

Archetypes of individual and collective in the model of the universal social cycle

Sergey Asaturov,

asaturov555@ukr.net

PhD, docent

Department of international relations and social science

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

Kyiv, Ukraine

Andrei Martynov

martynov.andriy15@gmail.com

Dr., Habil (History), Professor

Department of international relations and foreign policy of Ukraine

at Institute of History of Ukraine, National Academy of science of Ukraine Kyiv

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the peculiarities of the interaction of archetypes of individual and collective in the context of the model of the universal social cycle and the history of the development of corresponding concepts. Modern sociological theories are the attempts to find answers to challenges of the ongoing modernization process. Controversial approaches in most sociological theories seem to be methodological individualism or methodological holism. Accordingly, the modern space is marked by the dominance of the “instrumental mind”. With the onset of the Early Modern, a rigid (revolutionary) opposition to traditional social institutions and values arises. For the developed Modern the ideals of stability and security of both the individual and the collective, are inherent. Instead, the late Modern (or Postmodern) reinforces the controversy in individual and collective relations, stimulates social disintegration, blurring of individual and collective identities. The open question remains the nonlinear, cyclic approach to the highlighting of the interaction of archetypes of individual and collective. For every person living in the society in one way or another is connected with the information-energy interaction between society and the individual, between “WE” and “US”. Postmodernity also actualizes the other side of social life of man, society and civilization, which is a cyclical psychosocial process. Each of the stages of this process reveals, as evidenced by the research of the Ukrainian school of archetype, national peculiarities of social systems, and typical for one or another historical epoch psychosocial characteristics, and socio-historical development appears interaction of mental and social structures.

KEYWORDS: Archetype, Individual, Collective, Universal social cycle.

Received: 12/11/2021

Revised :

Accepted: 23/11/2021

Introduction. Modern sociological theories are the attempts to find answers to challenges of the ongoing modernization process. Controversial approaches in most sociological theories seem to be methodological individualism or methodological holism. Accordingly, the modern space is marked by the dominance of the “instrumental mind”. With the onset of the Early Modern, a rigid (revolutionary) opposition to traditional social institutions and values arises. For the developed Modern the ideals of stability and security of both the individual and the collective, are inherent. Instead, the late Modern (or Postmodern) reinforces the controversy in individual and collective relations, stimulates social disintegration, blurring of individual and collective identities.

Swiss psychologist K. G. Jung defined the archetype as an irrational unconscious, which he denoted as an abstract soul, common to all people, even if it manifests itself through individual consciousness. In fact, the archetype is a collective unconscious cultural stereotype that affects the behavior and history of mankind. Since the archetype is a phenomenon of the human unconscious, which manifests itself in culture and religion, then it is characterized by a certain socio-historical dynamics, which has its own laws. The first attempt to demonstrate the relationship between the development of world history and the idea of archetype on the example of the development of local civilizations was made by the German philosopher O. Spengler.

The experience of many generations, accumulated in the spiritual treasures of the memory of the cultures of many nations, generally forms the landscape of archetypes of local civilizations, each of which is a part of the world civilizational space and the embodiment of certain groups of peoples, ethnic groups and states that are self-identified by the community of spiritual, cultural, ethnic and religious values, historical destinies and geopolitical interests. The follower of C. G. Jung and the founder of archetypal psychology J. Hillman in the monograph “The Power of character” notes that “character is the driving force” [1, p.178.] This character is formed in the interaction of archetypes of individual and collective.

Analysis of the main research problems. E. Durkheim, the founder of the French sociological school, proposed to consider society as a superindividual and subindividual reality that possesses individuals and does not depend upon on them. At the same time, the German philosopher and founder of phenomenology, E. Husserl, emphasized that “Me” is before everything conceivable, and it is for the subject who expresses such a judgment, the primordial intentional base of his world [[2],p.137-138]. Today, in the leading countries of the world, with the help of innovative communication systems, the individual gradually acquires an greater degree of individual freedom. He creates its own virtual world that goes beyond the boundaries of a national state body, even becomes a leading producer of intellectual information, which can claim to play a role independent on the state and social group in the world.

On the other hand, this leads to a certain conflict between the movable interests of the “autonomous personality” and the social values consolidated within the nation. Gradually, this becomes an important contributor to the contradictions between the global subject “Me” and the permanent form of social organization, which ultimately “pushes” the human community into a new cycle of world-historical development. In essence, there is a contradiction actualized between an individual and

the authorities, which was successfully described by the ideologues of anarchism from P. Kropotkin and M. Bakunin, who protest against various international forums and declare themselves to be “fighters with anti-human ideas of globalization”.

The formation of an early Modern is in one way or another connected with the ideas of K. Marx and F. Engels regarding the development of “productive forces”, in which the individual is regarded as a source of physical strength, and the economy is limited by the relationship “goods — money — goods” (a kind of production for the sake of consumption). Industrialization, becoming the leading idea of the modern epoch, exacerbates the social issue and the relationship between an individual and collective. In the context of individual archetypes there are phenomena of “social fetishism” and “individual alienation” [3,p.114]. The German sociologist M. Weber attracts our attention to “methodological individualism”, he describes the problem of subjective perception of social relations. American sociologist T. Parsons, answering the question of how a social system can exist, states that it exists only through collective values [[4], p. 155]. German sociologist N. Elias spoke about the dual civilization process, characterized by uneven distribution of models of civilized behavior among individuals and in society as a whole [4, p. 196]. I. Wallerstein, *The modern World-System*. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

One of the co-founders of the Frankfurt Philosophical School T. Adorno in the middle of the twentieth century wrote that we live in the age of “disintegrating individuals, and societies that regress” [[5], p. 361]. In the work “Dialectics of Enlightenment” T. Adorno, along with M. Horkheimer noted that “people are radically alienated from each other and from nature” [6, p. 270].

German futurist H. Opaszowski writes about the danger of the middle class blurring and the emergence of the phenomenon of the procuracy, that is, the temporarily employed labor force. The progress of technology kills many jobs. A new phenomenon for the western civilization is the poverty of those who work. There is no more favorite work, which parents used to have. There is a constant shortage of qualifications. Flexible change in occupations leads to loss of employee loyalty and a shortage of social time. As a result, the democratic political system becomes unstable [7, p. 45]. H. Opaschowski, *Deutschland 2030. Wie wir in Zukunft leben*. Gutersloh, 2008. There is a hybridization of consumption in an aging society. Due to the increase in anthropological load, nature loses the usual mechanisms of self-regulation. In social life there is an irreversible process of losing the privacy of personal data. Life in metropolises is de facto taking place under permanent video surveillance. Anomie gives a real picture of the destruction of collective morality. Instead of two genders, gender pluralism is already under discussion [8]. The process of globalization makes hybrid national forms of social inequality. M. Hardt and A. Negri in the monograph “Empire” drew attention not only to the political tendency of transition from modernist imperialism to postmodern imperial order without external borders and with limited national sovereignty, but also to the hybridization of technology and nature, as well as technology and human beings [9]. In his latest monograph, “The Metamorphoses of the World”, the German sociologist W. Beck draws attention to the fact that climate change integrates nature and society [10, p. 65].

Overview of unresolved tasks. The open question remains the nonlinear, cyclic approach to the highlighting of the interaction of archetypes of individual and collective.

The purpose of the paper is to demonstrate the epistemological capabilities of the author's cycle model of the universal social cycle on the example of the interaction of archetypes of individual and collective.

Presenting main material. For every person *living in the society in one way or another is connected with the information-energy interaction between society and the individual, between "WE" and "US"*. Accordingly, the links between the societal psyche, which characterizes the current postmodern society as an integrity, and the individual psyche of a certain person, which undergoes dynamic changes today, are actualized. In the context of these changes, there is every reason to consider the subject only the part of the society that actively influences others beyond itself. For example, the subjects of politics are large social groups with their specific interests that define the meaning of political action. At a certain stage of their development, they create their own political structures, made to act effectively in the interests of their groups. The direct organizers of political actions are individuals, if they determine the direction, course and content of political processes, so an important role is played by another subject — a political leader as a person who has a crucial influence on the members of a particular social group.

A leader is an subject that has an organizational and integrating influence. As evidenced by the rich historical experience, the activity of the leader promotes the disclosure of the creative potential of a small or large social group, and sometimes, on the contrary, prevents it. It is appropriate to note that liberalism considers the symbolic "end of history" the liberation of an individual from all forms of collective identity. And all this happens in the context of the implementation of a system-building for the postmodern age psychological factor.

Postmodernity also actualizes the other side of social life of man, society and civilization, which is a cyclical psychosocial process. Each of the stages of this process reveals, as evidenced by the research of the Ukrainian school of archetype, national peculiarities of social systems, and typical for one or another historical epoch psychosocial characteristics, and socio-historical development appears interaction of mental and social structures.

Not the last value for social life and behavior of social systems is carried by biological cycles. The annual cyclicity of ancient agricultural societies established the tradition of cyclic understanding of being. In particular, O. Chyzhevskiy linked human (social) activity with the rhythms of space cycles. The activity of the Sun displays a tense social system from the state of equilibrium, becoming a signal for its switching to another quality [11, p. 24]. All the life of a person of a traditional society, says Russian philosopher A. Ahiezer, is an endless system of cycles, which he reproduces as rituals. Sacred rituals were a way of adaptation to natural, cosmic cycles [12, p. 122]. In addition, human mental development have cyclic nature. In particular, in the psychological structure of human activity, the communicative (mastering of tasks, motives, norms of human activity and development of emotional

sphere) and substantive (formation of operational possibilities) are interchangeably actualized [13, p. 96].

The general scientific principles of the author's concept of the universal social cycle are logically associated with the notion that the “inanimate” nature is characterized by symmetry, whereas the ***“animated” nature***, including the social form of matter, which is hierarchically higher than all the others, is ***characterized by the asymmetry*** caused by the gender dichotomy of society.

Twenty years ago, speaking to the National Library of Ukraine named after V. I. Vernadskyi, with the jubilee (to the author's fiftieth anniversary) lecture “Social relativism or sociology of the transitional age of social development” E. Afonin drew the attention of his colleagues to the law of Louis Pasteur (1822–1885) and Pierre Curie (1859–1906), who, in studies on crystals, showed and explained the dissymmetry of “living” nature. And a decade earlier, based on the original system engineering model of the Russian A. Gribashev's “Semisloika” and the intuitive sense of the asymmetry of “animated” nature, it was managed to construct an author's projective psychodiagnostic technique of “Color Tendencies” (1987). Using as a stimulant the seven colors of the “rainbow”, the technique allows to distinguish 49 human psychotypes. Adapted to mass sociological surveys, the variant of the methodology allowed to measure the codes of Ukrainian (62:38), Russian (56:44) and Belarusian (37: 63) cultures in 1992 and to begin monitoring of system-wide changes in Ukraine (1992–2017).

The author's idea of the possible distribution of codes of world cultures somewhat resembles the periodic system of chemical elements of the table of Russian chemist D. Mendeleev — the classification of chemical elements, which establishes the dependence of various properties of elements on the charge of the atomic nucleus. The key hypothesis of the author's concept is that the psychosocial characteristics of the Eastern and Southern national cultures are close to symmetry, while their Western and Northern cultural controversies — to asymmetry. Under such conditions it is logical that the socio-historical cycles, starting at the East and South, in the process of deploying of a large epochal cycle, move the center of the historical civilization process to the West and the North. Now mankind is again at a crossroads.

The idea of a new cyclical paradigm of the historical process consists in understanding the fundamental difference of the very nature of the deployment of social cycles. Unlike cycles that occur in nature, and are, as we already know, symmetric, the repetition of historical cycles is also asymmetrical. Symmetric cycles (spiral) correspond to the model of the pendulum, whereas the rhythms of social cycles are asynchronous. The principle of asymmetry of cycles has practically not been taken into account in previous concepts of the cyclical development of social objects, and traditional notions of cycles still connect the final phase of development with the repetition of the first one, although the content of the social cycle is naturally regarded as a set of connected phenomena and processes, which reflect the completed development cycle for a certain period of time.

For understanding the cyclic model, the notion of the difference in the cyclic time paradigm from the linear one has a big importance. Social reality is historical in its essence. A historical phenomenon can not be adequately explained outside of its time. Instead, the term “social time”

describes human activity and social relations during certain social processes. At the same time, every society or local civilization has its own configurations of social time. In ancient times, the concept of “historical time” was introduced into scientific circulation, it is *kairos* (from the Greek language — “favorable moment”) as a period of time, favorable or unfavorable for a particular event. Instead, *chronos* was defined as “physical time”. In the Orthodox tradition, *kairos* is a time that has a specific historical meaning. It is *kairos* that fills the social historical periods. Historical time is a local characteristic of the development of the organic part of the nonlinear environment. The internal (biological) time of existence of a particular system characterizes its functioning. Instead, the external (socio-historical) time is the time of its change. For example, in the opinion of the Polish sociologist P. Stompka, internal time consists of short-term social changes, and external time is a real historical time, which enters into eternity [14, p. 287].

Generally, social time is a value-normative concept that determines the existence and functioning of society. Social time characterizes the sequence of different activities and is a non-material form of wealth of society and each member. The rhythm of social life is almost always uneven, because it consists of many rhythms of components.

Accumulated in a certain physical time, information is not transmitted automatically to every person from birth. Instead, people who are in a particular historical situation are trying to absorb it throughout their lives. Therefore, people who live in different historical epochs possess qualitatively different levels of knowledge. There are also ways to master knowledge, as well as the pace of their building-up. In particular, according to American A. Toffler, 70% of the population of the Earth live in different past, 25% — in the present, 3% — in the future [15, p. 81]. History studies the past, sociology — present, futurology — the future. Symbiosis of these sciences gives a real picture of being.

The most common models of social time are linear, cyclic, point and phase. In a linear model, time runs continuously and irreversibly from the past to the present, and then to the future. In the classical cyclic model, the flow of time is constantly repeated and forms a closed circle within which the time consequently and continuously proceeds in one direction from the past to the future, and then again to the past. In addition, the traditional interpretation of the full cycle is reduced to a model in which the final phase is converted to the original one, and the cycle begins again, passing the same route.

In the “universal social cycle” designed by the authors, the reverse process does not coincide (in form) with a series of previous processes. It is embodied in the general trajectory of a spiral, when successive states are mostly similar, but not identical. Reverse processes in a spiral signify a repetition of the process at a relatively high level or (for a downward model) at a relatively low level. The general duration of the cycle is not absolute (the same), but depends on the type of cyclic processes. So, the universal social cycle is non-rhythmic, and the intervals between the phases of this cycle are not equal. Actually, such a cycle, according to the authors, is only able to withstand chaos and anarchy.

Let’s say more, the concepts of “evolution” — “revolution” that are existing from the time of the Modern notion of social development on the basis of dichotomy — are not adequate to the

modernity and the present complexity of the historical process. Moreover, they contradict the laws of dialectics, in particular the denial of denial law, according to which the natural cycle, which consists of two normative periods and two transitional states, should be reproduced in social nature. *The authors propose a model of the “Universal Social Cycle”, the parts of which are two normative periods: “involution” and “evolution” and two transitional states: “revolution” and “co-evolution”.*

Revolution. During the revolution there is a peculiar “war of everyone against everyone” (Latin *Bellum omnium contra omnes*), by which the English materialist philosopher T. Hobbes describes the natural state of society before the conclusion of the “social contract” and the formation of the state, since in the social system the possible number self-sufficient individuals reaches its maximum. The uneasy nonlinear process of terrifying revolutionary vicissitudes seems to have a logical temporal inversion. An example of such reverse processes in the USSR was the period of the NEP (New Economic Policy), which lasted from the end of the Civil War (1921) to the beginning of industrialization (1929). In the end, together with the formed collective entity “Us” the revolutionaries of the Soviet system led the masses to “gain the common fruits of historical creativity”. True, in the socio-historical terms, the revolution naturally opens the way to a social involution, the consequence of which is the collapse of the social space. Yet the general historical result of the involution is the assimilation by the future generations of new — modern — social meanings. Currently, psychosocial mechanisms that enhance the role of myths and traditions, which are, in fact, the main regulators of the “static social norm”, enhance their influence. The degree of freedom of an individual in such a society is limited to the influence of the collective and society as a whole.

Involution. *The psychosocial basis of the involution determines the emotionally sensitive type and behavior of the person based on the material picture of the world, the orientation to socially significant values, intuition thinking, evaluative-volitional decision-making, reliance on external social control, the functioning and maintenance of integrity as a feature social and productive activities. The fundamental meanings that cultivate the science of the involutionary era are the source of the development of the collective unconscious. The mechanism of transforming these meanings into the collective unconscious is the school as a social institution, which, due to the collective nature of educational activity, produces invariants of these actions. In particular, according to the theory of “phased formation of mental actions” of the Soviet Ukrainian psychologist P. Galperin [16, p. 236-277], any action, other than operations, consists of an IBA (indicative basis of action) — a system of representations of the nature of the environment, conditions, purpose, plan and means of action. Transfer in the learning process of action-skills in habit patterns — automatic actions, in fact, are the mechanism that transforms the knowledge component of the action (theoretical knowledge or their meanings) into the collective unconscious.*

Coevolution. The general configuration of the changes in the co-evolutionary transitional state is mirror to its controversy — the revolution. In its bowels a new — individual — value appears, and its carrier is affirmed — the subject “Me” (a self-sufficient individual) who squeezes on the periphery of the social system of the former colleague “Us”. It is this moment in the history of

independent Ukraine that the first “maidan” — “Orange” (2004), which, in fact, gave birth to a citizen or self-sufficient Ukrainian. Thus, for 33.7% of adult citizens, 21.3% were self-sufficient Ukrainians, and 12.4% were collectivists [17, p. 101]. “Dignity maidan” (2013–2014) took place against the background of the essential growth of these indicators: 44.3%, 24.1%, 20.2%. At the end of 2017, these indicators increased, to 46.8%, 25.5% and 21.3% respectively.

It is worth noting that unrealized overestimated expectations from the Orange Maidan regarding the adoption of new values as the basis for further development of the country generated (2006) authoritarian (controversial) trends in the social system — (such as “NEP inside out”) and pathosichological state (such a cow that got on ice), which Ukraine (as well as other post-Soviet countries) still has [17, p. 100]. Essentially, this state is legitimately tied to violations of inter-system relations, which a priori puts Ukraine in a situation of non-controllability. Prognostically, it should be noted that both the entrance and the exit of the social system from an uncontrolled pathosychological state occurred and will occur “unexpectedly”, although according to the dialectical law the transfer of quantity into quality, as evidenced, in particular, by the growing number of social reforms: 1 (2005) — 28 (2010) — 62 (2014) — 144 (2017).

According to the monitoring studies of “System-wide changes in Ukraine”, which are carried out during 1992–2017, representatives of the Ukrainian School of Archetype predict a high probability for a Ukrainian society of coming out of the pathosychological state and of the systemic crisis as a whole during the period 2019–2021. Actually, a new phenomenon of the country — “Ukrainian miracle” — will be associated with the period, not related to destructive activity, which in general was inherent in the country from 2013 to 2014, but with the continuous social growth of Ukraine, which, in particular, in the economic aspect will significantly exceed the projected by World Bank’s 2.5–3.0% annual economic growth. In addition, this growth will already be on an updated psychosocial basis.

In the context of the key forecast of the Ukrainian School of Archetype on the prospects for social growth in Ukraine, we would like to recall the 50-year-old historical novel by P. Zagrebelnyi’s “Divo” (1968), which combines the plot lines of the times of Kyiv Rus and then-present, the fate of Yaroslav the Wise and the talented architect with fates of Soviet contemporaries. But, if the described by P. Zagrebelny Ukrainian miracle grew up on myths and traditions as social regulators of the Soviet era, then the current, predicted by representatives of the U.S.A. Ukrainian miracle, will grow on a purely rational basis. And together, both these miracles, like the two sides of one medal, will be united through the Ukrainian psychosocial nature and its cultural code — the Golden Section — and will feed the main — the human resource of Ukraine’s growth.

Evolution. *The psychosocial basis of evolution will be determined by the rational type and behavior of the person based on the subjective idealist picture of the world, the orientation towards utilitarian values (material benefits, economic efficiency, etc.), sensory-logical thinking (according to the formula “if I don’t touch, I do not believe”), the peculiarity of decision-making as a consequence of a reasonable calculation, reliance on internal self-control, dominance in the social system of innovation development as an extension of the existing state of affairs and communication with the outside world as a communicative activity and harmonization of public, state and industrial relations.*

The increase of complexity and heterogeneity of the new social structure, its functioning and development as a subject occurs on the basis of developing an ever-widening variety of social meanings. At the same time, the prerequisite for such a large-scale innovation activity in the evolutionary period is the emancipation of the individual and the strengthening of the subject-cognitive component in the psychological structure of the individual, which was investigated by the Swiss, J. Piaget. It should also be noted that in the evolutionary period of the deployment of the social cycle, there is a search for a social solution that promotes the adaptation of the subject to the constantly updated system of motivation. Due to this, in the new structure of social activity, the subject-individual changes not only himself and his goals and improves the means of their achievement, but actively forms his new social environment. Existing social meanings in the context of innovation processes are extrapolated to new social phenomena.

The field of existence of the social, thus, focuses on the interaction and co-existence of the individual and the social. Individual and social can be considered as a two-sided characteristics of social, and in the foreground there is now a personality. Classical sociology considers it not in the prism of unique properties and qualities (in essence, it is the subject of psychology of personality), but from the standpoint of its socially typical features as a subject of development of society. At the same time, each person is considered not only as a component of a small social group, but also as a typical representative of a certain large social group with the norms, traditions, values, attitudes typical of this group. The integration of the individual into society is carried out through socialization, that is, the process of formation of the individual, acquiring by him values, norms and patterns of behavior inherent in the society to which the individual belongs. The dialectics of the relationship between the individual, society and civilization poses the problem of social integration or the isolation of these subjects from the social environment.

On the other hand, the individual compared to the social, and even to civilization, is more variable, because the social time of its development is limited to the duration of human life, which is measured by the century, while the duration of social life – by centuries, and the duration of civilization life – by millenia. At the same time, the historical periods of the past, of the present and future of society are made up of the lives of different generations who lived and acted in a certain historical time. Unfortunately, the Soviet age psychology did not cover not only the prenatal period, but also an adulthood, which became a serious disadvantage, as it violated the holistic consideration of the individual’s mental life.

Thanks to the complex of military and social studies of Professor E. Afonin in 1992-1994 he was able to empirically state that the ontogenetic development of personality is described by four small cycles of socialization and one (final) large cycle of human self-realization [18, p. 14]. On the contrary, social cycles of society develop from a large cycle of prehistory to small cycles of self-actualization of society. Similar (in form) to the ontogenetic development of personality is the ontogeny of the development of mankind (civilization) [18, p. 128].

The personal social cycle unfolds faster than national-state and civilization ones, it is realized through the change of generations. The Spanish philosopher H. Ortega-i-Gaset rightly emphasized that the rotation of generations is an important historical mechanism. In the involutorial state of the cycle for a person conscious social position is objectively determined by a certain social interest. In a co-evolutional state, a demonstrative presentation of the position is initially followed by interest. In the involutorial phase of the cycle the problem of the impact of the whole social organization on the individual is solved. Instead, in the evolutional phase of the cycle, the individual's influence on social organization and culture is crucial.

At the same time, identification is not with individual people, but with small or large communities. The model of the action of this mechanism can be presented in the form of interaction "Me" — "Us" — "Others". In this context, one can distinguish between the directive and the chosen identities, and the social identity has the motivational properties of self-esteem. According to E. Erickson, in general, the identity has three features:

- 1) the sense of internal identity and integration in time of action with the past, and hopes for the future are experienced as being associated with the present reality;
- 2) a sense of internal identity and integration in space: a person perceives himself everywhere as an integrity, and all his actions and decisions are considered not as accidental or imposed ones, but as internally conditioned;
- 3) identity is experienced among significant others: relationships and roles help to maintain and develop the sense of an integrated, prolonged identity.

It is the personal cycle that deploys in the fastest way. It is regulated through the change of generations. Age cohorts of socio-cultural socialization can be analogues for understanding the hierarchically higher types of historical deployment of social cycles. In essence, the personal socio-cultural cycle is the foundation of the cyclical development of macrosocial subjects of the higher level of the hierarchy.

Conclusions

1. New — postmodern — communicative environment transforms the very nature of information and informational network of sociality. Thanks to the communicative revolution, mankind has been given the opportunity to spread his knowledge quickly. High technology and biotechnology change the human environment. Human cloning transforms existing traditional religious beliefs and values. Total computerization changes the perception of the material and virtual worlds, when the first of them involves the physical body of man, and the latter one involves his spirit.

2. The transition society (revolution and co-evolution) is undergoing institutional changes, during which social structures and social norms are blurred, social ties become weaker and even ruptured during inversion, and the hierarchy of factors that make up the mechanisms for the reproduction of social structures is violated. The researcher should realize that in a transitive state, not only social norms are blurred, but also causative-consecutive relationships that lie under the rational scientific method are violated.

3. From the political point of view, the social actors “Us” and “Me”, which are crucial for the normative periods of involution and evolution, differ radically in the following ways:

3.1) *by the political consciousness of individuals*, which significantly influences the nature and way of exercising power: in a totalitarian society dominated by the “We”, it is a total state (external to the individual) control and violence, in the autocratic society there are certain zones of freedoms that are inaccessible to state control; Under the conditions of the “pre-democratic regime”, the authorities begin to engage in dialogue with independent groups that have matured in the time of autocracy in peculiar enclaves of social freedom, but they determines the results of this dialogue themselves; finally, the power is exercised on a representative basis, in accordance with the laws, on the basis of a democratic regime;

3.2) *by the attitude of people to the regime*: totalitarian consensus is characterized by a merger with state power; for authoritarian power — alienation from power; for a pre-democratic regime, it is a limited influence on power; for democratic power, the choice of certain representatives of power;

3.3) *by the status of horizontal social structures*: the totalitarian regime destroys any horizontal structures, authoritarian allows them to exist until they are of a political nature, the pre-democratic regime allows any organization, other than those who claim to power, while the opposition has the same mentality as the authorities; in a democratic society the structure of public organizations becomes the foundation of the political system.

3.4) *by the hierarchy of social taboos*: in a totalitarian society it is allowed if it is ordered by the authorities, the rest is prohibited; in an autocratic society the right to life is something that does not apply to politics; everything is allowed in a pre-democratic society, except for change of power; in a democratic society — everything that is not prohibited by law is allowed;

3.5) *by political ideals*: a totalitarian society demands from the authorities omnipotence, and from people — enthusiasm and modesty; an authoritarian society requires competence from the authorities, and from people — professionalism and loyalty, a pre-democratic society require from power morality, from people — activity and certain irresponsibility, a democratic society requires from the authorities and citizens only law-abidingness.

References

- [1] J. Hillman, *The force of character: and the lasting life*. New York: Random House, 1999.
- [2] E. Husserl, *The Reader in the History of Philosophy*. Kyiv: Dovira, 1993, pp. 137–138. [In Ukrainian].
- [3] I. Wallerstein, *The modern World-System*. New York: Academic Press, 1976.
- [4] R. Hartmut, D.Strecker, A Kottmann, *Soziologische Theorien*. Konstanz, 2007. [In German].
- [5] T. Adorno, *Negative Dialektik*. Frankfurt-am-Main: Suhrkamp, 1966. [In German].
- [6] M. Horkheimer, T. Adorno, *Dialäktik der Aufklärung*. Frankfurt-am-Main, 1969. [In German].
- [7] H. Opaschowski, *Deutschland 2030. Wie wir in Zukunft leben*. Gutersloh, 2008. [In German].
- [8] R. Gildemeister, *Die soziale Konstruktion von Geschlechtlichkeit*. Opladen, 2001. [In German].
- [9] M. Hardt, and A.Negri, *Empire*. Frankfurt-am-Mein, 2000. [In German].
- [10] U. Beck, *Die Metamorphose der Welt*. Berlin, 2017. [In German].
- [11] A. L. Chizhevskiy, *The Cosmic Pulse of Life: The Earth in the Embrace of the Sun. Heliotoraxia*. Moscow:Mysl 1995.[In Russian].
- [10] U. Beck, *Die Metamorphose der Welt*. Berlin, 2017. [In German].
- [11] A. L. Chizhevskiy, *The Cosmic Pulse of Life: The Earth in the Embrace of the Sun. Heliotoraxia*. Moscow:Mysl 1995.[In Russian].
- [12] A. S. Ahiezer, “Between the Cycles of Thinking and the Cycles of History,” [In Russian]. *Social Sciences and Modernity*, no 3, pp. 122-132, 2002 .
- [13] D. I. Feldshteyn, *Psychology of personality development in ontogeny*. Moscow: Pedagogika, 1989. [In Russian].
- [14] P. Sztompka, *Sociology of Social Change*. V. A. Yadov (Ed.). Moscow: Aspekt Press, 1996. [In Russian].
- [15] A. Toffler, *Future Shock*. Saint Petersburg: Lan, 1997. [In Russian].
- [16] P. Ya. Galperin, “Psychology of Thinking and the Teaching on the Gradual Formation of Mental Actions,” in *Studies of Thinking in Soviet Psychology*, Moscow: Nauka, 1966, pp. 236-277. [In Russian].
- [17] E. A. Afonin ,and O. V. Sushyi, “Patterns and Peculiarities of Ukrainian Transformation,” (In Ukrainian), *Stratehichna panorama. – Strategic Panorama*, no 1, pp. 94-108, 2015 .
- [18] E. A. Afonin, O. M. Bandurka, and A. Y. Martynov, *Great Co-evolution: Global problems of contemporaneity: historic-sociological analysis*. Kyiv: Parliamentary Publishing House, 2003. [Online]. Available: http://lib.rada.gov.ua/static/LIBRARY/povni_text/coev_eng.pdf [Accessed: Oct. 9, 2021].