

<https://doi.org/10.15407/socium2021.01.069>
UDC 330.341.1

Lozynska T.M., Dr Habil (Public Administration), Professor, Head of the Department of Public Administration, Poltava State Agrarian Academy, 1/3, Skovorody Str., Poltava, 36003, Ukraine, email: tnloz@rambler.ru, ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2858-9374>, Scopus Author ID: 57192011330

ARCHETYPES AND IMAGINATION IN THE FORMATION OF RURAL NEO-SOCIETIES: CONCLUSIONS FOR THE STATE POLICY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The article contains the results of a study on modelling new communities in rural areas of Ukraine. Modelling considers both the possibility of modernization of archetypes and archaization of the individual imaginary. The research methodology is based on the theoretical work of G. Durand on the structures of the imaginary, used in the study of the transformation of rural communities. The applied value of the research is determined by the possibility of using the obtained results in the development of state policy of rural development. The initial hypothesis of the study was the assumption that the stratification of modern rural society is based on archetypes (images, myths or schemes), which subconsciously create an idea, crystallize the imaginary and form thinking. Social processes in rural areas were eclectic, mixed with “modern” and “archaic”. It is noted that old archetypes and ideas showed a high ability to survive and adapt to new conditions, demonstrating incredible configurations of a combination of tradition and innovation. Attention is drawn to the fallacy of the dominant notion that market transformations of the economy will contribute to forming an exclusive class of owners. The reality has become the antagonism of relations between owners and non-owners, who have become employees with poorly protected rights. G. Durand attributes a “dramatic myth” to the “night mode” of the structure of representation. It is noted that social gaps, violating the integrity of rural communities, also affected the perception of the individual’s place in the local social environment and his behaviour within the community, based on which 10 social groups of rural communities were modelled. It is concluded that the formation of imaginary and archetypes in rural communities occurs in an environment where the number of strangers is increasing. The polarization of the rural population and the confrontation of relations indicate the destructiveness of social processes in rural areas. Society must create artificial social institutions that will regulate human life, and this seems to be a super difficult task in the context of a variety of archetypes of rural life.

Keywords: archetype, imaginary, rural community, stratification, public policy.

Лозинська Т.М., д-р наук з державного управління, професор, завідувач кафедри публічного управління та адміністрування, Полтавська державна аграрна академія, вул. Сковороди, 1/3, Полтава, 36003, Україна, email: tnloz@rambler.ru, ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2858-9374>, Scopus Author ID: 57192011330

АРХЕТИПИ І УЯВНЕ У ФОРМУВАННІ СІЛЬСЬКИХ НЕОСПІЛЬНОТ: ВИСНОВКИ ДЛЯ ДЕРЖАВНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ СІЛЬСЬКОГО РОЗВИТКУ

Стаття містить результати дослідження щодо моделювання нових спільнот у сільській місцевості України. Моделювання враховує як можливість модернізації архетипів, так і архаїзацію індивідуального уявного. Методологія дослідження ґрунтується на теоретичному доробку Ж. Дюрана щодо структур уявного, використаному при вивченні трансформації сільських спільнот. Прикладне значення дослідження зумовлюється можливістю використання отриманих результатів при розробленні державної політики сільського розвитку. Вихідною

© Lozynska T.M., 2021

гіпотезою дослідження було припущення, що стратифікація сучасної сільської спільноти спи-рається на архетипи (образи, міфи чи схеми), які підсвідомо створюють уявлення, викри-сталізують імажинер і формують мислення. Суспільні процеси в сільській місцевості були еклектикою, замішаною на поєднанні “модерну” та “архаїки”. Зазначається, що старі архе-типи та уявлення виявляли високу здатність до виживання і пристосування в нових умовах, демонструючи неймовірні конфігурації поєднання традиції та інновації. Звертається увага на оманливість домінуючого уявлення про те, що ринкові перетворення економіки сприятимуть формуванню виключно класу власників. Реальністю став антагонізм відносин між власниками та невласниками, які перетворилися на найманих працівників з погано захищеними правами. У наявності – “драматичний міф”, віднесений Ж. Дюраном до “нічного режиму” структури уявлення. Наголошується, що соціальні розриви, порушивши цілісність сільських спільнот, вплинули і на зміну уявлень щодо місця індивіда в локальному соціальному середовищі та його поведінку всередині громади, на основі чого змодельовано 10 соціальних груп сільських спіль-нот. Зроблено висновок, що формування уявного та архетипів у сільських спільнотах відбу-вається в середовищі, де збільшується кількість малознайомих або незнайомих людей. Полярн-зація сільського населення та конфронтація відносин свідчать про деструктивність соціаль-них процесів у сільській місцевості. Суспільство має створити штучні соціальні інститути, що регламентуватимуть людське життя і це видається надскладним завданням у контексті розмаїття архетипів сільського життя.

Ключові слова: архетип, уявне, сільська спільнота, стратифікація, державна політика.

An archetype as an “initial model”¹, as a “genetic” imitation of human experience [1], as a “prototype” of human existence [2] can be considered an invariant of the culture of society (in the broad sense of the word). This set of ideals, subconscious images and meanings have some features:

- it is stable in time;
- it finds its expression in myths;
- it permeates all spheres of human life.

Hence the desire to use archetypes in language, art, psychology, sociology, and more recently in public administration to consider patterns and explain the motives of human behaviour. However, the transfer of the behavioural pattern from the past to the present and imitation of it occurs with the introduction of subjective meanings, created in particular under the influence of imagination. The consolidation of the idea of “virtual reality” in the scientific turnover of modernity makes the range of issues of the relationship between the individual picture of the world (imaginary), mass mythology [3] and objective, reality is even more debatable. One such issue is the modelling of social communities and their relationships (mainly in rural areas), taking into account the modernization of archetypes and anticipating the possibility of archaizing the individual imaginary, which became the **purpose** of this study.

Since the study was interdisciplinary and interdisciplinarity, it prompted to turn to scientific works on philosophy, sociology, psychology, the theory of public administration, the subject area of both archetypes and imaginary. The Ukrainian school of archetypes

¹ Archetypes. Encyclopedia of modern Ukraine. URL: http://esu.com.ua/search_articles.php?id=44787 [in Ukrainian]

immensely helped the study of the archetypes of Ukrainian postmodernism under E.A. Afonin, whose colossal work is expressed in an array of publications in various areas of archetypes in modern Ukrainian society. Helpful in understanding the processes of formation of new communities in Ukraine were the works of O.M. Kozhemyakina [4], L.V. Ponomarenko [5], V.I. Sudakova [6], which considered the problems of institutionalization of society under the influence of cultural archetypes, subculture, mentality and tradition. In the context of the study, the article by E.A. Afonin and A.Y. Martynov, "Tradition as a factor of integration and consolidation of Ukrainian society in the postmodern: an archetypal approach" deserves special attention, in which the authors refer to the scientific heritage of G. Durand, which contains the original methodological approach to explaining the external and internal factors of regulation of everyday life by introducing the concept of "imaginaire" [7]. The authors note that: "According to the concept of G. Durand, postmodernism draws society into the regime...", which they call "the mythological imagination of the mystical" [7, p. 38]. G. Durand's delineation of the structures of the image evokes a natural desire to use the methodology developed by scientists to study the transformations of rural communities, which can have theoretical and applied significance for the development of state policy of rural development.

The work was performed with the involvement of the methodological heritage of the theory of archetypes, particularly the approach of C. Jung to the selection in the structure of the human personality of the subconscious – emotions that affect human consciousness and determine its activities. Based on the methodology of archetypes, the irrationality of people's behaviour is allowed, including the choice of its involvement in a particular social group. The psychology of personality can thus be combined with human perceptions evoked by the subconscious, which led us to turn to the methodology of the imaginary. The study was based on the basic idea of G. Durand on the primacy of representation in the formation of a picture of the world of a particular person, as well as on the recognition of integrity: "imaginary – the one who imagines – imagination" (imager) [8]. Thus, the initial hypothesis of the study was the assumption that the stratification of the modern rural community is based on archetypes (images, myths or schemes), which subconsciously create ideas, outline the image and shape thinking. That is, we add archetypes to G. Durand's triad because the imaginary that is inherent in man is determined by something, albeit subconsciously.

It is also methodologically justified to involve the provisions of systems theory and the use of comparative analysis and theoretical modelling methods in identifying non-communities arising from the integrity of rural communities.

Let us turn to some conclusions of the author's previous research, in particular, that "governance aimed at communities (social groups) is always associated with variability and heredity of social interactions, and involves the selection of models (models) of appropriate interaction" [9, p. 185]. Heredity and variability, or, more specifically, tradition and innovation, were studied by the author in the context of identifying conflicts of state formation. It will be recalled that the development of the state as a social system is conditioned by the contradiction between tradition ("cultural and social heritage reproduced in unchanged form for a long time" [10, p. 155]) and innovation – "new knowledge and practical results of their

implementation” [10, p. 155]. Tradition as an archetype and the opposite innovation, as a practical embodiment of imaginary, formed, and subconscious impulses, is the basis of any violation of social integrity, even as traditional as the rural community.

Transformations of rural communities: archetypes and imaginary. Studies of the transformations of the social life of rural communities are of interest given the much higher level of their conservatism and homogeneity compared to urban communities. The unifying factor for the villagers was the archetype of the farmer with his cycle of necessary and vital survival actions that accompanied the processes of agricultural production. Sowing seeds, caring for plants and harvesting, and raising cattle gave rise to many traditions of joint work – the celebration of the first furrow, haymaking, alternate grazing of cattle, fairs, harvesting and more. Many myths, reorganizations, prejudices are associated with these events, which were passed on from generation to generation in the form of rituals, were kept as a stable basis for mutual understanding and formed the originality of village life – easy to understand and, at the same time, difficult in his everyday worries; individualistic in concern for the preservation and augmentation of property; and collectivist – to reduce the cost of its maintenance and get the best results from its use. The way of life formed under the influence of such an immovable production factor as land could not but affect the mobility of the farmer, minimized and limited to shared living space.

The archetype of the farmer with his imaginary and imagination has survived. The collective farm-state farm system, which interacted with private production, focused on the self-sufficiency of households and large state or large-scale collective enterprises. M. Moshiaşvili attributes the traditional peasant way of life, which is entirely determined by economic conditions, changing seasons, biological cycles, ethno-religious, geographical and linguistic preferences of man and does not depend on his will, to the archaic type of community [11], contrasting it with the modern archetype. Using the methodology of K. Jung, in the analysis of the archaic archetype of the farmer, it is advisable to talk about the collective subconscious as a structure that has signs of independent functioning and does not belong to the thinking subject or objective reality [1]. According to G. Durand, this collective subconscious is based on the primary idea, the dynamics of which creates the inherent characteristics of the subject and the objects of the external environment of the peasant. Deprivation of the idea of the properties of reality, according to G. Durand, is nothing but a philosophical hypothesis [8]. Thus, in explaining the transformation of archetypes, it is necessary to move away from the rigid “subjective-objective” dualism and recognize the independence of the instance that is between them, that is, the idea. Imagination plays an essential role in the formation of patterns inherent in a particular archetype. From the notion that in a closed community, people still learn about everything, a large number of behavioural patterns have been formed, such as the construction of low fences around peasant estates, convenient for climbing; refusal to use complex locking systems in houses (all their own); rejection of the new (everyone always did); a kind of competition (and the neighbours have already planted potatoes), etc.

However, these archaic ideas changed under the influence of collectivization of economic life, increasing the openness of settlements and, consequently, increasing the mobility of people. New residents (newcomers) with dissimilar views and ideas, and

sometimes with threatening behaviour, began to join previously closed communities. Rural communities remained united, as united by common work and common concerns, but in their depths matured factors of social stratification: a new hierarchy of status was formed, economic stratification became more noticeable, the importance of proximity to power grew, the social role of women changed, children's orientation to higher education in cities became a social norm, which later led to the rapid depopulation of rural settlements. During this period, the transformation of rural communities was carried out to form separate social groups under the influence of another social division of labour. Thus, separate groups consisted of managers and specialists of agricultural enterprises; rural intelligentsia (teachers, doctors, librarians, employees of cultural institutions, etc.); highly qualified employees; workers engaged in manual low-skilled work. There are signs of modernism with its inherent desire for individualism and individuality, which appeared in urbanized communities much earlier, in the early twentieth century. Simultaneously, social processes in rural areas were eclectic, mixed with "modern" and "archaic". Old archetypes and ideas showed a high ability to survive and adapt to new conditions, demonstrating incredible configurations of a combination of tradition and innovation.

Reforming economic relations as a determinant of the formation of rural neo-communities. The transfer of economic relations in agriculture to a privately owned basis has led to tremendous changes in rural society. First of all, let us pay attention to the fallacy of the dominant notion that market transformations of the economy will contribute to forming an exclusive class of owners. The reality has become the antagonism of relations between owners and non-owners, who have become employees with poorly protected rights. There is a "dramatic myth" attributed by G. Durand to the "night mode" ("nocturne") of the structure of representation [8]. Dramatic myth – the result of fantasy (fantasia), i.e. spoiled transfer of the mind impressions of the outside world, which mixed real and imaginary [8]. The dramatic myth destroyed the spiritual community as the basis for the existence of a rural community [9], to which F. Tonnis draws attention: different social groups, often with opposite points of view, occurs when these groups are united by a common life" [12, p. 194]. The consequences of the mythologizing of economic transformations are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Distribution of households in Ukraine depending on their primary source of income, 2019

Indexes	Quantity, thousand units	Specific weight, %
All households	14881,7	100,0
Including the primary source of income: employment income (wages)	8422,1	56,6
Income from self-employment (entrepreneurial activity)	1261,1	8,5
Transfers (pensions, scholarships, benefits) and property income	5198,5	34,9

Source: compiled by the author with: [13].

After 30 years of market transformations, only 8,5% of Ukrainian households receive income from doing business; more than half exist with a source of income wages; budget transfers support one-third of households, i.e. they are recipients of income redistribution.

The poverty level among rural residents is almost twice as high as in large cities, which “significantly reduces the availability of social benefits for them and moves them to lower levels of the social hierarchy” [14, p. 193].

The weakening of social interaction in rural communities and the negative trends of rural development have not been overcome by reviving economic life through the expansion and modernization of outdated enterprises, as it is carried out on an individualistic basis. In addition to economic stratification, which significantly destroys the social integrity of the community, within rural communities, there is a transformation of the behaviour of groups of people in life circumstances other than imaginary. Workers released from agriculture moved to more urban areas in search of work, essentially remaining villagers; instead, wealthy citizens invested in the homestead development of the suburban area and thus became part of rural communities with special ideas about the way of life new conditions.

Rural neo communities and archetypes. More details about social transformations in rural areas are presented by the author in [9; 14] but note that social gaps, violating the integrity of rural communities, also affected the change of perceptions about the place of the individual in the local social environment and his behaviour within the community. Let us pay attention to the characteristic features of the newly formed groups' behaviour in rural communities (non-communities), given in the table. 2.

Table 2

New social groups in rural communities and their archetypes

Social groups	Archetypes
1. Residents – employees of agricultural enterprises, the economic basis of which is income from employment (wages) and insignificant income from monetization of homestead products	Demonstrate the transformation of the archaic archetype into a modern one, seeking to invest the proceeds in their own business. They have a high interest in local development and a relatively active public position
2. Highly qualified employees of agricultural enterprises who come to work from other places. Claim for employment income, the size of which is comparable to the European level	They have signs of a postmodern archetype with a pronounced refutation of social attitudes about good and evil, a creative approach to planning their own lives. They are indifferent to the problems of local development because they do not affect their living space
3. Employees of non-agricultural enterprises (trade, consumer services, catering, etc.). Incomes are similar to the representatives of the first group, but in the rural social hierarchy have a slightly higher status	If they are locals, they have an archaic-modern archetype, quite close to the archetype of the first group; if not local, they lean towards the postmodern. Locals are much more active, non-locals are more mobile
4. Employees of budgetary institutions (doctors, teachers, police, local government officials, etc.). The employment of this category of residents is regulated, more socially protected than that of employees of private enterprises, and wage payments are legal and transparent	A kind of archetype of elitism, sometimes with a demonstration of a sense of permissiveness. Representatives of this group make up the stratum of the rural intelligentsia, which has a high level of education, has an active public position, which allows it to influence decision-making and be part of the management elite. In this context, it does not even matter whether they are local or non-local

Table 2, continued

Social groups	Archetypes
5. The local population, self-employed in agriculture, receives entrepreneurial income (farmers or owners of agricultural enterprises of other organizational and legal forms)	The archetype of the capitalist landowner of the modern period. They are aware of their role in shaping local budgets, so they actively influence their distribution in various forms (in particular, through representative democracy). Are the subjects of public-private partnership, in modern realities often form distorted forms of the relationship between business and government
6. Population (both local and non-local) self-employed outside agriculture, receives entrepreneurial income (from self-employment) and property income	The archetype of postmodernism: the focus on consumption, the rejection of traditional values (for example, the birth of children and formal family relations), cosmopolitanism. Less dependent on local development and relatively easier to break with the territory of living space and labour
7. Population that only lives in rural areas, carrying out labour activities outside it (employees, employees of budgetary institutions, employees of urban enterprises)	An archetype that correlates with the tragic myth of G. Durand's nocturne or fits into the famous expression "Lolik, everything is gone!" The tragedy of this group's ideas is due to the weakening of ties with rural areas and the lack of stability of new ties that are emerging in cities
8. Registered population who have real estate in rural areas but live and work outside the settlement or even in Ukraine	The archetype of postmodernism. There is almost no connection with local development; the only factor of involvement in the rural community is property, which is quickly monetized in a favourable price situation
9. Disabled rural population and student youth receiving income in the form of social transfers	Representatives of this group, united by the criterion of the source of income, have different archetypes. Student youth – postmodern; the disabled rural population is an archetype of the tragedy caused by the difficult economic situation
10. Internally displaced, partially marginalized populations, who are often mobbed	The archetype of tragedy. The division of the community into "own" – "foreign" is complicated and can take the form of "their" – "enemies". There is a growing danger of radicalization of the community and the spread of violence

Source: Author's development, partially used data [9; 14].

Conclusions. Thus, the formation of imaginary and archetypes in rural communities occurs in an environment where the number of strangers or strangers is increasing. The polarization of the rural population and the confrontation of relations indicate the destructiveness of social processes in rural areas. F. Tonnis believes that since strangers (the dominant group of postmodernism) cannot trust each other naturally, society must create artificial social institutions that will regulate human life [12], and this seems a daunting task in the context of the existence of a variety of archetypes only rural life. Building a state social policy on the principles of democracy and in the context of decentralization of public administration necessitates in-depth research on the transformation of rural communities and

the identification of dominant archetypes, which will help exacerbate social conflicts and find ways to rationalize associations of weakly connected people.

References

1. Jung, C.G. (1994). On the psychology of the unconscious. Collected Works. Psychology of the unconscious. Moscow: Canon [in Russian]
2. Donchenko, O. (2011). Archetypes – common in our lives (recognition of archetypes as a way to uniqueness). *Psykhohiia osobystosti – Psychology of Personality*, 1, 170-181. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Po_2011_1_23 [in Ukrainian]
3. Gutsol, S.Yu. (2011). Psychological features of structural components of neomythological narrative. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho tekhnichnoho universytetu “Kyivskiy politekhnichnyi instytut imeni Ihoria Sikorskoho”. Filosofiia. Psykhohiia. Pedagogika – Bulletin of the National Technical University of Ukraine “Kyiv Polytechnic Institute named after Igor Sikorsky”. Philosophy. Psychology. Pedagogy*, 1, 103-108 [in Ukrainian]
4. Kozhemyakina, O.M. (2020). Tradition and archetype: creative bases of postmodern interpretation. *Publichne upravlinnia – Public governance*, 1 (21), 122-133 [in Ukrainian]
5. Ponomarenko, L.V. (2020). Mentality of Ukrainian society and its influence on modern processes of institutionalization (archetypal approach). *Publichne upravlinnia – Public governance*, 1 (21), 266-278 [in Ukrainian]
6. Sudakov, V.I. (2020). Archetypes of culture and subculture as determinants of social action and social management. *Publichne upravlinnia – Public governance*, 1 (21), 301-312 [in Ukrainian]
7. Afonin, E.A., Martynov, A.Y. (2020). Tradition as a factor of integration and consolidation of Ukrainian society in postmodern conditions: an archetypal approach. *Publichne upravlinnia – Public governance*, 1 (21), 27-41 [in Ukrainian]
8. Durand, G. (2015). Anthropological structures of the imaginary. URL: <https://castalia.ru/translations/zhilber-dyuran-antropologicheskie-strukturyi-voobrazhaemogo-vvedenie-bespoleznye-obrazyi> [in Russian]
9. Lozynska, T.M. (2017). Social transformations in rural areas and non-community. In *New inequalities – new conflicts: ways to overcome: abstracts of reports and speeches of participants of the III Congress of the Sociological Association of Ukraine, Kharkiv, October 12–13, 2017* (pp. 185-186). Kharkiv: V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University [in Ukrainian]
10. Lozynska, T.M. (2020). Conflict of traditionality and innovation in state formation: archetypal approach. *Publichne upravlinnia – Public governance*, 1 (21), 151-162 [in Ukrainian]
11. Moshiasvili, M.M. (2016). Economic archetypes and growth models. Moscow: Higher School of Economics [in Russian]
12. Tennis, F. (2002). Community and Society. In S.P. Bankovsky (Ed.), *Theoretical Sociology: Anthology in 2 parts*. Moscow: Publishing House “University” [in Russian]
13. Expenditure and resources of households of Ukraine in 2019 year: a statistical collection. (2020). Kyiv: State Statistics Service of Ukraine. URL: http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/druk/publicat/kat_u/2020/zb/06/zb_vrd_19_ue.pdf [in Ukrainian]
14. Lozynska, T.M. (2015). Economic basis of rural communities as a factor of decentralization of power. In M.A. Lepsky (Ed.), *Sustainable human development of local communities: scientific works of universities – partners of the Project of the Association of co-owners of houses for the implementation of sustainable energy efficient solutions “Local development, community-oriented”* (pp. 189-197). Kyiv [in Ukrainian]

Received on 25.01.21