

ISSN: 0025-1569

# MAN IN INDIA

Volume 97

Number 23

2017



**Serials** Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Publishers & Distributors

Man in India  
© Serials Publications

ISSN: 0025-1569

***Editor***

R.M. Sarkar,  
Kolkata, India

Amit Kumar Mishra  
University of Hyderabad, India

***Editorial Board***

Brij Maharaj  
University of KwaZulu-Natal, South  
Africa

Pierre Gottschlich  
University of Rostock, Germany

K. Laxmi Narayan  
University of Hyderabad, India

Dr. Mihir Kumar Mallick  
Professor and Head, School of  
Education  
Lovely Professional University,  
Phagwara, Punjab, India

Jonathan Miles-Watson  
University of Manchester, UK

Luighi Yao, LU,  
Professor,  
Department of Medicine,  
McGill University,  
845 Rue Sherbrooke O, Montréal, QC  
H3A 0G4

Peter Seele  
Institute for Advanced Study in the  
Humanities, Germany

Dave Sangha  
University of Northern British  
Columbia, Canada

***Abstracted/Indexed/Reviewed***

Indexing and Reviews: Mathematical Reviews, MathSciNet, IndexCopernicus  
Zentralblatt fur Mathematik, EBSCOhost, SCOPUS, Elsevier's bibliographic  
database, Ei databases index, EMBASE, EMCare, CAP International, Indian  
Sciences Abstract and Indian Citation Index (ICI).

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF ARCHETYPAL IDEAS OF A PUBLIC POWER ORGANIZATION IN RATIONAL DISCOURSES OF MODERN TIMES

Alexey Mamychev<sup>\*</sup>, Tatyana Mordovtseva<sup>\*\*</sup>, Georgiy Trigub<sup>\*\*\*</sup>, Maria Filippova<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>  
and Alexander Samoylichenko<sup>\*\*\*\*\*</sup>

**Abstract:** The subject of this study is the ideological and conceptual foundations of the archetypal studies of the public power organization and their evolution in the context of the development of rationalistic discourses of the New Age. The paper analyzes the place and role of the deep/original foundations of a public authority in the doctrines of Leibniz, Kant, Schopenhauer, Fichte, Hegel, and the influence of these ideas on the development of the Jung's theory of the archetype. The article also formulates the main results of the development of archetypal ideas in the New Age, determines the influence of the latter on current positions and trends in the development of archetypal research. The work justifies that the Jungian version of the archetype is not the only attempt to comprehend the deep foundations of a public-power organization, but is based on several traditions of archetypal studies formed in the New Age, and tries to unite/harmonize them. In addition, the article highlights the main results of the development of archetypal traditions in the Modern Age and points to the existing two main directions of the archetypal reconstruction of a public-authority organization: the first is the study of higher archaic-ideas, the original principles, the comprehension of divine institutions, etc.; the second is secular projects focused on the justification of a purely human, material dimension of the archetype - archaic heritage, unconscious structures of the psyche, collective representations, etc.

**Keywords:** Archetype, state, discourse, New Age, law, legal culture, public authority, evolution, legal thinking, political doctrines.

### INTRODUCTION

The origins of the modern theory of the archetype are rightly associated with the formation of a rationalist discourse of knowledge that begins to form in the Modern Age. It is during this period that the concept of archetype theory is conceptualized, and the ideological, theoretical and methodological foundations for the development of archetypal research projects are summarized and formulated. At the same time, it should be noted that in this development there are various ideological directions in

\* Doctor of Political Science, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia. *Email: mamychev@yandex.ru*

\*\* Doctor of Cultural Studies, Professor, Taganrog Institute of Management and Economics. *Email: aum.07@mail.ru*

\*\*\* Candidate of historical sciences, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia. *Email: joker1073@rambler.ru*

\*\*\*\* Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia. *Email: buharina-masha@mail.ru*

\*\*\*\*\* Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia. *Email: Aleksandr.Samoylichenko92@vvsu.ru*

understanding and interpreting the deep, original foundations of the social thought-activity of people and, in particular, the public-power organization.

In this regard, we proceed from the thesis that the theoretical-conceptual version of the archetype proposed by K.G. Jung, though the most fundamental and authoritative, however, is not the only attempt to comprehend the deep foundations of a public-power organization. And it is important to emphasize, that the Jungian theory of the archetype is based on several traditions of archetypal research and tries to connect/harmonize them. And in this context, we only accept as an ideological and semantic basis that along with the theory of the Jung archetype other alternative research projects with significant heuristic potential for the development of the modern theory of archetypes were realized.

### **METHODS AND MATERIALS**

It should be mentioned some studies tell not about individual trends/traditions, but about the stages (classical, critical, analytical and postclassical) or generations (classics, interpreters-critics, followers, etc.) of the development of archetypal analysis (Malenko, 1998; Nikita, 2001).

For us, such a theoretical “maneuver” of conditional systematization of various categorical-conceptual interpretations of the archetype and typology of theoretical-conceptual constructions (archetype theories) is not appropriate for a number of reasons:

- Firstly, it seems more appropriate for us to talk about different directions, since different research programs for the reconstruction and interpretation of the hidden/primordial foundations of a public power organization can be identified in different periods of development of political and legal thought, are not reducible to the tradition of analytical psychology;
- Secondly, it is impossible to talk about clear stages or periods, since their allocation is based on chronological and “generational” criteria, and many directions of archetypal research developed in parallel;
- Thirdly, strict periodization is possible within the framework of one scientific discipline (for example, psychology, anthropology, etc.) and is not appropriate in the framework of interdisciplinary research, and even more so in those studies in which the theory of the archetype acts as a propaedeutic ideological- conceptual framework that does not define a strict categorical-conceptual matrix and a theoretical-methodological research system (as in the present case).

### **THE MAIN PART**

Rationalistic discourses of archetypal research of the New Age. One of the fundamental doctrines of the New Age, in which the foundations of a social and,

in particular, a public-imperious organization, are developed and analyzed, is the monadology of G.V. Leibniz. Thus, one should point to the conceptual and ideological proximity of the concept of “archetype” and category of “monads”, introduced by Leibniz. The very concept of “monad”, which expressed the first being, the original number/indivisible beginning, a single whole, the essential “building material” or the original world-explaining principle is found as early as in the Pythagoreans.

In Leibniz’s theory of knowledge, the “monad” is a universal and simplest principle, a spiritual atom characterized by immateriality, primordially, indivisibility. The necessity of the existence of archetypal or monadological bases for the theoretical concept of Leibniz is due to the necessity of the existence of simple, unchanging elements that form a complex world of substances/aggregates. Leibniz’s hypothesis boils down to the fact that “the source, the meaning of existence, the cause of all finite and definite - all this is enclosed in the infinitesimal, indistinguishable,” this infinitesimal substance is “the foundation of everything” (Leibniz, 1982).

And the nature of monads, as we can see below, ideologically and meaningfully coincides with the concept and characteristics of the “archetype” of Jung. Thus, the identified principles (primordially, formality, strength and activity) and qualities (aspiration, attraction, perception, representation) of the “monad” correlate with the principles and qualities of the “archetype”. Thus, Leibniz argues that “the mind has only innate principles, that is, tendencies or embryos that have the ability to develop to conscious ideas. In the collective unconscious of Jung, the “archetype” has the same nature: the “archetype” itself is empty and purely formal, it is nothing more than *facultas praeformandi* (pre-established ability), the possibility of representation given a priori” (Marinosyan, 1998).

These independent units of being are capable of active external and internal action, contains in themselves both the future and the past. At the same time, the external causes of development that cause changes in bodies are connected with the combination of simple elements in complex substances (the union of monads), and the internal causes are associated with the development of individual elements, caused by “causal” or “final” causes (*causa finalis*). This development ultimately leads to a connection to the principle of continuity, to the formation of the unity of matter and motion, i.e. “A mixture in spirit and at the same time a miraculous increase in the purely spiritual acting forces of the world” (Marinosyan, 1998).

Similar ideological and theoretical “motives” can also be seen in I. Kant, who points to the existence of transpersonal, a priori synthetic judgments that act as the primary, initial (prior to any experience and logical judgments). The presence of extra-personal, universal forms of contemplation exists in Kant’s “outside” and independently from consciousness; however, they are a source of sense organs, the ability to perceive in a certain way.

The German philosopher defines the “idea” as a “prototype” (Urbild), which is a transcendent concept that has nothing to do with practical experience, but largely determines and structures this experience. Kant’s intellectus archetypus is an intellect-prototype, an intuitive divine understanding that generates objects: “Equally: if what is called a representation in us was in relation to the object actio, i.e. if it was the object itself, just as they imagine divine knowledge as the prototypes of things, then the correspondence of representations with objects could be understood. Thus, at least it is possible as an intellectus archetypus, exhausting the data for its logical processing from the sensory contemplation of things” (Kant, 1984).

For example, K.G. Jung refers to I. Kant as the source of his ideological and conceptual constructs: “Plato’s idea is the primitive of things, while Kant defines it as the archetype (Urbild) of all practical use of reason, a transcendental concept that, as such, goes beyond the limits of the possibility of experience, the concept of the mind, “the object of which cannot be found at all in experience” (Jung, 2001). Kant argued that these archetypes are fundamental ideas that “imperceptibly serve the mind as a canon” and as the guiding principle in cognition (Kant, 2015).

However, the main gap between the Kantian a priori forms and the Jungian archetype is revealed in the justification of the mechanism for the reproduction of these primitives in human thought activity. So, for Jung this question is solved at the level of biogenesis, archetypes are treated as congenital, archaic genetic codes. For Kant Urbild are cognitive forms, rather than innate a priori ideas.

A significant contribution to the formation of the archetypal tradition was made by the philosophical systems of I.G. Fichte, A. Schopenhauer, G.V.F. Hegel, who justified the existence of super-individual, absolute foundations of human thought activity. Each of the philosophers justifies their system and the stage of manifestation of the eternal, unchanging in consciousness and activity.

For example, Fichte argued that the basis of all things is absolute intelligence, which is revealed and realized through human thought activity (the secondary nature of consciousness and human activity). It is thanks to a person that the superindividual enters the world. At the same time, the person’s destiny is connected with the “adjustment” of his thought activity to this absolute beginning and then the realization of the moral ideal and order. G.V.F. Hegel also did not use the concept of archetype, however, many of his ideas and philosophical system positions became the basis for the theory of the archetype of K.G. Jung (for example, Jung credits the works of Hegel “Phenomenology of the Spirit” and “Logic” as ideological and conceptual sources). In the Hegelian concept, the ideological foundations of the archetype are found in the concept of the absolute spirit and in its development as a step-by-step definition of the creative power of “world reason” (Pletukhina, 2016). Dedicated to the “Phenomenology of the spirit,” the laws of the unfolding of absolute reason, are manifested independently of the thought activity of people (Hegel, 2014).

Thus, declaring: “What is reasonable is real; And what is real, is reasonable” (Hegel, 1990), Hegel not only substantiates his thesis about the identity of being and thinking, but also emphasizes the thesis that in human history eternal, original absolute ideas are gradually embodied. In turn, the existence of the unreasonable is only a temporary, specifically historical, private “deformation” of absolute truths. As V.S. Nersesyants explains this thesis in the introduction to the “Philosophy of Law”: “According to all the rules of the Hegelian method of thinking, the thesis about the rationality of everything that is real turns (dialectically – A.M.) into another thesis: all that exists is worthy of destruction... reality is not just “existence”, but an existence that has the property of necessity (and, consequently, also of rationality), reality is the unity of essence and existence” (Nersesyants, 1990).

Moreover, it is necessary to emphasize the ideological-conceptual innovation, important for the theory of the archetype, on which our research is based: two forms of primordial, archetypal bases of human thought activity - the universal and the sociocultural - are clearly distinguished in the Hegelian philosophical system. In the first case, we are talking about the deployment of universal human ideas (the idea itself is its concept and its implementation), these are conditionally archetypal principles of a universal, all-human character (Hegel, 1990).

In the second case, we are speaking about the local, sociocultural, i.e. the process of deploying an absolute idea at the national or state level. For example, “the state is an organism; Development of ideas into their differences.” In other words, the political organism “is the development of the idea in its differences and their objective reality. These various parties are different authorities, their functions, and spheres of activity, through which the universal impartial - precisely because they are determined by the nature of the concept - necessarily generates itself, and since the universal is presupposed by its generation, it also preserves itself (emphasis added – A.M.)” (Hegel, 1990).

The position of A. Schopenhauer in many respects coincides with the theses of Fichte, where “the true essence of the individual, which is the basis of every concept and every phenomenon, is the will. When a subject contemplates their own essence, they know that all consciousness is only their phenomenon to themselves, whereas character or will serve as their true and unchangeable essence” (Windelband, 1998). Schopenhauer argues that the “will” is at the basis of all that exists (the universal “thing-in-itself”), the “will” being of a character not of absolute reason, but, on the contrary, unreasonable, lacking a sign of conscious intention in it. In this respect, the human world is mainly “the objectification of the will,” but the form in which the thing reveals itself to the world is a representation.

When Jung describes the ideological and conceptual content of the archetype, he often points to the significance of the ideas and the philosophical system of A. Schopenhauer. Thus, the thesis that the real world is the product of human representations, and the original forms of all things that are only truly existing, have

an unchanging and eternal character, becomes one of the keys in the formation of the Jungian theory of the archetype. Schopenhauer also substantiates the existence of transcendental ideas and visual primordial images as the initials, prototypes of existence: the ideas “come as unreachable images, or as eternal forms of things, they do not enter time and space - the environment of individuals, they are not subject to becoming and to any changes, they exist eternally, while individual things are eternally coming into being”.

In general, it can be noted that in each epoch some or other researchers turned to the fundamental principles of social life, archaic-ideas, values, and principles that determine the formation and development of a publicly-authoritative organization. In these works, it is emphasized that, from the psychological point of view, the archetypal in the cultural life of society reflects the adherence of the adherents of this culture, from ancient times to the established behavioral stereotypes that determine the building of people’s life, public institutions, the system of interpersonal and intergroup relations, rites and rituals, ideology, art and folklore, etc. (Ovchinnikov, 2009). Different researchers of “completely different regions in a certain sense” encounter “the immutable fact of the existence of some stably reproduced constants that fulfill the role of supporting structures in this or that realm of reality” (Pelipenko & Yakovenko, 1998).

The main results of the development of archetypal traditions in Modern Age. In Modern Age, two main directions and mainly alternative projects of archetypal reconstruction of a public-authority organization are clearly drawn up: firstly, the study of the highest archaic-ideas, the original principles, the comprehension of divine ordinances, etc.; Secondly, on the contrary, these are secular projects oriented to justify a purely human, material dimension of the archetype - archaic heritage, unconscious structures of the psyche, collective representations, initial arbitrariness and “cultural amnesia” of sources of social integrity or specific institutions, etc.

Let us note here that to both the first and second case one can apply the characteristic that is so often reproduced in various archetypal studies: supernaturalism. This characteristic indicates that the “content of the archetype” is outside the natural state of things with which we correlate it. And in the first and second directions of the development of archetypal research archetypal bases act as “over” the usual order of organization or thought the activity of people.

This seems to us to be the problem of sociological verification of archetypal foundations, because, for example, the traditional sociological toolkit is designed and oriented to the natural course of things and the usual processes of life. In its turn, the “archetypal” as such refers to a completely different dimension - supernaturalness and is described through the stable practices of concrete human relations only conditionally (Baranov P.P., Mamychev A.Y., Ovchinnikov A.I., 2016).

In general, disputes about the archetypes themselves and the problems of their scientific justification, “in particular, on the issue of empirical verification of their



existence continue at the turn of the century” (Bolshakova, 2011). Attempts at the sociological interpretation of this content lead, as a rule, to different and very contradictory results. This allows many researchers to make evaluative judgments and theoretical and practical verdicts of the term “archetype” since it is not possible to clearly record their manifestation, meaning, and content, not the modern theoretical and methodological tools. All this allows us to perceive the archetype either as a metaphorical statement, or as a philosophical speculation, or as useless theorizing, which has nothing in common with actual reality (Zelensky, 2004).

From our position, the sociocultural is lived and is being created, stopping, the very stable community itself disappears. Maintaining and continuing sociocultural integrity, rather than imitating or simulating it, requires tremendous work and effort from the whole generation. The continuation of the tradition of sociocultural integrity does not put emphasis on collectivity to the detriment of the creative energy of individuality. This is a common communitarian process, the content of which is given precisely by the social interaction of people, and not by the subordination of the individual to social forces. It is in action, in interaction, that “sociocultural integrity” comes to life and “reproduces,” and not in general hegemonic structures that impose a certain whole on creative uniqueness. Therefore, the sociocultural for us is, above all, the process developing on an archetypal basis, rather than a static structure inherited from the once formed archaic structures.

## CONCLUSION

Today, by the archetypal bases, from our point of view, it is necessary to imply certain and stable “axial elements”, general orientations and formal models that are involved in concrete historical practices of continuation (reproduction), restructuring and living of sociocultural integrity. In this regard, we can talk about a concrete being-culture, or as noted by K.V. Chistov, about “a gradual advance through a variational combination of the old with the new” (Chistov, 1986). In its turn, we describe the specific in this process through the notion of “sociocultural archetypes,” which, metaphorically speaking, represent “material”, “specific blocks” for assembling a new political, legal, socio-economic space that regulates social interaction in concrete historical conditions, in the context of active and latent challenges and threats. If we take the instrumental aspect, it can be noted that through the juxtaposition, imitation and creative use of sociocultural canons, the successive development of sociocultural integrity is carried out.

The problem of restructuring, re-assembly is conditioned by creative and innovative moments arising in the development of a sociocultural and in particular a public-power organization. At the same time, the extreme, radical version of transformation (as a process more general than specific processes - modernism and conservatism) of a sociocultural organization is, from our point of view, the concept of a crisis that can both lead to the destruction of the sociocultural as an

integral and evolutionary phenomenon, and open new formats and directions of its transformation.

### Acknowledgement

The work was carried out with the financial support of the grant of the President of the Russian Federation No. MD-6669.2016.6.

### References

- Baranov P.P., Mamychev A.Y., Ovchinnikov A.I. (2016). *Management of the conservative political platform of the transformation public-power organization in Eurasia*. International Review of Management and Marketing. No. 6 (S6). P. 241-246.
- Bolshakova, A. Yu. (2011). *Archetype - a myth - a concept (the turn of the XX - XXI centuries). The theory of the archetype. Part III*. Ulyanovsk, p. 87.
- Chistov, K.V. (1986). *Folk traditions, and folklore*. Moscow, p. 175.
- Hegel, G.V.F. (1990). *Philosophy of law*. Moscow, p. 293.
- Hegel, G.V.F. (2014). *Phenomenology of the spirit*. Moscow.
- Jung, K.G. (2001). *Psychological types*. St. Petersburg.
- Leibniz, G.V. (1982). *Works in 4 volumes. Volume 1. Monadology*. Moscow, p. 413.
- Kant, I. (1984). *Collected works in eight volumes*. Moscow, pp. 487-488.
- Kant, I. (2015). *Criticism of practical reason*. Moscow, pp. 311-501.
- Malenko, S.A. (1998). *Phenomenology of the archetype in the system of sociocultural development of the collective unconscious (on the materials of KG Jung's work)*. Candidate of Philosophy thesis, author's abstract. Kiev, 1998, pp. 7-9.
- Marinosyan, T.E. (1998). *Archetype as a concept of philosophical anthropology. Candidate of Philosophy thesis, author's abstract*. Moscow, p. 9-17.
- Nersesyants, V.S. (1990). *Philosophy of Law: History and Modernity. Hegel GVF. Philosophy of law*. Moscow, pp. 3-43.
- Nikita, A.G. (2001). *Mechanisms of unconscious social distortion of the phenomenology of the archetype*. Candidate of Philosophy thesis, author's abstract. Kiev, p. 5.
- Ovchinnikov, A.I., Mamychev, A. Yu. Manastyrny, A.V. & Tyurin, M.E. (2009). *Legal archetypes in the legal policy of Russia: a monograph*. Rostov-on-Don: SFedU Publishing house.
- Pelipenko, A.A. & Yakovenko, I.G. (1998). *Culture as a system*. Moscow, p. 77.
- Pletukhina, E.G. (2016). *Development of ideas about the archetype in the history of culture. Scientific and Publishing Center "Sociosphere"*. Retrieved 15 November 2016 from URL: [http://sociosphera.com/publication/conference/2014/232/razvitie\\_predstavlenij\\_ob\\_arhetepe\\_v\\_istorii\\_kultury/](http://sociosphera.com/publication/conference/2014/232/razvitie_predstavlenij_ob_arhetepe_v_istorii_kultury/).
- Windelband, V. (1998). *From Kant to Nietzsche: The history of a new philosophy in its connection with a common culture and individual sciences*. Moscow, p. 362.
- Zelensky, V.V. (2004). *Basic course of analytical psychology, or Jungian brevity*. Moscow, p. 103.