

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).

MEDIEVAL TRADITION OF ARCHETYPAL RESEARCH OF PUBLIC-POWER ORGANIZATION: FORMATION AND EVOLUTION

Alexey Mamychyev^{*}, Tatyana Mordovtseva^{**}, Diana Mamychyeva^{***},
Alexey Shirshov^{****} and Maria Filippova^{*****}

Abstract: The subject of this research were made by medieval political and legal thought in which developed the archetypal (divine) ideas, and also antique ideas about “Arche” (the original basis, the proto-ideas, etc.) as the underlying Foundation of public power organizations and value-normative system. The article shows that medieval thought has formed two axial lines of the development of archetypal studies: the first related to a higher Arche-ideas, the original principles of the divine institutions, etc.; second, on the contrary, from a purely human, material dimension of the archetype of the archaic heritage, the unconscious structure of the psyche, its collective representation, the initial tyranny and the “cultural amnesia” sources of socio-political and protoculture integrity, specific political and legal institutions. Theoretical and methodological basis of the present study were the achievements of General history of state and law, regulations, legal anthropology and cultural-historical approach in legal studies and political science. The main methods used absheronkiy (systemic, phenomenological and dispositional, oriented reconstruction “mysledeyatelnostny background” era), as well as General logical methods (analysis, synthesis, analogy, etc.) and specially scientific (historical-legal, comparative-legal). Scientific novelty of the work is the author’s interpretation of the medieval tradition of archetypal research. The article reveals and substantiates the unique tradition, conceptualized by medieval theologians related to the understanding of the archetype as both the ultimate and original “point harmonization” of volitional, cognitive and spiritual forces. This aspect is shown ideational the nature of the presentation of the archetypal foundations. So, if in the material world, in human organizations operate trends of plurality, differences and divisions, the archetype of the “gives rise to” a fundamentally different dimension, forms the “point of convergence” or the “method of ascent” to the uniform. The author shows that this allows the archetypal tradition to lay the Foundation for a measurement – the measurement represents the basis for justification, not of the description, a new way to conceive of integrity in diversity and the division or to carry out “Assembly” of the state space based on the original ideas and principles. The article also argues that the idea of the archetypal foundations as a descriptive discourse became dominant in the Renaissance and reformation, and significantly influenced the formation of the Jungian theory of the archetype. In addition, the novelty and significance of the work relates to the description laid down in the middle ages the tradition of the consideration of positive law in an instrumental

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

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

*** Candidate of Cultural Studies, Associate Professor, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia. *Email: mamychyeva@yandex.ru*

**** Associate Professor of the Department of Criminal Law and Criminology of the Law School of Far Eastern Federal University. *Email: brahma@bk.ru*

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

perspective, i.e. as a necessary institutional and regulatory forms to ensure the manifestation and presence of the highest values and standards in public power organizations, including the coercion of community members to adherence to the highest principles and ideals.

Keywords: Archetype, new age, power, politics, culture, methodology, political organization, political philosophy, tradition, evolution.

INTRODUCTION

Archetypal research is topicalized and actualized under the following conditions: first, when large-scale events that radically change the worldview and sustainable practices of interaction occur in the society; the general connection of generations and the continuity of sociocultural development are lost; Second, when there is an uncertainty in the value-normative structure that determines the thought activity of the community, the meanings, and perceptions of the ongoing social, political, economic and other processes; Thirdly, when the mechanism of self-identification of the individual and society, symbolic (imaginary) integrity as a whole is destroyed.

In this aspect, we accept the position of N.N. Firsova who notes that “in the situation of the disintegration of the habitual worldview with established norms of social and political identity, with the value identity of the disorientation of mass consciousness, the archetypal structures of the collective unconscious expressed by such categories of archaic consciousness as those of space-time, causality, the integrity and indivisibility of the perception of the world act as protective mechanisms” (Firsov, 2005).

However, we do not agree with the interpretation of archaism as the basis of socio-cultural integrity, its successive reproduction. A common feature of many modern archetypal studies is that archaic nature is the fundamental basis of socio-cultural development, and it is not entirely clear how archaism leaves room for creative interaction. Is the process of sociocultural development itself an eternal return of the archaic, once formed and invariably repeated (played out in different variations and contexts)? The difficulty arises even when relating the “cultural unconscious” to the value-rational and socio-normative values of culture, the process of cultural transformation, the semantic and symbolic variations with the unchanging archaic basis of culture. In general, such archetypal projects of cognition of the hidden foundations of a public power organization form more questions than reveal the essence of the research program.

From our point of view, if we talk about the archaic heritage, then rather as general forms and models that were worked out by people at the ancient stages of development, having formed the original foundations of community/solidarity connected with the focus on preserving the human in man, the reproduction of this community, or rather the replacement of natural aggression with sociocultural forms

of legitimate violence, institutional support for the elements of social integrity, its reproduction, and so on.

For example, the elaborate symbolic forms and imitative mechanisms form the first mimetic complexes, which are based, first, on imitation of natural nature, and then on reproduction/imitation of already formed artificial nature (social order of relationships), past symbolic and cultural forms and practices of interaction. For example, the famous French researcher René Girard describes these archaic forms in detail and systematically, especially the principle of mimesis in the organization of social societies and their reproduction. So he notes that “today, in the sciences of man and culture, a one-sided view of everything that we call mimetism, imitation, mimesis prevails. At the same time, there is nothing or almost nothing in human behavior that would not have been appropriated through study, and every study is reduced to imitation. If people suddenly cease to imitate, all forms of culture will disappear. Neurologists constantly say that the human brain is a huge imitative device. For the development of science about man, it is necessary to compare human imitation with mimicry in animals, to determine human forms of mimetic behavior” (Girard, 2016). In this aspect, the archaic nature formed the basis, the basic authentic forms of social integrity, the prototypes for subsequent socio-cultural transformations.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

Today we can state the diversity of approaches to understanding the essence and content of the archetype. This concept is used in various scientific disciplines, substituting original and often incompatible interpretations, tools of knowledge, and so on. Quite often the formulated positions of the theory of archetypes contradict one another or reflect completely different bases and contents. An even more problematic situation has arisen in the presentation of the history of the development of the traditions of archetypal research. So, at the present time, from one scientific work to another, ideas about the only tradition of the latter are broadcast. It is substantiated that the prevailing general ideas about the archetypal bases in antiquity have practically reached the present and are conceptually shaped in the theory of the archetype of Jung.

In fact, Antiquity saw several traditions and directions of interpretation of the archetype. Moreover, the semantic basis of the “archae” was used in many philosophical, philosophical-political and philosophical-religious treatises. In addition, similar ideological and conceptual “foundations” of the archetypal theory developed in the Ancient East. In the Middle Ages and the Modern Age, there were also various directions of archetypal research. Even more “monistic position” formed in the twentieth century, when the theoretical and practical breakthrough of psychoanalysis (Freud’s discovery of the collective unconscious), and then analytical psychology for many years formed only one model of interpretation

of the theory of the archetype. In modern studies of this problem, the authors, as a rule, give a long and highly diverse list of studies that develop the tradition of archetypal research, and the Jungian theory of the archetype is interpreted as a kind of theoretical and conceptual outcome of the development of this tradition (Malenko, 1998; Marinosyan, 1998; Storchak, 1997).

Subsequent registers of thought and research platforms (implicitly or explicitly) substantiate, in the overwhelming majority, theoretical and practical versions of the development of the Jungian theory in this or that sphere. Thanks to this orientation, an “authoritative scientific track” was formed, where it became practically impossible to “jump out” from the formed tradition of research, and all subsequent developments predominantly reproduced the formulated by K.G. Jung ideological and semantic and theoretical and conceptual orientation, focused on the archetypes of the collective unconscious. In this aspect, the theory of Jung archetypes is perceived uncritically, and research programs boil down to reinterpreting the Jungian heritage, isolating/discovering new archetypes, and so on. New forms of thought and “procedures of truth” within this tradition do not arise and are not welcomed. In rare exceptions, fundamental research appears that challenges the content of the term archetype, which is “abstractly” denoted by Jung; nevertheless, the “Jungian track” as a whole seems irresistible (Eliade, 2010; Meletinsky, 2012).

From our point of view, such approaches significantly impoverish and narrow the theoretical and conceptual variety of archetypal research projects that take place in the history of political and legal thought. For example, in pre-philosophical ancient Greek thought, the “archae” tradition is formed (Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Heraclitus, etc.); it is the source of the ancient Greek philosophers’ reasoning, but it coincides neither with the Platonic version of archetypes (archae - “beginning” and typos - “pattern”), nor with Aristotle’s interpretation of the initial basics, the initial ontological and epistemological principles.

Although Thomism and archetypal discourses in the Middle Ages were based on the legacy of Greek philosophers and, above all, Aristotle’s doctrine, nevertheless, the Augustinian archetypes-ideas or the Absolute-ideas-the beginnings of Aquinas unfold completely different principles of comprehension of the original/primitive images, their meaningful understanding, interpretation of meaning.

Scholarly discourses of I. Kant (intellectus archetypus, Urbild - “prototype”), G.V. Leibniz (monads), D.O. Shelling (allegorical formulas), I.M. Snegirev (root concepts), F.I. Buslaev (rooted folk images and motifs), etc., who are rightly acknowledged as authors who made a significant contribution to the theory of archetypes and archetypal research, are still unlikely to be “included” in one tradition of research of both ideological-semantic and conceptual development of the archetype. It is impossible to fit in the same “universal tradition” the various religious and philosophical traditions of the interpretation of the archetype.

Various are epistemological and ontological grounds for the collective unconscious by Z. Freud and K.G. Jung, for collective conscience and collective representations by E. Durkheim and L. Levy-Bruhl, for structures of the imaginary (imaginary community by B. Anderson, for “structured multiplicity” as a condition of life and co-living by K. Hübner, sociology of the imaginary by J. Durand, etc.), for the ideational foundations of the socio-cultural life of the activity of P.A. Sorokin, for original mimic desires and sacrificial mechanisms (which are the hidden basis of all forms of philosophical, religious, political and legal thinking that cause institutionalization and the processes of its evolution) by R. Girard, the original tradition by R. Guénon, the social habitus by P. Bourdieu, etc. And all this ideological and semantic diversity is often combined into one and the same tradition of archetypal research, which is not correct (Laza, 2013).

In this regard, we suggest analyzing archetypal ideas during the Middle Ages and presenting a meaningful interpretation of the main political and legal doctrines during this period, as well as the influence of the latter on the further development of the ideas of reconstruction and the description of the deep foundations of public power in the Renaissance and Reformation.

THE MAIN PART

Medieval archetypal discourse. In the formation of Thomism and the official doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, one can also discover the use of the archetypal basis in religious and philosophical discourse, albeit in other “ideological and semantic connotations”. So, the medieval doctrine proceeds from the ideas of the ancient Greek philosophers about the original images, ideas organizing all existing, all variety of real incarnations.

St. Augustine the Blessed uses the Greek legacy of the “archae” and in his theological doctrine one can clearly trace “the combination of ancient and medieval theories” (Losev, 1994). Thus, Augustine combines the idea of primordial images with theological concepts of the divine light, which underlies any human knowledge. At the same time, they emphasize the fundamental non-recognition of archetypes, their eternity and timelessness, acting as a light that illuminates the movement of human thought and activity. In other words, the archetypality in the latter’s teaching is noumenal, a divine idea.

In general, the archetype-idea becomes the key ideological and semantic basis of medieval theology, noumena “are located” in the divine mind and exert their influence either through the creative principle - the living Divine word (the teachings of the Holy Apostles), or through the normalization (correspondence) of nature and Human organization (for example, as in the teachings of F. Aquinas). Looking ahead, we can say that these archetype-ideas have largely laid the foundation for both the theological and secular interpretation of man, right, law, power and other

phenomena, “intertwined” by Christianity into “historical fabric” and related to the terrestrial, spatiotemporal Organization. Thanks to these Christian ideas, history is perceived as the totality of one-time solutions of individual wills, which are indispensable for the movement of this history, for the accomplishment of the world and the fulfillment of the divine predestination of the “archae.”

For example, Mircea Eliade notes that, spreading mostly in an academic way, for several centuries, these archetype ideas have had a significant impact not only on the people’s spiritual and religious views, on the formation of mass political ideas and on the formation of ordinary sense of justice, but also on the world perception of people in general (Eliade, 2009). They, collectively, laid specific sociocultural codes and worldview matrices (a system of symbols and archetypes) that determine the forms and directions of development of legal and political cultures, perceptions and interpretation of various social phenomena and processes during the evolution of the social system (Ovchinnikov, 2009).

Let us note that medieval religious thought had a significant impact not only both on the formation of Western European civilization and its culture (the idea of history and linear time, the understanding of man, his dignity, rights, freedoms, etc.), but also on the theory of the archetype. So, for example, Jung saw more ideological and semantic beginnings for the formation of his theory of the archetype in medieval philosophy, rather than in the ancient tradition of “archae”. In his opinion, it was the latter that developed and conceptually formalized the Platonic idea of the fundamental principles, their influence on the individual’s thought activity: “Medieval philosophy since the time of Augustine the Blessed, from whom I borrowed the idea of an archetype, up to Malebranche and Bacon, continues to adhere to the concept of Plato in this respect. But among the scholastics, we find the opinion that archetypes are natural images embedded in the human mind and helping him to come to a particular judgment” (Jung, 2016).

The entire medieval philosophy is “imbued” with the idea of correspondence to the original divine order, the hierarchical forms, and methods of social, political and legal organization that correspond to it: “According to Paul, the whole history is ruled by God’s wisdom, in a hidden way, finally bringing its revelation in Christ reconciling the worldly and divine. All things are created in Christ; He is the beginning of divine wisdom. Christ is the archetype of every creation that was created according to His model, turned into Him and found his victorious meaning in His incarnation and resurrection. Thus, Christianity came to understand the entire movement of human history, including all its various religious and philosophical struggles, as the unfolding of the divine plan that was fulfilled at the coming of Christ as the archetype of the whole creation (emphasis added – A.M.)” (Tarnas, 1995).

Let us note an idea important for our research, which was conceptually designed by medieval theologians, namely, that the archetype is both the ultimate and the

initial “point of harmonization” of strong-willed, cognitive and spiritual forces. So, if in the material world, in the human organization the tendencies of plurality, differences and divisions act, then the archetype “generates” another dimension, represents either a “point of convergence” or “a way of ascent” to a single, common, which allows us to act from a different dimension - a measurement that provides a basis for justification, not a description. The only way to think of integrity in diversity and division or to carry out a “social assembly” (Latour, 2014), is to accept the idea of archetypal foundations as a substantiating rather than describing discourse.

For example, St. Thomas Aquinas developed this idea into a harmonious teaching, according to which the world “unfolds” from the archetypal divine foundations and rises to it. In particular, he justified the structure of forms (divine, spiritual and material forms), in accordance with which the hierarchy of ordering and normalizing forces is ensured, the politico-legal order is embodied and organized. Aquinas substantiates the harmony of all ordering forces through a system of normative elements and subordination. Thus, he distinguishes four types of law: the eternal, natural, human and divine laws.

Lex Aeterna or the eternal law/divine “archae” is the divine mind itself, which is the basis of everything. The content of the eternal law includes systems of theonormative requirements, identical to the concept (idea-archetype) of God. This law is an expression of the Divine Reason as the fundamental/primordial, timeless/supreme, guiding and absolute principle, rule, and principle.

However, man cannot entirely comprehend the divine plan, cannot intellectually embrace the whole order of the universe and the depth of this design. Nevertheless, the mere fact of the existence of the created world and order obliges man to submit to the requirements of the divine law/original plan (namely, as an active, consciously-volitional form of the realization of divine law): “The eternal plan of divine law is the eternal law designed by God to control the Things pre-known to him”.

Lex Naturalis or natural law represents the manifestation, incarnation and unfolding of the divine “archae” in the natural environment and forms, accordingly, a system of theonormative requirements and principles of organization, acting in relation to God created creatures. The two circumstances highlighted below are important from the point of view of theonormative regulation (Mamychev et. al., 2015).

First, the natural law, unfolding the original design, allows us to “specify” the essence (for example, in relation to a man his supernatural dignity) and the purposeful functioning (the place and purpose of each creature in the divinely organized order of things) of every natural being. In other words, a variety of natural beings, by virtue of their nature (i.e. inherent natural properties of nature), is directed toward the attainment of those purposes that are conditioned by the divine “archae”.

Second, the natural law is the objectification, the reification of the divine archetypal basis, is a reflection of the original forms, principles, norms by the human mind (for example, the laws of the community, the desire for self-preservation and the continuation of the family). And with the help of this type of law people are able to distinguish between moral and immoral, legal and extra-legal, fair and unjust, lawful and illegal, moral and immoral, good and bad, good and evil, etc. In addition, the natural law gives a chance, the possibility for a person to be involved in the eternal law: "This involvement of a rational creature into the eternal law is called a natural law". However, according to Aquinas, in the immediate reality, in material existence, man, of course, is far from such unity, and therefore, when choosing these or those vital goals, deviations are possible both in the direction of the good and towards the evil, contrary to God, unlawfully natural law, etc.): "Free will also apply to the election of the good and evil".

By virtue of the latter, differences arise both in consciously volitional activities of people and in the interpretation of natural law, because "man, by virtue of his natural nature (which, of course, is the result of God's creativity) acts by obeying certain instincts, inclinations, inclinations (towards self-preservation, marriage and procreation, to a co-existence, to knowledge of God, etc.). However, the numerous circumstances of human destinies determine the various options for people to understand the requirements of natural law. Hence, according to S.E. Turkuletz, various interpretations of natural law from different people arise (Turkulets, 2009).

In turn, in order to remove contradictions and inconsistencies in people's understanding of natural law, important in the hierarchy of laws is a written, human right, the essence of which lies in the materialization and concretization of the principles of natural law. The latter is objectified to concrete historical conditions, circumstances and requirements of human life activity.

Lex Humana is written human right or acting legal right, expressing the requirements of the natural law, backed by sanctions. This law, in the content of which the conscious-volitional principle of man is manifested, is necessary for people not to pervert the natural law due to the fall. In substantiating the positive law, St. Th. Aquinas assigns an important place to the public good, which in accordance with the natural nature of man is the main requirement of state and legal organization and public power: "The law is something other than the establishment of the reason for the common good, promulgated by those who care about society".

At the same time, Aquinas admits a divergence between the natural and positive law; because of the sinful human nature, only the written law that corresponds to the nature of man, his physical and moral nature is just, normative and universally binding. In turn, coercion involves, on the one hand, an understanding of the requirements contained in the law itself, and on the other - its correspondence to the

eternal and natural laws. And, while the natural law is sufficient for the righteous people, for sinful people a positive right is needed, forcing them to the common good and respect, under the threat of punishment, to the principles, norms, and requirements, according to which the natural nature and the human community are arranged.

In the future, a whole tradition of considering the positive law in the instrumental aspect emerged and reproduced, i.e., as a necessary institutional and regulatory form, ensuring the manifestation and presence of the highest values and standards of human organization, including compelling members of society to follow the highest principles of organization. For example, V.S. Soloviev noted that a positive law must, first of all, establish a minimum of moral principles, acting as a minimal, inferior level of morality. In other words, the legal law is only a concrete historical embodiment of the absolute moral law, the “guarantee” of the embodiment of moral principles and the “potential possibility” of legitimate coercion/from immoral forces of destruction (individual or collective). Accordingly, a person living according to high moral principles rises above simple positive regulatory requirements, presenting to himself a more complex system of principles, norms, requirements, etc. (Soloviev, 2001). At the same time, the institutional and normative expression of the principle of “minimum morality” should not lead to the destruction of freedom, responsibility, and freedom of the individual, as well as to the absolutization of coercive force.

Lex Divina or the written divine law is a written divine right, expressed in the Bible and the living tradition of the biblical righteous. According to the teachings of St. Thomas, lex divina appears in three interrelated hypostases: (1) it points to the ultimate goals of human existence, the comprehension of which lies beyond the limits of man’s worldly possibilities; (2) it is a system of theonormative attitudes for holy and righteous living (the rules of confession given to people in the Scriptures); (3) it is necessary because of the imperfection of the human mind, people themselves cannot come to a single conception of truth, and the Bible should help them in this, because the Divine law is the way to eliminate all the sinful and evil that due to certain circumstances cannot be prohibited within the framework of the operation of human law.

From the point of view of St. Thomas, human laws result from their eternal law (the Divine “archae-idea”). If the eternal law is the “archetypal/original plan” of God, then human laws contain the “original plans” of the earthly rulers (or the archetypal foundations of a public-authority organization). It should be emphasized that human law is not a direct copy of the eternal law, since the first can be unjust. All human (publicly-authoritative) history “clearly shows how human laws deviate from the eternal law, representing rather not the power of reason, but violence over the will of man” (Turkulets, 2009).

CONCLUSION

It is the problems of harmonizing the divine “archae-ideas” and the archetypal bases of the public power organization (secular initial plans of the organization) that becomes the leading one in the development of the archetypal tradition. Thus, in the Reformation and Renaissance era, the dominant philosophical and legal basis of thinkers was the idea of a harmonious interaction of the divine and the worldly, which in its essence does not contradict, but complement each other: power, law, the church are (or should be!) organic elements organizing spiritual and practical life. At the same time, the main issue is the legitimization (of justification through philosophical and legal and religious teachings) of state-legal organization, which is based primarily on the spiritual and moral dimension (the original intent) of the functioning of legal and political institutions, their fundamental dependence on religious (sacred and universal) ideals and goals.

The greatest theologian and philosopher of law, Karl Barth, rightly notes that the thinkers of this epoch “very persuasively inspired us that there is one and the other: the divine justification and human right, the preaching of Jesus Christ, the belief in him and the post, the authority of authority, Recognition of the church and recognition of the state, the inmost life of a Christian in God and his civic duty. The reformers tried to explain to us that one does not contradict the other, but on the contrary, one can exist and act in parallel to the other”. However, after confirming the postulate on the relationship and parallel existence of divine and positive law, the reformers, according to the conclusion of K. Barth, could not clearly answer how and how much these two realities are related to each other, on this issue “the reformers have no answer or only an unsatisfactory answer in the form of a weak hint” (Bart, 2006).

Further, the constant confrontation between the secular and spiritual foundations of power led to the fact that in the ordinary, religious, and later in the political and legal consciousness, the ideas began to dominate, strictly breeding the religious and publicly-dominant activities of society, the church and the state, clergy and laity. Mass sense of justice began to represent the church as an organization (institution) largely “separate from the world”. At the same time, the church, like the Augustinian “City of God”, was opposed to the sinful “City of Earth” - the state, respectively, between the clergy and laity, as well as between the church and the state, a wall was erected, and the sacred and secular were sharply contrasted to each other (Dugin, 2004).

There appeared a cardinal gap between the divine plan/archae-plan and the secular principles (the original plans) of the public-power organization. The “being of the cause” (God) was rendered so far that it gradually became interpreted as what theologians call the “lazy Deity”, “Deus Otiosis” (Dugin, 2009).

Two main axial lines of development of archetypal studies of the foundations of a public and public power organization are beginning to be formed: the first, connected with higher archaic ideas, original principles, divine ordinances, etc.; The second, on the contrary, with 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 both can be described using the characteristic that is so often reproduced in various archetypal studies: supernaturalism. This characteristic indicates that the “content of the archetype” is laid out of the natural state of things with which we correlate it. And in both directions archetypal bases act as “super” in relation to the usual order of organization or thought-activity of people, but we will dwell on this in more detail further.

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

- Bart, K. (2006). *Justification and Right*. Moscow, p. 8-9.
- Dugin, A.G. (2004). *Philosophy of Politics*. Moscow, p. 241.
- Dugin, A.G. (2009). *Post-Philosophy. Three Paradigms in the History of Thought*. Moscow, p.235.
- Eliade, M. (2009). *History of Faith and Religious Ideas: From Mohammed to the Reformation* (2nd ed.). Moscow.
- Eliade, M. (2010). *Aspects of Myth*. Moscow.
- Firsov, N.N. (2005). *Myth in the Russian Political Discourse of the 1990s*. (On the materials and documents of political parties and movements). Moscow.
- Girard, R. (2016). *Things Hidden From the Creation of the World*. Moscow: BBI Publishing house.
- Jung, K.G. *Instinct and the Unconscious*. Retrived 10 October 2016 from URL: <http://www.oculus.ru/stat.php?id=52>
- Latour, B. (2014). *The reassembly of the social: an introduction to the actor-network theory*. Moscow, p. 16-18.
- Laza, V.D. (2013). *Archetypal in Orthodoxy: History and Modernity. Monograph*. Pyatigorsk, pp. 9-56.
- Losev, A. (1994). *The History of Ancient Aesthetics: The Results of Millennial Development*. Moscow, p. 82.
- Malenko, S.A. (1998). *Phenomenology of the Archetype in the System of Sociocultural Development of the Collective Unconscious (on the materials of K.G. Jung work)*. Candidate of Philosophy thesis, author’s abstract. Kiev, p. 5-7.
- Mamychev, A.Yu., Fominskaya, M.D. & Shestopal, S.S. (2015). *Christian Paradigms of the Doctrine of Human Rights*. Lambert Academic Publishing.

- Marinosyan, T.E. (1998). *Archetype as a Concept of Philosophical Anthropology*. Candidate of Philology thesis, author's abstract. Moscow, p. 9.
- Meletinsky, Y.M. (2012). *Poetics of Myth*. Moscow.
- 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.
- Tarnas, S. (1995). *The History of Western Thinking*. Moscow, p. 88.
- Turkulets, S.E. (2009). Faith as a Spiritual Value in Religious and Legal Consciousness. The value discourse in the sciences and theology. *RAS, Institute of Philosophy, Russian State University for Humanities*. Moscow, p. 344-347.
- Soloviev, V.S. (2001). *Law and Morality*. Minsk.
- Storchak, V.M. (1997). *Archetype and Mentality in the Context of Religious Studies*. Candidate of Philosophy thesis, author's abstract. Moscow, p. 6.