

Archetypal bases of governmental administration: Socio-cultural paradigm of research aspects

Alexey Y. Mamychev*, Andrey Y. Mordovtsev, Alla A. Timofeeva, Maria K. Filippova

Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russian Federation

Abstract: The article proposes and discusses the need for socio-cultural development (archetypal) political research strategy aimed at the reconstruction and interpretation of public government institutions and management practices as sustainable and successively reproducing political phenomena in a certain socio-cultural environment. The author proves that the social and cultural basis of the study should be considered as the content, and the political system and the relationship (as socio-cultural phenomena) are a form of political and legal life of society, where the first - it is essential, qualitative characteristics of public power organizations, and the second is external, specific and concrete hysterical (Conventional) representation and execution of social and cultural content. The contents of the paper present the author's multilevel system of coding the archetypal political process of transformation of public power of social organization and management practices.

Key words: Archetypes; Governance; Political process; Political and legal organization

1. Introduction

Central to modern studies of social and cultural conditioning of the government and public management is a powerful socio-cultural reconstruction of codes (archetypes, the dominant socio-cultural), causing the development of the political system and culture of the society, as well as levels of conditionality. However, the levels of content and forms of social and cultural conditioning of the political process are one of the controversial issues.

The complexity and ambiguity of such research is, on the one hand, excessive "psychologizing" of the research project, which is not always meets the challenges of political analysis; and on the other in particular "restraint", "caution" with whom the researcher refers to the deep social and cultural structures of political culture, which is due to lack of theory sufficiently clear and authoritative position to study national bases of power, politics, law, and other political and legal phenomena.

At the same time theoretical and practical terms, it should be noted that the pursuit of a number of trends in contemporary political thought to "purify" authoritative political communication with all national, cultural, religious, leads to a dumping political knowledge, and therefore the conscious care researchers from solving complex problems organization of public-legal space as a highly organized and many systems of the company; from understanding the ethno-national and other mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of public power organizations, and especially the political

process; from identifying the real causes deformations public authorities, legal, social and cultural institutions and practices of interaction in the system of the person - society - state.

2. Review of the literature

Research status and the existing contradictions at the end of XX beginning of the XXI century. Western European political science and public practice proves imperious and provides dramatic dismantling of national identity and socio-cultural (political, ethnic, spiritual, intellectual and so on.), specificity (Lyubashits et al., 2015). Thus there is a "build" a new community in which many other unique and deviations are not the basis for the identification of (U. Beck).

However, the practice of this project, at least in the Eurasian space, causes a lot of problems and inconsistencies (Baranov et al., 2015). "Cleansing" of Political Studies of sustainable socio-cultural dominant causes. To the widespread crisis of values and normative foundations of public power organization (J. Gray, E.A. Lukashev, A.Y. Mordovtsev, V.N. Sinyukov, V.V. Sorokin, etc.); to the political culture of the strain (Y.S. Pivovarov, A. Soloviev, P. Sztompka), sense of justice (P.P. Baranov), distorting the functioning of political institutions and public law institutions (I.N. Igoshin); to destroy And political traditions that provide stability and reproduction of socio-political integrity and ethno-political stability (Ovchinnikov et al., 2015); as well as the pragmatism and the bureaucratization of the rights (G.V. Maltsev, A.G. Kravchenko); spiritual and

* Corresponding Author.

moral collapse and degarmonizatsii social and regulatory controls (G.V. Maltsev, N.A. Narochnitskaya, M. Remizov, Y.A. Tikhomirov and others).

Generalizing the latest achievements in the field of scientific research there are two main areas that are developing or innovative (neoliberal) forms of political communication, where public authorities and publicly-imperious given to a very small space management as an institutional structure that ensures national-cultural unity and ethno-political stability (Agamirov et al., 2015); or revolutionary (neo-Marxism, cosmopolitanism) forms of socio-cultural unity, depriving it of any social value in the future (Lyubashits et al., 2015).

However, these two contradictory directions, each of them is problematic "reflexive field", "producing" quite controversial practical projects of public power organization (Ovchinnikov et al., 2015). In this connection there is a problematic issue, and perhaps whether the national-cultural and ethno-political stability is state-legal forms of organization, can whether the global civil institutions (dynamic and constantly changed in structure) to ensure a stable and predictable evolution of social systems and political relations.

3. Methodological bases and tools

The aim of this work is to develop the socio-cultural (archetypal) political research strategy, which advocates "the legal successor of" the civilization approach of state and aimed at the reconstruction and interpretation of the public institutions of power as a sustainable and successively reproducing political phenomena in a certain socio-cultural environment. In this aspect of the socio-cultural basis of the study serves as a content, and the political system and the relationship (as socio-cultural phenomena) are a form of political and legal life of society, i.e., First - this is essential, qualitative characteristics of public power organizations, and the second - external, specific - concrete hysterical (Conventional) representation and execution of social and cultural content.

This methodological turn in the study of political culture and the political process is based on a systematic analysis of all the factors and patterns of development of the specific social and cultural environment. In this case the main thing in these studies becomes an analysis of behavioral patterns (cultural models) and clichés and stereotypes of thinking characteristic of the representatives of a particular culture (Moses and Sorokovikova, 2003). In this context, holds the position of Sapir, voiced at the Congress of the British Association of ethnographers, according to which the culture on the socio-psychological level imposes certain style of political thinking and behavior, including the typical political rituals and symbols, even postures and gestures (Mead, 1988).

At the same time as the leading methodological principles are used: 1) the principle of "knowing

interpretation", i.e. the concept of the archetypal foundations of public power organization and management methods built understanding and explanation, which generally corresponds to the heuristic settings post non-classical (understanding) of science. It is this approach and allowed to consider the scope of the socio-political subjects of everyday politics, especially their political activity, to identify the factors of sustainable development of Russian statehood and civil society institutions, to evaluate the criteria for determining the efficiency of political doctrines, programs and activities in their socio-cultural dimension; 2) socio-cultural conventionality, meaning that the value-regulatory system in force in society have a specific historical and social-communicative nature. At the same time knowledge of the past is due to socio-cultural and historical context, any political event or process theoretically and ideologically loaded and driven by socio-cultural factors and the dominant (Mamychev et al., 2015).

4. The main content

Repeated political experience forms a certain unconscious (sustainable, collective) dominant factors and interactions that become archetypal structures or socio-cultural codes (archetypes) of the political life of society. At the same time, these archetypal structures influence our ideas and experience in an effort to organize them in accordance with existing models. Socio-political structure and the archetypal model, according to our definition, is a crystallization of the political experience of the nation, retaining the basic scenario of political thought, the regime of interaction between the individual, society and the state, shaping trends in the institutional power of organization of society.

In this aspect it seems appropriate to highlight the following structure archetypal conditioning of political culture and public overbearing control.

1. The archetypal level of political society is the primary, basic level of formation of political culture of the society, in fact, represents the foundation. He is a carrier of social and cultural reinforcement that determines the specifics of how the institutionalization of certain phenomena and processes of legal livelihoods, and forms a "congruent meaning and activity-perspective" (Mead, 1988).

Some researchers propose to call this level of primary, to particular cultural layer, which "is formed mainly at the level of the mass of the unconscious manifesting itself in the movement of private life in the local socio-cultural psyche of the human community and vice versa. At the same time there is a particularistic culture as a phenomenon of the individual unconscious, reflecting general trends of private life and in many ways causing the formation of personality and her social roles and the nature of the interaction with other individuals" (Bridge and Skorik, 1995). Substantially

characterizing this level, we can distinguish the following components: moral and cognitive intuition; supranational value (archetypal codes); archetypal images and ideas; archetypal pre-legal norms.

2. Quasi dimension of archetypal *structures* are socio-cultural space where their roots and are the main social and political archetypes of the local community (ethnic, minority, ethnic, etc.). It is at this micro level, is continuous and quite slow formation of social and cultural landmarks that reproduce the specificity and originality of the political culture of a particular society and its special power-legal practice of interaction.

Therefore, this dimension reflects the so-called "derivatives" "social" factors and sources. In other words, the derivation means that the social and political codes and factors that contribute to the national political reality, expressed in customs, traditions, style of perception of political and legal processes and phenomena, moral and spiritual dominants and stereotypes of interaction in the system of the person - society - state, other ethnic and religious artifacts, causing the particular political culture, forms and practical schemes meet the spiritual and material needs, accompanying rituals.

The ratio between the archetype and its derivatives are not informative, and energy-motivation. For example, K. Jung himself pointed out that the archetypal foundation of society "does not refer to the inherited ideas, but to the internal dispositions that produce the same performance". The first level leads to no content, and streamline shape pravokulturnoy society.

3. Empirical level of political society is the level of everyday political engagement in the context of which the everyday (practical) the behavior of subjects on the basis of established and successively reproducing the forms and models of socio-typed powerful interaction to achieve the subjective interests and needs. Essential to this level is, of course, not only the "behavioral tradition", but also "oral tradition" and also formed at the previous levels of moral and cognitive readiness and installation in the perception of the current reality, as well as legal emotion and installations (emotional and psychological component of everyday political engagement). It is practical (usually-daily) behavior reflects the real, as opposed to, for example, authorized (officially recognized) customs, the specifics of the socio-political life of the nation, ethnic groups, specific groups.

In turn, the emotional and psychological side reflects the internal component of everyday social and political. This relationship between individuals is based on the emotional and psychological experience.

4. Doctrinal (theoretical) level of political society is the deep, essential (conceptual, axiological, symbolic) characteristics of political and legal phenomena and processes related to their performance and assessment in political thinking. This level of integrative, rallying the existing cultural

content with basic, tipofmiruyuschimi installations dominant socio-political development, etc. It includes the following elements that characterize this level in terms of archetypal conditioning: axiological (normative value), conceptual (political and legal theory, doctrine, concepts and categories) and symbolic (the existing state-legal symbols and rituals) components.

5. Institutional level of political *life* respectively embodies the historical patterns of development of a particular political environment institutionalizes established, typed forms and models of positive interaction in the system of the person - society - state. Rightly considered in this regard P. Berger and T. Lukman stated that institutionalization occurs whenever carried out mutual typing habitual action figures of all kinds. In other words, any such typing is an institution, "in turn", logic (institutional development - auth.) Is not peculiar institutions and their external functionality, but a process of reflection (the style of political thinking, cognitive settings of their perception and evaluation - auth.). In other words, the reflective consciousness carries logic property to the institutional order. Therefore, the researchers conclude, "Institutions always have a history, the product of which they are. It is impossible to adequately understand the institution is not aware of the historical process in which it was created" (Berger and Lukman, 1996).

This level, in addition to the existing political institutions and structures that reflect, in fact, a static element of the institutional level, also includes such dynamic elements such as institutional and regulatory activity (legal, law enforcement, judicial and other political and legal practice) as well as institutional and regulatory activity of citizens and various social institutions and structures (Mordovtsev, 2002).

6. Quasi dimension of political life is a level that reflects the positive (having socio-political approval) and negative (harmful, dangerous) political and legal phenomena and processes. At this level, there is an interaction of the existing institutional and legal power organization with real behavioral practices, refraction of existing institutions in the national political thinking.

In addition, it should be assumed that the political and legal space is a certain sphere of life of the society in which the interaction of social actors about the organization and the exercise of political power, the implementation of specific interests and needs, direct management of public affairs and the organization ordering the political and legal interaction of individual individuals, their social communities, organizations, institutions, etc.

Thus, political and legal space includes institutional structure, its political, legal, cultural, spiritual and moral foundations of providing certain public-legal regime. In the public mind formed definite ideas about the individuals social space, predetermining thus the political and legal organization of the latter, and the very political cooperation subjects within this space defines the

true meaning and importance of the political and legal establishments, institutions in the existing conditions of the place and space (Mordovtsev and Popov, 2007).

7. The level of socio-political integrity characterizes the culture of a particular society itself as a holistic phenomenon reflects its specificity and adaptive capacity to the challenges of modern times (Rulan, 2005). It expresses the three main elements that characterize the specificity of a particular political culture, institutional development prospects, adaptation to external borrowing of certain institutions, importing any ideas and doctrines, as well as stable forms and ways of perception and evaluation of the political and legal phenomena reality, socio-cultural standards and models of interaction in the system of the person - society - state (Ovchinnikov et al., 2009). These elements include:

a) The dominant type of social and political thinking, reflecting, respectively, condition (linguistic, communicative, historical), which reveals the existence of a political and updates to the subject as a special "background", the context of the existence of real political and legal phenomena;

b) Socially important and legitimate standards and models of social and political interaction, reflecting the prevailing level of institutional organization and in the daily political activities sustainable patterns of interaction in the identity of the system - society - state, as well as existing and shared by the majority of perception and evaluation system (national cognitive matrix) occurring within society and outside of the political and legal phenomena and processes. This component represents the highest form of human activity that has a collective origin (Durkheim), as well as the dominant current in the society political and legal ideology;

c) Social and political psychology of the nation is reflected in the form of integrative socio-political sensitivity and social and political stereotypes powerful interaction. And this political sensitivity, cognitive and installation readiness (define style storylines and value predispositions) are reflected in the prevailing patterns of behavior, moral norms, mass estimates and judgments regarding various political and legal phenomena and processes (Duby, 1991).

5. General conclusions

To understand the political trends of public administration development is necessary to analyze the social and cultural conditioning of power relations, as well as the reconstruction of social and cultural codes (archetypes, dominant). The socio-cultural conditioning of the latter is related to the crystallization of the political experience of the nation, retaining the basic scenario of political thinking activity, the regime of interaction between the individual, society and the state, shaping trends in the institutional power of organization of society.

In this aspect of the socio-cultural basis of the study serves as a content, and the political system and the relationship (as socio-cultural phenomena) are a form of political and legal life of society, i.e., First - this is essential, qualitative characteristics of public power organizations, and the second - external, specific - concrete hysterical (Conventional) representation and execution of social and cultural content.

Following a multi-level model for the description of the social and cultural integrity of the development of political events and processes in the work developed: 1) the archetypal level (moral and cognitive intuition supranational values, archetypal images and symbols, socio cultural prelegal norm of social interaction; 2) socio dimension archetypal structures (social and political codes and dominant, which are expressed in the political customs, traditions, style of perception of the political and legal phenomena, moral and spiritual dominant stereotypes and interaction in the system of the person - society - state); 3) empirical level of political society ("behavioral tradition" and "oral tradition", the socio-political and legal emotion, installation); 4) Doctrinal level - axiological (normative value), conceptual (political and legal theory, doctrine, concepts and categories) and symbolic (the existing state-legal symbols and rituals) components; 5) the institutional level - existing political institutions and structures (static measurement), the institutional and regulatory activity of the state (legislative, law enforcement, judicial and other publicly-imperious activities), institutional and regulatory activity of citizens and various social institutions and structures (dynamic elements); 6) socio dimension of political life -positive (with socio-political approval) and negative (harmful, dangerous) political and legal phenomena and processes; 7) the level of socio-political integrity - the dominant type of social and political thinking activity, socially relevant, legitimate standards and models of social and political interaction, as well as existing and shared by the majority of perception and evaluation system (national cognitive matrix), social and political psychology of the nation.

6. Acknowledgement

The work was supported by the Russian President's grant number MD-6669.2016.6 "Archetypal (socio-cultural) of the base of the Russian public organization of power and its evolution in the XXI century."

References

Agamirov, A.R., Sarychev, I.A., Mordovcev, A.Y. and Mamychev, A.Y. (2015). Legal mindset as factor in the state in the XXI century. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. Vol. 6. No. 36. pp. 235-240.

- Baranov, P.P., Ovchinnikov, A.I. and Mamychev, A.Y. (2015). The legitimacy of power and relations as a multi-level political and legal phenomenon. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 6. No. 5 S3. pp. 209-216.
- Berger, P. and Lukman, N. (1996). *The Social Construction of Reality. A treatise on the sociology of knowledge*. M. pp. 92-94.
- Duby, J. (1991). *The development of historical studies in France*. M. pp. 203.
- Lyubashits, V.Y., Mamychev, A.Y., Mordovcev, A.Y. and Vronskay, M.V. (2015). The social-cultural paradigm of state authority. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 6. No. 36. pp. 301-306.
- Lyubashits, V.Y., Mordovcev, A.Y. and Mamychev, A.Y. (2015). State and algorithms of globalization. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 6. No. 36. pp. 277-282.
- Mamychev, A.Y. Ovchinnikov, A.I. and Mamycheva, D.I. (2015). Archetypal and socio-cultural foundations of law and legal policy of the Russian state. *Vladivostok*. pp. 156.
- Mead, M. (1988). *Culture and the world of childhood*. M. pp. 49-50.
- Mordovtsev, A.Y. (2002). *National legal mentality: Introduction to the problem*. Rostov n/D. pp. 86.
- Mordovtsev, A.Y. and Popov, V.V. (2007). *Russian legal mentality*. Rostov n/D. pp. 256.
- Moses, N.A. and Sorokovikova, V.I. (2003). The mentality and national character (On the choice of research method). *Sociological studies*. No 3. pp. 49.
- Mostovaya, I.V. and Skorik, A.P. (1995). Archetypes and landmarks Russian mentality. *Political researches*. No. 4. pp. 70.
- Ovchinnikov, A., Mamychev, A. and Litvinova, S.F. (2015). Extra-legal and shadow functioning of public authorities. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 6. No. 3. pp. 387-393.
- Ovchinnikov, A., Mamychev, A. and Mamycheva, D. (2015). Sociocultural bases of state - legal development coding. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 6. No. 3 S4. pp. 67-74.
- Ovchinnikov, A.I., Mamychev, A.Y., Manastyrny, A.V. and Tyurin, M.E. (2009). *Legal archetypes in the legal policy of Russia*. Rostov n/D. pp. 45.
- Rulan, N. (2005). *Historical Introduction to the right*. M. pp. 304.