструментарій, який дає можливість встановити закономірності й особливості сучасного соціального розвитку, практичне застосування якого розширює можливості публічно-управлінської діяльності. Водночас, це — метафора, за посередництвом якої дослідника запрошують поринути у більш широкий психосоціальний і соціокультурний контекст соціальних явищ і процесів.

**Ключові слова:** соціальна архетипіка, Українська школа архетипіки, публічне управління, Україна, соціокультурні практики.

### **СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ АРХЕТИПИКА В ПРОБЛЕМНОМ ПОЛЕ ПУБЛИЧНОГО УПРАВЛЕНИЯ: СОВРЕМЕННОЕ СОСТОЯНИЕ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ РАЗВИТИЯ**

**Аннотация.** Рассмотрен процесс становления и развития социальной архетипики как нового междисциплинарного научного направления в проблемном поле публично-управленческой науки, реализованного в рамках инициированных Украинской школой архетипики (УША) и в формах научной коммуникации: международные теоретико-методологические семинары и конкурсы молодых ученых “Архетипика и публичное управление” (2010–2018), международный лекторий “Закономерности и особенности украинской трансформации” (2016), Интернет-дискуссии и скайп-конференции. Обобщены тематические направления работы названных научных форматов, определены перспективы дальнейшего продвижения УША и развития социальной архетипики как междисциплинарного научного направления.

Обращается внимание, что постсоветское научное сообщество не имеет достаточно сложившегося мнения относительно социальной архетипики как междисциплинарного направления исследований и ее методологических основ. Основанием для критических замечаний является неоднозначное отношение как к учению К. Юнга об архетипах коллективного бессознательного, так и к психоаналитическому направлению в целом. Высказано предположение, что снижение градуса критического отношения к социальной архетипике как междисциплинарного направления исследований в пред-

метном поле публичного управления зависит от ряда условий. Во-первых, от корректного использования и интерпретации идей, которые повлияли на ее становление и развитие. Во-вторых, от адекватного понимания как возможностей социальной архетипики, которые определяются ее оригинальными способами объяснения и методами анализа трудноуловимых социальных явлений, что может стать ориентиром для дальнейших теоретических и эмпирических изысканий, так и теоретической и практической ограниченности архетипного подхода. Именно поэтому социальная архетипика позиционируется как междисциплинарное направление исследований.

Утверждается, что социальная архетипика — не универсальный научный аппарат и не ортодоксальное наследование идей юнгианства. Прежде всего, это — научный инструментарий, который позволяет установить закономерности и особенности современного социального развития, практическое применение которого расширяет возможности публично-управленческой деятельности. Вместе с тем, это — метафора, посредством которой исследователя приглашают окунуться в более широкий психосоциальный и социокультурный контекст социальных явлений и процессов.

**Ключевые слова:** социальная архетипика, Украинская школа архетипики, публичное управление, Украина, социокультурные практики.

---

**Thesis statement.** Modern academic science, which has huge needs today in changing its methodological principles, demonstrates new creative approaches to scientific research. These approaches are largely determined by global trends in the development of interdisciplinary, global and integrated areas that are most often implemented within scientific schools. Ukrainian public administration science does not stand aside and offers its own scientific methods and methods of comprehension of modern dynamic social processes.

In Ukraine, the Scientific School of Interdisciplinary Studies was founded and successfully developed — the Ukrainian School of Archetypic (USA). The USA is an open-ended scientific and public association of representatives of various branches of sci-

ence, which, from the standpoint of archetypes of the collective unconscious, consider the actual problems of the theory and history of public administration, the formation and development of mechanisms of public administration and service in the bodies of state power and local self-government [1]

School specialists note that modern — postmodern — social world acquires a high level of dynamics of continuous change and, as never, needs to harmonize and to balance the foundations of its existence. Such harmonizers and a prerequisite for the sustainable development of society are the archetypes of the collective unconscious.

**Analysis of recent publications.** Despite the initial level of development of archetypal problems in various subject areas of social and humanitarian knowledge, it nevertheless finds pro-

per justification within the framework of public administration science in Ukraine. In her bosom, the USA develops a new scientific and practical interdisciplinary direction of research in the field of public administration science, approved are the main provisions of the methodology of social archetype.

Social archetypic was formed on the basis of an archetypal approach. It is closely associated with the analytic psychology of the Swiss Charles Gustave Jung, the American personality typology Myers-Briggs, the works of the Ukrainian sociologists Eduard Afonin and Olena Donchenko, a psychodiagnostic Leonid Burlachuk, a cultural historian Serhii Krymskii, a historian Andrii Martynov and a political scientist Yurii Romanenko.

For almost ten years, the USA has been developing its methodology on the problems of public administration. Significant milestones on the way of its formation was the realization by the founders of such tasks:

- creation and adaptation for mass surveys of special psychodiagnostic tools, which consisted of a projective method of “color preferences” (author E. Afonin) and a personal questionnaire “BAD” (authors L. Burlachuk, E. Afonin, O. Donchenko);
- launch of sociological monitoring of system-wide changes in Ukraine (1992–2017), Russia (2010, 2011) and Belarus (2010, 2011, 2013);
- comprehension of empirical data, their generalization and conceptualization in societal (1994), cyclic (1996) and actually archetypal (2002–2010) paradigms.

Initiated in 2010 as the main organizational form of the association of

the scientific community of the USA, the annual theoretical and methodological seminars (hereinafter — TMS) with the international participation of “Archetypic and Public Administration” allowed the uniting of efforts of more than 200 researchers from 15 countries in the world. And initiated in 2013 within the TMS annual international competitions of young scientists constituted the social guarantee of sustainable development of the national scientific school of archetypic of public administration.

**The objective of the article** is to highlight the process of formation and development of social archetypic as a new interdisciplinary scientific direction in the problem field of public administration science, realized in the process of forms of scientific communication initiated by the USA. The review and synthesis of the thematic areas presented in these scientific formats will determine the prospect of further progress of the USA and the development of social archetypic as an interdisciplinary scientific direction in the problem field of public administration.

**Results.** With the growing complexity of state and management tasks solved by modern society, the formation of new systems and types of management, the activation of theoretical and practical developments and decisions in the managerial field, etc., the scientific community of the USA has focused primarily on the problems in the field of public administration. However, the new scientific approach is relevant not only for the system of public administration in Ukraine, but also for management in various spheres of human activity. This is evidenced by

the content of scientific discussions unfolding in the process of scientific and communicative activities initiated by the USA, such as the international theoretical and methodological seminar and the competition of young scientists “Archetypic and Public Administration” (2010–2018), international lectures cycle “Policies and Peculiarities of the Ukrainian transformation” (2016), Internet discussions on the youtube platform “Proyasnenie.info [Clarification.info]” [2], public lectures, at the invitation of the USA, of a well-known French postmodern sociologist, professor Michel Muffesol and other foreign scholars.

### **International Theoretical and Methodological Seminar “Archetypic and Public Administration”**

The USA titular scientific forum is an annual theoretical and methodological seminar with international participation “Archetypic and Public Administration”, which started its work in 2010. Its focus is being clarified every year. The organizers see the goal of TMS in the unification of interdisciplinary efforts of researchers working in various fields of social and humanitarian knowledge, as well as in discussing theoretical and methodological principles of the influence of archetypes of the collective unconscious on modern public administration.

For many years, the problems of democratic state formation in the field of public administration and public policy are discussed by the USA researchers from the point of view of the science of public administration, political science, history, sociology, psychology, economics, philosophy, cultural studies, philology, geography, mathematics, etc.

The key element of the forum was the plenary discussion of scientific reports, grouped by panels – general thematic platforms for discussions. The culmination of the meeting is a joint discussion, which, depending on the number of participants, is carried out according to the author’s methodology of the active participant of the USA Taras Plakhtii in the formats of two-dimensional or three-dimensional dynamic networks.

The reports of the participants are published in the annual special editions of the professional magazine: in Ukrainian/in Russian, “Public Administration: Theory and Practice” (2010–2015), in Ukrainian/in English “Public Administration” (2016–2018), issued by the scientific specialty of the SAC of Ukraine “Public Administration” and included in the scientometric databases (Index Copernicus, RINC). The annual review of scientific and communicative activities of the USA is presented on the pages of the professional scientific publication “Ukrainian SOCIETY”. As a result of discussions, as well as generalization of the proposals submitted in scientific publications, information notes are prepared annually on practical recommendations for state authorities and management. A brief overview of the thematic areas of work of TMS and the competition of young scientists based on its platform is given further.

*I TMS “Archetypic and Public Administration”* (Ukraine, the city of Feodosia, 2010). The organizers of the Feodosia Forum offered scholars to consider from a position of archetypic rather familiar problems of the theory and history of public administration and local self-government, the forma-

tion of mechanisms of public administration and service in state authorities and local self-government. The program conditions of the scientific discussion identified the following theoretical positions: one of the key features of the new-postmodern-social reality, which is replacing the modern social world, is associated with the psychology of people, “which, more often than is commonly considered, — as is assumed by Serge Moskovici, — lies in the basis of social (social structures, products, institutions, etc.)”. The second feature is associated with the actualization of our past, which more and more influences our present. Proceeding from the aforementioned theoretical positions, within the framework of the first TMS, a set of issues was discussed that would allow theoretically and methodologically to reveal the peculiarities of the interrelationships between state administration and archetypal representations that were analyzed in the stream of a cyclic paradigm (the theoretical model of the “universal epochal cycle” by E. Afonin and A Martynov).

*II TMS “Archetypic and Public Administration: objective, subjective and unconscious in the processes of social integration and differentiation”* (Egypt, Sharm El-Sheikh, 2011) is devoted to the analysis of contradictions in the manifestations of objective, subjective and unconscious in the processes of social integration and differentiation. It is proposed, firstly, to look at social reality through the discovery of deep (archetypal) determinants as constructs that determine the integrity of society, culture, actions and human consciousness; second, to determine theoretical and methodological principles and metho-

dical tools for analysing the dynamics of these processes, which, in the opinion of the organizers, can become a promising component of the theory and practice of public administration.

*III TMS “Archetypic and Public Administration: Mental and Psychological Aspects”* (Spain, Barcelona, 2012). In order to understand the phenomena of “norm” and “pathology”, analysis of their manifestations in public administration, the organizers of the third TMS-2012 proposed to “go” to the macro level of the processes of social and spiritual history of a particular society and of mankind as a whole, which politician is involved in and “learns” through the mechanisms of collective unconscious. The reason for such an imaginary step is that during the Post-modern period, the psychosocial characteristics of the subjects of interaction, especially their preferences, motivations and behavioural styles depend on both the mental characteristics and the cultural archetypes of the people and its political and management elite as well as on the situation in general, which takes place in certain socio-historical conditions. Managerial relations, being a certain type of social relations, are determined not only by the current system of public administration, they are also conditioned by factors of socio-historical development, therefore the managerial relations reflect the socio-cultural specificity of the interaction of the individual, society and the state.

*IV TMS “Archetypic and Public Administration: Institutional Forms, Mechanisms and Practices”* (Ukraine, Kyiv, 2013) is devoted to problems of development of public administration in Ukraine and other countries of the

world, which were analysed in the focus of archetype methodology. An important prerequisite for the institutionalization of democratic procedures in the context of fundamental social change is the transition from the domination of corrupt professional politicians and political technologists to an open policy, the formation and development of which involves not only government actors, parliamentary political parties or big business, but also — directly, through mechanisms of direct feedback from the authorities — representatives of civil society, the so-called Third Sector.

*V TMS “Archetypic and Public Administration: Rationalization and Regulatory Practices”* (Ukraine, Kyiv, 2014). The program framework of the V TMS-2014 were identified by a deep systemic crisis in Ukraine, which was a reflection of the nonlinear nature of social transformation processes, leveling out strategic orientations for the country’s movement towards democracy, which pushed it into the social inversion embrace. Against the reversal of social processes, archetypes of the past that “trigger” the process of reproduction of a new (or alternative/other), an adequate to the time and the changing human nature basis of social integration, “explode and come to the surface”. Under these conditions, the solution to the systemic social crisis and the way out to sustainable development will undoubtedly depend on the successful formation of a rational system of regulation. But not to a lesser extent, the state of this regulatory system under the new conditions becomes dependent on the effective reproduction of the generated psychosocial properties of a per-

son and social relations, the sacralization of which is carried out under the influence of the corresponding archetypes of the past. The latter, in fact, become the subject of scientific reflection (rationalization) of the collective unconscious.

*VI TMS “Archetypic and Public Administration: Social Self-Organization, Social Mobility, Social Integration”* (Ukraine, Uzhhorod, 2015). The content plan of the VI TMS-2015 was indirectly defined by the situation, so to speak, of the radicalization of public sentiment as a result of the events of 2013–2014, which not only diminished the ambivalence and uncertainty inherent in the mass consciousness of Ukrainian citizens, but also signalled, according to the organizers, the formation of new installations, which can become the basis for strengthening the national consciousness of the Ukrainian people, social consolidation, social mobilization and social self-organization. It is extremely important not to disperse these sprouts and, on this basis, to implement a systemic, realistic, open and transparent, socially responsible state policy to restore confidence in the government. Thus, the priority issues for the regular discussion were the issues of strategic directions of development of the Ukrainian society and the state in overcoming the systemic crisis in Ukraine; restoring social dialogue, ensuring a stable civil and political peace and achieving national consolidation. These issues, of course, were proposed to be analysed in the context of the development of ideas about the nature of the collective unconscious.

*VII TMS “Archetypic and Public Administration: Challenges and Risks*



of *Social Transformation*” (Georgia, Tbilisi, 2016). The program of the VII TMS-2016 is connected with the idea that social transformations and political modernizations of the countries of the end of the XX – the beginning of the XXI century do not necessarily coincide with the model of the “Western European model” that arose during the “great depression” of the 30–40-ies of the XX<sup>th</sup> century. The modern political life of the countries of the “second modern” (as defined by Ulrich Beck) leads to the emergence of new socio-economic and socio-political forms of organization of society. The acuteness is expanding and the natural palette of conflicts of political modelling, which is particularly evident in the post-Soviet countries, is growing. The social transformation process is marked by a number of new phenomena of “convertible democracy” or “chameleon democracies”. It seems that modern political modernization is fed not only by universals of institutional matrices and archetypes of the collective unconscious, but also by specific manifestations of conscious and unconscious in various spatio-temporal incarnations of the sociocultural nature of national-state formations. At the same time, the growing challenges and threats to the global, regional and social integrity and security that are gaining strength in the context of the emergence of postmodern realities of the modern world significantly change traditional perceptions of nature and factors of social and state development. Under these conditions, the most sensitive issue in the social transformation process is the question of the balance between the pace of increasing socio-political, socio-economic

and other socio-cultural forms of manifestation of institutional activity (freedom) of citizens and the potential of reproduction of the psychosocial (archetypal) nature of social reform. This balance between the institutional form and the psychological content, in fact, also ensures the regime of sustainable development of society.

*VIII TMS “Archetypic and Public Administration: Mechanisms and Strategies for Conflict Resolution in the Modern World”* (Ukraine, Kyiv, 2017). Archetypists have not ignored the actualized by the situation in Ukraine issues of social conflicts. At present, the need for adequate managerial representations about the psychosocial nature of man and society, the possession of methods for prediction and resolution of social conflicts has exacerbated. It is important to understand that under new socio-historical conditions they are determined primarily by the psychological nature of man and society, heterogeneity of social structure, dynamism and nonlinear character of social development, the diversity of spatial and temporal ties and relations, global interdependence and exclusive features of social actors. This greatly complicates the diagnosis of social conflicts and crisis situations, the possibility of their forecasting and modelling conflict resolution mechanisms and managing conflict situations.

At the invitation of the USA within the framework of the VIII TMS (May 29 and 30, 2017), a well-known French postmodern sociologist, professor at the University of Paris V (University of Paris Descartes), Michel Muffesoli, gave public lectures on the following topics:

1. “Neotribalism and modern decentralization policy” [3];

2. “Transformation of the political into ethical: the moral values of the postmodern space” [4; 5].

See the Ukrinform material [6] on participating the Sorbonne’s Professor Michel Muffesoli in the USA 2017 annual events.

*IX TMS “Archetypic and public administration: European space in the dimensions of imaginary, real and ideal”* (France, Montpellier, 2018). The content plan of this year’s scientific forum is determined by the issues of public administration, which is related to the changes that will be felt in the medium-term by the West and East European public space. The affinity of Ukraine and Europe, due to the common natural and geographical conditions and historical and cultural heritage, stimulates the aspirations of Ukrainians to enter the family of the countries of the European Union. Instead, not only Ukraine has recently been absorbed by the processes of nation-building and state-building, which were substantially complicated by the external armed aggression on the part of neighbouring Russia. The European world has also recently faced internal challenges and external challenges, which once again led some experts to declare Europe’s decline.

**International Competition for Young Scientists “Archetypic and Public Administration” (2013–2017).** In order to develop the USA community in 2013, an annual International Competition for Young Scientists was founded on the TMS platform. Its program boundaries are determined by the topic of the next TMS. The youth

forum is gaining strength every year, and it increases the number of countries whose members participate in it. Within the framework of the competition, the international expert commission defines the winners. The winners and the best authors of scientific papers have the opportunity to present key ideas on the special plenary panel of the TMS. Ukrainian and Russian-language collections of scientific works of winners and the best authors of the competition are issued in the competition.

**International lectures cycle “Policies and Peculiarities of Ukrainian Transformation” (Ukraine, Poland, Kazakhstan, 2016).** The school’s new initiative to promote the main results of its work was embodied in the format of the international lectures cycle “Policies and Peculiarities of Ukrainian Transformation”, which, according to the plan, will promote popularization of the scientific direction that is important for the present, and increase its authority and management science in general. The main platforms of the Lectures cycle were the National Parliamentary Library of Ukraine, the Institute of Economics and Forecasting of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, and the youtube platform “Proyasnenie.info [Clarification.info]”, which provides skype conferences with the participation of archetypists [7].

The topics of the Lectures cycle covered a wide range of scholars and problems proposed to discussion\*. They are the following:

1. Introduction to the lectures cycle “Patterns and Peculiarities of the

\* The personal data of the speakers is given in the wording relevant during the time of the Lectures (2016).

Ukrainian Transformation”, E. A. Afonin, Dr. of Sociol. Sciences, Prof., UTA Academician, Merited Scientist and Technologist of Ukraine, Professor at NAPA under the President of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine);

2. “Social transformation and development of personality in ontogenesis”, E. A. Afonin, Dr. of Sociol. Sciences, Prof., UTA Academician, Merited Scientist and Technologist of Ukraine, Professor at NAPA under the President of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine);

3. “Global Civil Society and its Impact on Modern State Policy”, T. V. Belska, Candidate of Public Administration, Associate Professor, Doctoral Candidate at the NAPA under the President of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine);

4. “Culture of trust as a value of civil society”, O. M. Kozhemiakina, Candidate of Philosophy Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at Cherkasy State Polytechnic University (Cherkasy, Ukraine);

5. “Genocodes of national cultures: conceptual foundations”, V. P. Patrakov, philosopher, independent researcher (Stepnogorsk, Kazakhstan);

6. “Transformation of the Institute of Multiparty in Ukraine: de facto versus de jure” K. P. Merkotan, Candidate of Political Sciences, Independent Researcher (Borne Sulinowo, Poland);

7. “Historical Sociology and Archetypal Research”, A. Yu. Martynov, Dr. of Historical Sciences, Prof., Senior Scientific Member of the Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine);

8. “The Authority of the Manager in Public Administration: An Archetypal

Paradigm”, Novichenko T. V., Doctor of Public Administration, Associate Professor, Prof. at NAPA under the President of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine);

9. “Binary dichotomies of power: between “eternal evolutioner” and “eternal revolutionary”, S. O. Yushin, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Prof., Ch. Research Fellow of the NSC “Institute of Agrarian Economics” of the National Academy of Agrarian Sciences (Kyiv, Ukraine);

10. “Valuable system of society as a mechanism of democratic state-building”, O. V. Radchenko, Doctor of Public Administration, Prof., Prof. at Pomeranian Academy (Slupsk, Poland);

11. “Electronic Governance: Mechanisms of Functioning and Development”, I. V. Klymenko, Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate professor at NAPA under the President of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine);

12. “Institutional and psychosocial aspects of the state policy reforming”, O. V. Sushyi, Doctor of Public Administration, Head of Lab. Methodologies of Psychosocial and Political and Psychological Research of the Institute of Social and Political Psychology of the NAPS of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine);

13. “Global communications and their influence on the processes of state-building”, M. G. Lashkina, Candidate of Public Administration, Associate Professor, Assistant of People’s Deputy of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine);

14. “Scientific and Information Resources of a Contemporary Society: A Management Concept” Ya. O. Chepurenko, Candidate of Historical Sciences, Senior Research Fellow, Associate Professor of Management, Information

and Analytical Activity and Euro-integration Department of the National Pedagogical University named after M. P. Dragomanov (Kyiv, Ukraine).

### **Conclusion and prospects of research.**

1. The post-Soviet scientific community does not have enough developed opinion about social archetypic as an interdisciplinary research direction and its methodological principles. The reason for critical judgments on the part of some researchers is the ambiguous attitude to the teachings of C. Jung about the archetypes of the collective unconscious and the psychoanalytic direction as a whole, which is sometimes called “a new religion of the twentieth century”. Others contemptuously call the social archetype a pseudoscience, saying ironically that the proposed direction is positioned as a panacea for solving all sorts of social problems of the present and the “genius” of the unchanging leader of the Ukrainian School of Archetype (the USA).

2. The USA differs favourably from many scientific schools of the system of socio-humanitarian knowledge by the fact that, firstly, it has a well-defined psycho-diagnostic scientific method based on the psychological types of C. G. Jung and thus mediates the archetypal nature of the collective unconscious and its influence to solve problems of public administration. The projective method “Colour preferences” (1987) and the personal BAD questionnaire (2002), constructed on these bases, became reliable tools for sociological monitoring of the dynamics of psychosocial changes and their connection with institutional transformations in society.

Secondly, the USA has been in constant development for a long time. This development took a special dynamics in 2010, since it began to grow annually with new elements of its institutional practice, to expand the range of participants involved in the research and countries. Today, about 200 researchers from 15 countries of the world took part in the archetypal USA discourse on a permanent and rotational basis.

Thirdly, the open and exploratory nature of the research of the USA, its acquaintance with the work of Gilbert Duran in 2016, and in 2017 with one of the leaders of the French school of archetypic Professor Michel Muffesoli who visited Kyiv and delivered two lectures here “Non-traditionalism and modern policy of decentralization” and “Transformation of the political into ethics”, sure, made a reliable perspective for new ideas. The actual joint Ukrainian-French scientific format in Montpellier (France) is directed at their understanding.

3. As a long-term, so to speak, guardian (as the scientific secretary of the TMS and competition of young scientists), a participant and further observer of scientific and communicative activities of the USA, let me express the opinion that one can accept or not to accept social archetypic as a branch of interdisciplinary research in Ukraine, but it is impossible not to respect the systematic and multi-faceted nature of the activities of the representatives of the two archetypic schools filled with the infinite energy of their leaders. Therefore, the scientific community of archetypists in Ukraine does not lose optimism and is convinced that the established scien-

tific direction of social archetypic has sufficient creative potential for solving a wide range of issues and tasks of social and state development.

4. At the same time, it seems we should understand that the reduction of the degree of critical attitude towards social archetypic as an interdisciplinary field of research in the subject field of public administration will depend on:

- the correct use of ideas that influenced its formation and development, in particular the concept of C. Jung “On the archetypes of the collective unconscious”, the domestic concepts “Socialistic psyche” (O. Donchenko), “Universal epochal cycle” (E. Afonina, A. Martynova) and others like that;

- adequate understanding of the possibilities of social archetypic, which are determined by its original methods of explanation and methods of analysis of difficultly perceived social phenomena, which can serve as a benchmark for further theoretical and empirical searches, and the theoretical and practical limitations of the archetypal approach; that is why social archetypic is positioned as an interdisciplinary research direction.

5. It is important to realize that social archetypic is not a universal scientific apparatus and not an orthodox imitation of the ideas of Jungianism. Rather it is a scientific tool that allows us to establish the patterns and peculiarities of contemporary social development, to touch upon the deep nature of modern threats, to deal with a broad range of new motives of human development, to predict probable scenarios of the future, and most importantly – to offer a consensus vision of possible ways of solving the main problems of the present day and tomorrow. Its practical application

has considerable potential, capable to provide an effective solution to the actual problems arising in the process of social transformation. And sometimes it’s just a metaphor, through which the researcher is invited to plunge into the wider psychosocial and sociocultural context of social phenomena and processes.

6. Obviously, the topics and directions of the next – jubilee – TMS-2019 should in general present the results of the ten-year progress of TMS “Archetypic and Public Administration” and the USA. One of such meaningful results should be theoretical and methodological principles of social archetypic as an interdisciplinary research direction in the problem field of public administration. An important factor in understanding these principles will be this year (June 28–29, 2018) meeting in Montpellier, France, of the two scientific schools – the Ukrainian School of Archetypic and the French School of Followers of Gilbert Duran.

## REFERENCES

1. *Ukrainian School of Archetypics*, available at: <http://usarch.org/ua/page/Istoriya?page=1>, (Accessed 30 March, 2018).
2. *Proyasnenie.info* [Clarification.info], available at: [https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCNS-BFQV1Uqac7s9sWufVmgg/videos?sort=dd&view=0&shelf\\_id=0](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCNS-BFQV1Uqac7s9sWufVmgg/videos?sort=dd&view=0&shelf_id=0), (Accessed 30 March, 2018).
3. *Videozapys* lektsii M. Maffesoli “Neotraibalizm i suchasna polityka de-tsentralizatsii” (2017) [Video of M. Maffesoli’s lecture “Neotraibalism and Modern Decentralization Policy”], *Proyasnenie.info* [Clarification.info], available at: <https://www>

- youtube.com/watch?v=KYywl0aWKSw&feature=youtu.be (Accessed 30 March, 2018).
4. *Videozapys* lektsii M. Maffesoli “Transformatsiia politychnoho v etychne: moralni tsinnosti postmodernoho prostoru” (2017) [Video of M. Maffesoli’s lecture “The transformation of political into ethical: moral values of postmodern space”], Ch. 1 [Part 1], Proyasnenie.info [Clarification.info], available at: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u\\_q3dLyzQ8&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u_q3dLyzQ8&feature=youtu.be) (Accessed 30 March, 2018).
  5. *Videozapys* lektsii M. Maffesoli “Transformatsiia politychnoho v etychne: moralni tsinnosti postmodernoho prostoru” (2017) [Video of M. Maffesoli’s lecture “The transformation of political into ethical: moral values of postmodern space”], Ch. 2 [Part 2], Proyasnenie.info [Clarification.info], available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fxEu2FjiRs0>, (Accessed 30 March, 2018).
  6. *Mishel Maffesoli*, frantsuzkyi sotsiolog: Pohliad, shcho narod – tse dytna, yaku potribno vykhovuvaty, povnistiu sebe vycherpav (2017) [Michelle Maffesoli, French sociologist: The view that the people is a child who needs to be educated, completely exhausted itself], Ukrinform [Ukrinform], available at: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-society/2252920-misel-maffesoli-francuzkij-sociolog.html>, (Accessed 30 March, 2018).
  7. *Mizhnarodnyi* lektorii “Zakonomirnosti ta osoblyvosti ukraïnskoï transformatsii” (Ukraina, Polshcha, Kazakhstan) (2016) [International Lectures Cycle “Patterns and Characteristics of Ukrainian Social Transformation” (Ukraine, Poland, Kazakhstan)], available at: <http://ief.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Lektoriy-flyer.pdf>, (Accessed 30 March, 2018).

## СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

---

1. *Українська школа архетипіки* [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://usarch.org/ua/page/Istoriya?page=1>
2. *Прояснение.info* [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: [https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCNSBFQV1Uqac7s9sWufVmgg/videos?sort=dd&view=0&shelf\\_id=0](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCNSBFQV1Uqac7s9sWufVmgg/videos?sort=dd&view=0&shelf_id=0)
3. *Маффесолі М.* Неотрайбализм і сучасна політика децентралізації // *Прояснение.info*. – Режим доступу: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KYywl0aWKSw&feature=youtu.be>
4. *Маффесолі М.* Трансформація політичного в етичне: моральні цінності постмодерного простору : відеозапис лекції : Ч. 1 [Електронний ресурс] / М. Маффесолі // *Прояснение.info*. – Режим доступу: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u\\_q3dLy-zQ8&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u_q3dLy-zQ8&feature=youtu.be)
5. *Маффесолі М.* Трансформація політичного в етичне: моральні цінності постмодерного простору : відеозапис лекції : Ч. 2 [Електронний ресурс] / М. Маффесолі // *Прояснение.info* [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fxEu2FjiRs0>
6. *Мішель Маффесолі*, французький соціолог: погляд, що народ – це дитина, яку потрібно виховувати, повністю себе вичерпав [Електронний ресурс] // *Укрінформ*. – 23.06.2017. – Режим доступу: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-society/2252920-misel-maffesoli-francuzkij-sociolog.html>
7. *Міжнародний* лекторій “Закономірності та особливості української трансформації” (Україна, Польща, Казахстан, 2016 р.) [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://ief.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Lektoriy-flyer.pdf>