



**UDC: 321.01:342.228**

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2020-1\(21\)-168-182](https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2020-1(21)-168-182)

***Mamontova Ella Victorovna,***

*Doctor of Political sciences, Professor, Professor of Regional Policy and Public Administration Chair, Odessa Regional Institute for Public Administration of the NAPA under the President of Ukraine, 65009, Odessa, Str. Henuezka, 22, tel.: +38 (050) 336 25 54. general@oridu.odessa.ua, e-mail: arhitektonica@gmail.com*

ORCID: 0000-0003-2761-8217

***Мамонтова Елла Вікторівна,***

*доктор політичних наук, професор, професор кафедри регіональної політики та публічного адміністрування; Одеський регіональний інститут державного управління національної академії державного управління при президентові України, 65009, м. Одеса, вул. Генуезька, 22, тел.: +38 (050)336 25 54, general@*

*oridu.odessa.ua, e-mail автора: arhitektonica@gmail.com*

ORCID: 0000-0003-2761-8217

***Мамонтова Элла Викторовна,***

*доктор политических наук, профессор, профессор кафедры региональной политики та публичного администрирования, Одесский региональный институт государственного управления Национальной академии государственного управления при президенте Украины, 65009, г. Одесса, ул. Генуэзская, 22, тел.: +38 (050)336 25 54, general@oridu.odessa.ua, e-mail автора: arhitektonica@gmail.com*

ORCID: 0000-0003-2761-8217

---

## **ARCHETYPAL PROJECTIONS OF ARCHAIC SPIRITUAL PRACTICES INTO THE SYMBOLIC LANDSCAPE OF POST-POLITICS**

**Abstract.** The current trend of the modern post-industrial world associated with the symbolization of social and political relations is investigated. Symbolization is interpreted as the transformation into a symbol of any action consciously carried out by its subject. It is shown that the classical approaches to the conceptualization of the symbol as a component of politics consider it are considered in

the coordinates of the traditional political order, built on institutional principles and established ideologems. It is noted that in the era of postmodernity, the place of religion and ideology as the key sources of symbolic production and tools of creation is occupied by a new technique-political social semiosis. Its essence lies in the mechanism of universalization of practices of interpretation of political reality and its phenomena, the consequence of which is the symbolism of political space.

The resource potential of sociosemiosis in the situation of post-politics is investigated. Post-politics is defined as a permanent process of deconstruction of reality with the substitution of an entity for its sign, symbol, name, resulting in the autonomization of the symbol. The reasons for this lie not only in the fourth information revolution, with its new communicative practices, but also in the ontological nature of the phenomenon itself.

This predetermines the appeal to the primary sources of the phenomenon of symbolization. It is shown that its origin falls on prehistoric times and is caused by such principles of primitive mythological thinking as syncretism, genetics and etiology. The symbol-forming potential of mythological techniques of society management is considered on the example of totemism and fetishism-cult practices of unorganized archaic religions.

It is proved that totemism and fetishism are still widely represented in the symbolic landscape of post-politics as their archetypal projections. As a derivative of the ritual, the fetish is directly related to the totem, and together they form the background of the entire subject of political symbolism of identity: from physical and geographical objects, representatives of the world of fauna and flora to architecture, monumentalism and attributes of state sovereignty as objects of worship and collective amulets.

**Keywords:** symbol, symbolization, sociosemiosis, myth, post-politics, totem, totemism, fetish, fetishism, archetypal projection.

## **АРХЕТИПОВІ ПРОЕКЦІЇ АРХАЇЧНИХ ДУХОВНИХ ПРАКТИК НА СИМВОЛІЧНИЙ ЛАНДШАФТ ПОСТПОЛІТИКИ**

**Анотація.** Досліджується актуальна тенденція сучасного постіндустріального світу, пов'язана із символізацією суспільно-політичних відносин. Символізація трактується як перетворення на символ будь-якої дії, що свідомо здійснюється її суб'єктом. Показано, що класичні підходи до концептуалізації символу як складової політики розглядають його у координатах традиційного політичного порядку, побудованого на інституціональних засадах та усталених ідеологемах. Відзначено, що у добу постсучасності місце релігії та ідеології як ключових джерел символічного виробництва та інструментів смислоутворення, займає нова техніка — політичний соціосеміозис. Його сутність полягає у механізмі універсалізації практик інтерпретації політичної реальності та її феноменів, наслідком якого виступає символізм політичного простору.

Досліджується ресурсний потенціал соціосеміозису в ситуації постполітики. Постполітика визначається як перманентний процес деконструкції

реальності з підміною сутності на її знак, символ, найменування, в результаті чого відбувається автономізація символу. Причини цього криються не тільки у четвертій інформаційній революції, з її новими комунікативними практиками, але й в онтологічному характері самого явища.

Це зумовлює звернення до первинних джерел феномену символізації. Показано, що його виникнення припадає на доісторичні часи та зумовлено такими принципами первісного міфологічного мислення як синкретизм, генетизм та етіологізм. Символотворчий потенціал міфологічних технік управління суспільством розглянуто на прикладі тотемізму та фетишизму — культових практик неорганізованих архаїчних релігій.

Доведено, що тотемізм та фетишизм на сьогодні широко представлені у символічному ландшафті постполітики як їх архетипові проекції. Як похідний від ритуалу фетиш має безпосереднє відношення до тотему, а разом вони складають підоснову усієї предметної політичної символіки ідентичності: від фізико-географічних об'єктів, репрезентантів світу фауни і флори до архітектури, монументалістики та атрибутів державного суверенітету як предметів культу та колективних оберегів.

**Ключові слова:** символ, символізація, соціосеміозис, міф, постполітика, тотем, тотемізм, фетиш, фетишизм, архетипова проекція.

## **АРХЕТИПИЧЕСКИЕ ПРОЕКЦИИ АРХАИЧНЫХ ДУХОВНЫХ ПРАКТИК НА СИМВОЛИЧЕСКИЙ ЛАНДШАФТ ПОСТПОЛИТИКИ**

**Аннотация.** Исследуется актуальная тенденция современного постиндустриального мира, связанная с символизацией общественно-политических отношений. Символизация трактуется как превращение в символ любого действия, сознательно осуществляемого его субъектом. Показано, что классические подходы к концептуализации символа как нетъемлемой части политики, рассматривают его в координатах традиционного политического порядка, построенного на институциональных основах и устоявшихся идеологемах. Отмечено, что в эпоху постсовременности место религии и идеологии как ключевых источников символического производства и инструментов смыслообразования, занимает новая техника — политический соціосеміозис. Его сущность заключается в механизме универсализации практик интерпретации политической реальности и ее феноменов, итогом чего выступает символизм политического пространства.

Исследуется ресурсный потенциал соціосеміозиса в ситуации постполітики, которая определяется как перманентный процесс деконструкции реальности с подменой сущности на ее знак, символ, наименование, в результате чего происходит автономизация символа. Причины этого кроются не только в четвертой информационной революции с ее новыми комунікативными практиками, но и в онтологическом характере самого явления. Это обуславливает обращение к первичным источникам феномена символізації. Показано, что его возникновение приходится на доисторическую эпоху

и обусловлено такими принципами первобытного мифологического мышления как синкретизм, генетизм и етиологизм. Символический потенциал мифологических техник управления обществом рассмотрен на примере тотемизма и фетишизма — культовых практик неорганизованных архаических религий.

Доказано, что тотемизм и фетишизм и сегодня широко представлены в символическом ландшафте постполитики в качестве их архетипических проекций. Как производный от ритуала, фетиш имеет непосредственное отношение к тотему, а вместе они составляют подоплеку всей предметной политической символики идентичности: от физико-географических объектов, репрезентантов мира фауны и флоры до архитектуры, монументалистики и атрибутов государственного суверенитета, как предметов культа и коллективных оберегов.

**Ключевые слова:** символ, символика, социосемиозис, миф, постполитика, тотем, тотемизм, фетиш, фетишизм, архетипическая проекция.

---

**Problem statement.** Today, the world expert society is closely watching the paradigm shifts in the worldview of post-industrial society, which, in particular, are associated with the trend of symbolization of social and political relations, by which we propose to understand the transformation into a symbol of any action consciously carried out by its subject. In the situation of postmodernity of the XXI century, symbols no longer reflect social reality, but become a reality for the community. Thus, the formation, fixation and reproduction of the nation and the state is always based on a certain system of symbol forms and symbols, which through the creation of a national symbolic space, through the strengthening of the symbolic capital of their own state and through competition with the symbolic universes of other cultures, states and geopolitical entities, indicate the area of distribution and the degree of protection of national and state sovereignty.

Such a huge creative potential and the ability to give birth to new meanings, leading to the reformatting of the space of social and power relations, actualize the study of the nature of the symbol as a phenomenon of political reality and an instrument of political and managerial influence. After all, under the conditions when as a result of global transformations there is a weakening of traditional foundations of state regulation of social and political relations, which are mainly institutional in nature, the appeal to the arsenal of non-traditional resources in politics is an urgent demand of the time. One of such resources is a symbol.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** Of course, the social nature of the symbol and its political and managerial potential have long been a matter of interest for researchers. Thus, philosophically attempts to comprehend the symbol as a component of socio-political existence have gone a long

way from archaic attempts to comprehend this phenomenon in antiquity to its interpretation in rationalistic and aesthetic concepts of Enlightenment and, in general, do not go beyond the generally accepted periodization of the history of philosophy itself.

Since the second half of the XIX century the processes of symbol conceptualization, which have already covered a wide range of research areas and schools that have developed within the framework of sociology, are becoming more active (P. Blau, G. Bloomer, J. G. Mead, J. Homans, T. Shibutani), anthropology (F. Boas, K. Geertz, J. Lubbock, I. Lewis, B. Malinowski, M. Mead, M. Mauss, A. F. Radcliffe-Brown, E. Tylor, Ip. Taine, L. White, J. Fraser), analytical psychology (S. Freud, E. Fromm, K. G. Jung), culturology (E. Cassirer, G. Cohen, S. K. Langer, O. Spengler), hermeneutics (H. G. Gadamer, P. Ricoeur), phenomenology (E. Husserl, O. Losev, P. Florensky), semiotics (U. Eco, J. Lotman, C. W. Morris, Ch. S. Pierce, F. de Saussure, G. Frege), sociolinguistics, structural functionalism and poststructuralism (R. Barthes, M. Foucault, J. Lacan, L. Lévy-Bruhl, C. Levi-Strauss, E. Ortiga, J. Piaget, V. Propp, W. Warner), etc. However, the final transfer of the symbol and its socio-power role of categories as a theoretical and methodological meaning from the plane presented by the coordinates "signifier-signified" in the sphere of the political, occurred within social drama (K. Burke, E. Goffman, H. Duncan, J. Mccoll), communication studies (J. Deleuze, J.-F. Lyotard, N. Luhmann, J. Habermas) and postmodernism (P. Berger, J. Baudrillard, P. Bourdieu,

E. Giddens, N. Elias, T. Luckmann, A. Schutz).

Recent trends have made a significant impact on the formation of new research approaches aimed at the study of the symbolic aspect of politics, namely: political and cultural (T. Arnold, A. Wildavsky, M. Edelman, G. Ellis, L. Ditmer, M. Douglas, J. Kauffman, V. Radaev, R. Tucker, W. Turner, M. Thompson, A. Whitehead) and political-communicative (K. Deutsch, E. Canetti, H. Lasswell, G. Pocheptsov, F. Tönnies). In the context of technologization of processes of management of society the symbolic component of the policy is considered in the works of the foreign (J. Adair, E. Aronson, E. Brackins, G. Atamanchuk, R. Bellah, A. May, V. Sergeev, S. Potseluev, J. Pfeffer, V. Soloviev) and domestic (E. Afonin, V. Gorbatenko, F. Kirilyuk, T. Lyapina, G. Pocheptsov) researchers.

However, despite the wide range of approaches to the conceptualization of the symbol and the symbolic as components of politics, all of them, in their overwhelming majority, firstly, are fragmentary, secondly, as a rule, focus on the socio-cultural aspects of the issue, and, thirdly, consider it in the coordinates of the traditional political order, built on institutional principles and established ideologems. We also add that the request for the study the resource potential of the character in a situation post-politics remains outside the attention of most researchers, and it describes, among other things, the shift from substantive to formal, on the actual to the virtual, from the essence of its sign. The result of this permanent process of deconstruction is the absolutization of what is denoted against

the background of desacralization or the destruction of what is denoted. In other words, post-political reality is characterized with the substitution of meanings, phenomena, names signs, symbols, names.

In our opinion, the reasons for the strengthening of the above trend, which in the post-industrial era leads to the autonomization of the symbol, lie not only in the fourth information revolution, which gave mankind new communicative practices and thanks to Internet technologies, digitalization, interactive communication, virtualization, network integration and cooperation made the simple consumer of information a full participant in the process of its development, a co-author of new meanings and a co-creator of new images. Although, of course, without technological progress, which turned the media with their linear influence on the audience on the model of the classical author's discourse of the modern era, where the artist and the public are separated spatially, in status and functionally, the mass communication media with their postmodern "neo folklore" attraction of the audience in the creative process, when it turns into its full active accomplice, the trend of symbolization would not become a trend. Nevertheless, we are convinced that this phenomenon is ontological in nature, requiring reference to its origins and, above all, to the oldest spiritual practices.

**Purpose of article.** This assumption determines the purpose of this article, which is to identify the specifics of cult practices of unorganized archaic religions in the context of their symbol-making potential and the designation

of their archetypal projections on the symbolic landscape of post-politic.

**Presentation of the main research material.** Familiarity with the theoretical and methodological foundations of the study of the symbol as a determinant of social power relations and its dominance allows us to assert that as a subject of thought reflection, the symbol first appears in ancient philosophical discourse. However, proceeding to the analysis of the nature of the symbol and the identification of its social-creative potential, it should be noted that to is not quite accurate accept antiquity as a reference point. After all, the history of the phenomenon (object, phenomenon) and the history of the concept (term) are never identical. From Greek antiquity begins the history of understanding the symbol within the European intellectual tradition with its characteristic raciocentrism and a system of binary oppositions. While the history of the symbol as a phenomenon and a universal category of culture, in particular the culture of political and administrative relations, goes back to the ancient times of primitive societies. Man moved to the rational understanding of concepts only after he had passed the stage of intuitive, sensory perception of symbols and signs.

This stage is the starting point of a thousand-year process of evolution of forms of political organization of society, which, in particular, can be considered in the focus of paradigm changes of various symbolic systems of the world: mythology, religion, ideology, sociosemiosis. Assuming that myth becomes historically the first instrument of structuring social space and the pri-



mary source of symbolic production, we note that the chronological framework of the existence of the mythological world covers the longest period of human history—from prehistoric times to the fall of the ancient world, which determines the stages of its development and variability of forms of symbolic influence. According to the main stages of the historical process of state formation as a form of political organization of society, we propose to allocate three stages of formation of the society of mythological type: magic (archaic organized society of pre-state era); sacral (ideocratic society of Oriental despotism); rational-mystical (community of the ancient polis).

It is primitive society, as historically the first type of mythological society, that creates a mythological complex, which in syncretic visual-verbal symbol forms and symbolologies acts as an instrument of comprehension of the world, its explanation and reproduction of archetypal signs and images, than forms norms and patterns of social behavior.

The process of birth in the human consciousness of the sign and symbol was the integral part of the formation of the mythological worldview. In our opinion, the emergence of the phenomenon of symbolization is due to such principles of mythological thinking as syncretism, genetics and etiology. Thus, syncretism, which manifests itself in the absence of a clear separation of object and subject, name and thing, space and time, makes them signs of each other, which triggers the mechanism of symbolization. Genetics, through the recognition of the origin of an object for its essence, replaces cause-

and-effect relations with precedent and thus introduces the tools of imitation and repetition into the arsenal of the management of society. Etiologism, in search of the root causes of the existence of the individual and the world, reveals to man not only the meaning of life, but also the way of its reproduction, so that the myth is perceived as a project of the future and sets the vectors of social development.

The consequence of the spread of this type of social modeling is the emergence in mythological society of the magical type of the historically first, archetypal for the structure and system-forming functional load of the symbolic complex, which we have classified as a complex of identification. The factors of its formation were as follows: a) fixing the myth of the status of normative necessity; b) appeal to imitation as a mechanism of regulation of social interaction; c) the expression and manifestation of the ideological unity of man and nature, which is inherent in the mythological type of perception of the world in the phenomena of totemism, fetishism and animism; d) the recognition of magic as the dominant form of semantic and social relationships in the mythologized space.

Each of these factors gave rise to the emergence and structuring of archetypal first forms and first actions, which will later be the basis of a symbolic complex of identification, without which the implementation of the state project is not possible today, which is proved by the experience of many countries, including, unfortunately, Ukraine.

The most indicative from the point of view of revealing the symbol-making

potential of mythological techniques of society management are such cult practices of unorganized archaic religions as totemism and fetishism. They are based on the ideological unity of man and nature inherent in primitive thinking. Really, laws, based on which the living world of nature exists, like birth and death, unification in couples and bringing up kids, through mechanism imitation were fixed by a primitive man in rites and ritual attributes — masks, tattoos, cult objects and the like. At the same time, the sense of resemblance was perceived as a kinship with a certain animal, plant, natural phenomenon, and was the basis of the process of adoration and giving them the status of patrons. Thus, objects of nature gradually acquired the status of totems in the consciousness of primitive man, and objects confirming the kinship of man with the totem become fetishes.

The term “totem” (from “*ototeman*”, “*ot-totem*”) came into the scientific lexicon of the North American Ojibwe language and literally is translated as “belonging to the clan”, “his kind”. In other words, a totem is a plant or animal that is supernaturally connected with the life of a group or individual [1, p. 81]. For primitive man a totem is, above all, a good ancestor, progenitor and patron. The factual material of numerous anthropological studies (G. Atkinson, J. Fraser, G. Clark, S. Cole, D. Raymond, L. Richard, L. Morgan, E. Tylor et al.) convincingly proves that almost every genus bore the name of its totem, the choice of which was due to the physical and geographical nature of the area. And if at first the totem of the group was a real creature — an animal,

a bird, an insect, a plant, then later its image became sufficient for worship. And then the totem finally turned into a symbol, a word, a sound.

Such a system of ideas about the connection of the human collective with its mythical zooantropomorphic ancestor-totem is considered one of the most archaic forms of mythological consciousness and cult, which received the name totemism in the scientific literature. It is based on the phenomenon that L. Lévy-Bruhl [2] and L. Vygotsky [3] define as participation (from lat. *participatio*, involvement, communion, an attempt to make someone an accomplice). Its essence can be explained by the state when members of a group (clan, clan, tribe) consider the totem to be their direct ancestor and identify themselves with it.

The order of such totemic kinship was fixed with the help of prohibition-taboo, which first had the purpose of avoiding the harmful consequences of incest as sexual relations with members of their totem, which is probably punishable by death (C. Levi-Strauss, L. Morgan, A. Radcliffe-Brown, W. Robertson-Smith, J. Fraser, S. Freud et al.). In the future, the mechanism of taboo provided a gradual transition from the absolute individual freedom of the subconscious to the total control of the collective. Another important consequence of this process was that the taboo has become one of the most effective means of achieving self-control for a man. So, the two main taboos of totemism, the prohibition of totem killing and the prohibition of incest, played a key role in the birth of morality. Moreover, the taboo becomes the first step not only to the establish-



ment of a system of moral norms and rules, but also determines the process of formation of the entire social organization and an integral system of social interaction.

Of course, most of the peoples gradually lost the totemic representation, but their influence has been felt throughout history. Thus, in ancient Greek society myths about centaurs contain traces of totemism, as well as stories about the transformation of people into animals. Totemic traits can be traced in the images of gods and heroes in the beliefs of the indigenous people of Central and South America. Actual cults of sacred animals are widely known – cows, monkeys, elephants, crocodiles in India, in which traces of archaic ban on murder are clearly reflected. In European culture there is taboo for violence and destruction household animals-dogs and cats. The echo of totemism is observed in numerous folklore legends about werewolves, witches and in the characters of modern cinematic mass culture.

Such a fairly common phenomenon as the presence in the national landscapes of symbolic symbols of totemic origin can be considered as an echo of the totemism of primitive society. And today a certain animal or plant, in the archetypal image of which the brightest features of the national character are concentrated and the spirit of the nation is fully manifested, often act as its unofficial symbols. Often objects perceived as symbolic amulets of the nation, its patrons, guards, turn from powerful totems into well-known unofficial symbols of these states. We are well acquainted with the “Gallic cock”, “Russian bear”, “Chinese panda”,

“Swedish elk”, “Lebanese cedar”, “Estonian cornflower”, “Ukrainian viburnum”, “Canadian maple leaf”, “Irish St. Patrick’s clover”, etc.

The symbolic nature of totemism is eloquently indicated by the list of its social functions, which through their archetypal projections remain relevant to this day. This is: a) the association of people around a collectively recognized totem (integrative function); b) the subordination of the behavior of the group through prohibitions-taboos, which must adhere to all its members (regulatory function); c) the use of the totem during crises, natural disasters, wars, epidemics, disasters (mobilization function); d) demonstration of other belonging to a certain group (attributive function).

The symbolic basis is clearly seen in another archaic spiritual practice-in the worship of fetishes, or fetishism.

The term “fetish” (from Portuguese word *feitico* – witchcraft, amulet) was introduced into the scientific lexicon of the beginning of the XVIII century by the French researcher C. de Brosses [4]. However, in spite of the fact that the phenomenon of fetishism is quite thoroughly studied (P. Holbach, G. W. F. Hegel, O. Comte, J. Lubbock, E. Tylor et al.), it still remains the subject of acute scientific debate. Despite attempts to abandon the term, due to its vagueness and uncertainty, the following understanding is common for all trends and schools – fetishism (in French versions of translation-*fetichisme*, *fetichie*, – idol, talisman) – is, first of all, the worship of material objects-fetishes. In our opinion, fetishism is not a stage of formation of religion, and not a psychological mechanism,

but a set of cult practices of worship of inanimate objects, which in their natural state, or modified in a certain way in accordance with the purpose, constitute the object of worship. In the process of fetishization, the social and cultural functions of an object are identified with its natural properties or with the natural characteristics of the individual. For primitive man, any object that impressed him could become a fetish. Most often fetishes were either natural objects (stones from the mountain, which is revered as a cult, pieces of wood, animal body parts, grains, and the like), or man-made objects that mimic the object of worship-idols (plastic or wall images, and even tattoos).

Generalization of the broad factual material presented in the works on anthropology, ethnography and cultural studies of art history, allows in the context of the subject of our study to classify fetishes as object – symbolic (a) and symbolic – object (b) ones.

We propose to describe object-symbolic fetishes we as the real objects of the material world, which, as a consequence of fetishization, turn into direct objects of worship. At this level, such fetish may be the amulet and talisman, where the amulet (from. lat. *amuliri* – “to remove”, “to avert”) is a thing that is endowed with magical properties to avert trouble from a person and which is able to protect its owner from trouble and disease, and a talisman (from Greek. “telesma” – “dedication”) – is a talisman, which, unlike the amulet, was hidden from prying eyes, using not to protect against evil forces, but to attract good luck.

Let us note that amulets and talismans in their archetypal projections

accompany the entire history of mankind. Today, their most common traditional varieties are religious symbols and precious stones. In a certain sense, the role of amulets was performed by the ideological symbolism of totalitarian regimes. Thus, the party ticket of a member of the CPSU was not only an official document, but also a kind of guarantee of survival in a situation of state monopoly on power, including spiritual power. Hence, the cult of “party ticket” in the USSR can be considered a vivid evidence of the combination of primitive mechanisms of fetishization with the practices of ideological influence. The arsenal of fetishization was significantly replenished in the XXI century, when, the practice of occultism, astrology, magic, neo-paganism and the like are reanimated actively in their archetypal projections to counteract the scientism of information society of knowledge and technologization of the modern world as a whole.

As to the collective fetish of the object-symbolic order, it acts as a general and generally accepted specific natural object for the whole group (mountain, river, lake, beautiful big tree and the like). Often collective fetishes had a specialization: individual objects of worship were intended for the management of time, health, hunting, fishing, and the like. The one who played a leading role in their choice, secured its authority through it. As a rule, this function was assumed by magicians, sorcerers, priests – people whose activities were at the origins of the processes of social differentiation and the formation of a system of relations in the coordinates “management-subordination”.

Undoubtedly, the significance of the role of cult physical and geographical objects of national importance in the formation of the identification symbolic complex of each individual nation is an archetypal projection of archaic spiritual practices based on imitation mechanisms of fetishization. It is enough to remember what place in folklore, poetry, historical narrative and modern symbolic landscape of each nation is occupied by natural objects (Ukrainian Dnieper, Polish Vistula, Indian Ganges, Chinese Huanhe, Armenian Ararat, Japanese Fujiyama, Ukrainian Hoverla, Bulgarian Shypka, Greek Olympus, Halong Bay in Vietnam, Cape Roka in Portugal and the like).

In contrast to the object-symbolic fetishes, the transformation of which into objects of worship is carried out according to the scheme “from the material form to its symbolic comprehension”, the symbolic-object group of fetishes consists of human works: idols. In the literal translation from the Greek idol (*eidolon*) is “image”, “similarity”. Idolatrous fetishes are zoomorphic and anthropomorphic man-made figures made of natural materials (stones, trees, clay, bones, etc.) or abstract images. All kinds of idols: idols, pagodas, stone women, blockheads and the like, have a symbolic nature and are first forms of monumentalism – one of the components of the block of spatial symbolism, which subsequently, in the wake of the process of institutionalization of power, will take a prominent place among the tools of its legitimization and resources of influence on socio-political processes of identification. Archetypal projections

of such symbolic-object fetishes in modern national landscapes are symbolic iconic architectural religious and secular buildings, monuments (Egyptian Pyramids, Acropolis of Athens, Roman Colosseum, St. Peter's Cathedral in Vatican, Taj Mahal in Agra, Angkor Wat in Cambodia, Brandenburg gate in Berlin, Eiffel tower in Paris, Petronas tower in Kuala Lumpur, Burj Khalifa skyscraper in Dubai, the statue of liberty in new York, the Christ monument in Rio de Janeiro, and the like). It is enough to remember what a loud resonance was caused by the recent fire in Notre Dame de Paris, when the destruction of the architectural monument acquired the status of a symbolic event and was perceived by the world community as a sign of the “decline of Europe”.

In addition, fetishes of the symbolic-object type are closely associated with the cult of ancestors, in particular with funeral rites. Even E. Tylor [5] referred to the sphere of fetishism funeral rite, as such. Note that the ancient habit of storing parts of the body of the deceased or its transformation into a “vessel of supernatural forces” for its complete mummification (Egypt, Peru), as a manifestation of the practice of fetishization was suddenly revived in the totalitarian cults of the twentieth century (USSR (V. Lenin), Bulgaria (T. Zhivkov), China (Mao Zedong), Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh), North Korea (Kim Ir Sen)).

As we can see, the endowment of objects with magical properties, their fetishization does not disappear with the transformation of mythological society. In the following types of social organization, based on other varieties of sym-

bolic and normative forms, it continues to be an important part of the political and managerial arsenal. Thus, a direct connection can be traced between the fetishism of the primitive era and the religious cult practices of Christianity (worship of icons, Holy relics), Buddhism (veneration of sacred “stupas”), Islam (pilgrimage to Holy places and “black stone”).

K. Marx analyzes the phenomenon of “commodity fetishism” in the society of the capitalist formation. In his opinion, the self-growth of value leads to the process of endowing the products of production with supernatural properties. For Marx, fetishism is not so much an element of religious consciousness but a universal characteristic inherent in its various forms [6, pp. 458-470]. The philosopher connects fetishism with the fusion of cultural and social functions of a thing with its material substrate and introduces the concept of “commodity fetishism”. This phenomenon, in his opinion, is due to the anticipation of social relations and the personification of things. “Commodity fetishism” is the personification of things and economic categories, and above all, money. Capital, through relations of production, is personified in the capitalist, and labour – in the worker. Thus, through the personification of economic relations, the laws of capitalist production are manifested as the action and will of individuals and groups [7, p. 80-93].

In the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, the phenomenon of fetishization of the world of things is treated as a core characteristic of post-industrial consumer society and is included in the subject range of key topics of postmo-

dern discourse (R. Barthes, J. Baudrillard, M. Foucault, etc.).

The wide range of application of fetishization in the practices of political and managerial influence, outlined by actual sociological knowledge (suffice it to recall in this regard the concept of “visualization” by V. V. Benjamin [8, pp. 235–247],” verbal fetishism of the revolution “by P. Sorokin [9, pp. 151–153], “political fetishism” by P. Bourdieu [10, pp. 231–262]), is another evidence in favor of its power potential. It is no coincidence that the word “cult” is firmly rooted in the lexicon of globalized post-modern society. In order for a subject to be influenced – it must be a “cult” one, the one that becomes an object of mass worship because of outstanding achievements in a certain sphere of meaning production-culture, art, science, politics. After all, today only cult figures are able to conquer, integrate and mobilize the broad masses of the population and manage them.

This is how the key mechanism of post-politics functions, which consists in the absolutization of the sign and symbol with the total destruction of institutions, norms and traditions, as a result of which virtual parties and politicians-holograms-come to power.

**Conclusions and prospects for further research.** All of the above gives us grounds enough to make some generalizations. The real power in society is always the power of the intangible assests. After all, the social world, of which the subsystem of politics is a component, is an extremely multidimensional space. This space, marked out, constructed and built on the principle of differentiation, is formed by a set of acting factors, the possession of

which is the key to power in this universe. Based on the above, the appropriation of scarce material and intangible goods, where the latter are defined as cultural and symbolic resources, as well as the establishment of control over their further distribution in the process of social interaction, is a fundamental source of political power and governance. In other words, the relations of power in society always tend to be actualized in the relations of symbolic power, and the symbol becomes a key tool in the struggle for a monopoly on the legitimate worldview. Thus, referring to the mechanism of implementation of a certain system of values, mythologies and symbols, it is possible to organize a given perception of the social world and, therefore, the world itself, and to establish in this world the rules and norms by which social relations are constructed and reproduced. It is extremely important in this regard that symbolic dominance allows not only to exercise control over public opinion, but also, in the long term, provides control of the processes of socialization of future generations.

This observation is clearly reflected in the current post-political situation. After all, today religion and ideology have finally lost the status of key sources of symbolic production and leadership positions in the arsenal of tools of creation. In the era of post-modernity, their place is gradually and inevitably taken by a new practice-political social semiosis. Its essence lies in the mechanism of universalization of practices of interpretation of political reality and its phenomena, the result of which is the symbolism of the political space. Thus, the political social semio-

sis finally turns the political order into a symbolic order, where network hierarchies of the entities of the world of politics are created through interpretation techniques.

This conclusion can be clearly seen in the wide presence of archetypal projections of archaic spiritual practices such as totemism and fetishism in the symbolic landscape of post-politics. As a derivative of ritual, the fetish is directly related to the totem, and together they form the background of all the subject of political symbolism: from physical and geographical objects, representatives of the world of fauna and flora to architecture, monumentalism and attributes of state sovereignty as objects of worship and collective amulets.

The unity of man and the cosmos, which is the basis of the mythological worldview, give rise to the phenomenon of animism and its products-totem and fetish. Through the system of prohibitions (taboos), the totem establishes not only the norms of collective coexistence (group morality), but also sets the rules of social competitions (games) that allow a person to join the struggle for symbolic dominance. As a symbolic first form, the totem gave birth to the biological symbolism of the object block of the symbolic identification complex-representatives of fauna and flora, who through archetypal projections acquired the status of patrons of peoples and unofficial symbols of states.

Fetishism as a custom of worshipping material objects gave birth to several types of symbolism of the subject series. Thus, object-symbolic fetishes gave rise to physical-geographical symbolism as a component of the ob-

ject block of the symbolic identification complex (rivers, lakes, mountains, etc.), and symbolic-object fetishes (man-made idols) – monumentalism and architecture.

Thus, symbolism is an integral component of human social existence, and a wide band of irrationality predetermines and makes the appeal to symbolic production in any historical era at any stage of development of models of socio-political organization of society inevitable, including in the situation of post-politics.

## REFERENCES

1. Ionin, L. G. (2001). Totem [Totem]. *Novaya filosofskaya entsiklopediya v 4-kh tomakh. T. 4. "T – Ya"* [New philosophical encyclopedia in 4 volumes. Vol. 4. "T - Ya"]. (pp. 81-82). Moscow: Mysl [in Russian].
2. Lévy-Bruhl, L. (1963). *Le surnaturel et la nature dans la mentalité primitive*. Paris: PUF [in French].
3. Vygotskoy, L. S. (1999). *Myshlenie i rech* [Thinking and Speech] (5th ed., rew.) Moscow: Labirint [in Russian].
4. De Brosses, C. (2010). *Culte Des Dieux Fétiches: Ou Paralle de L'Ancienne Religion de L'Egypte Avec La Religion Actuelle de Nigritie*. Nabu Press [in French].
5. Burnett, T. E. (2009). *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art and Custom*. (Vols. 1). Cornell University Library [in English].
6. Marx, K., Engels, F. (1986). *Ob at-eizme, religii i tserkvi* [On atheism, religion and the church]. Moscow: Mysl [in Russian].
7. Marx, K., Engels, F. (1984). *Kapital. Kritika politicheskoy ekonomii* [A

*Critique of Political Economy*]. (Vols. 1). Moscow: Izdatelstvo politicheskoy literatury [in Russian].

8. Benjamin, V. (1991). *Parizh - stolitsa XIX veka* [Paris, capital of the 19th century]. *Istoriko-filosofskiy ezhegodnik – Historical and Philosophical Yearbook*, 235–247 [in Russian].
9. Sorokin, P. (2000). *Slovesnyy fetishizm revolyutsii* [Verbal Fetishism of the Revolution]. *Zametki sotsiologa: sotsiologicheskaya publitsistika – Notes of a sociologist: sociological journalism*. (pp. 151–153). Saint Petersburg: Aleteya [in Russian].
10. Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Delegirovanie i politicheskoy fetishizm* [Delegation and Political Fetishism]. (N. A. Shmatko, Trans.). (pp. 231–262). Moscow: Socio-Logos [in Russian].

## СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Ионин Л. Г. Тотем / Л. Г. Ионин// Новая философская энциклопедия в 4 т. Т. 4. "Т-Я". Институт философии РАН. М.: Мысль, 2001. С. 81–82.
2. Lévy-Bruhl Lucien *Le surnaturel et la nature dans la mentalité primitive* / Lucien Lévy-Bruhl. – P.: Puf, 1963. 568 p.
3. Выготской Л. С. Мышление и речь / Л. С. Выготской (Изд. 5, испр.) – М.: Лабиринт, 1999. – 352 с.
4. De Brosses Charles, *Du Culte Des Dieux Ftiches: Ou Paralle de L'Ancienne Religion de L'Egypte Avec La Religion Actuelle de Nigritie* / CharlesDe Brosses. – P.: Nabu Press, 2010. 298 p.
5. Tylor Edward Burnett *Primitive Culture: Researches Into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art and Custom* (V. 1) (1903 ) / Edward Burnett Tylor. Cornell University Library, 2009. 522 p.



6. Маркс К. Об атеизме, религии и церкви [Сборник], / К. Маркс, Ф. Энгельс. М.: Мысль, 1986. 670 с. (Серия: Научно-атеистическая библиотека).
7. Маркс К. Капитал. Критика политической экономии. Том 1. / К. Маркс, Ф. Энгельс. Избранные произведения в 9 т.: Т. 7. М.: Изд-во политической литературы, 1984. 812 с.
8. Беньямин В. Париж — столица XIX века / В. Беньямин; [пер. с франц.] // Историко-философский ежегодник. Ин-т философии. М.: Наука, 1990. М., 1991. С. 235–247.
9. Сорокин П. Словесный фетишизм революции / П. Сорокин // Заметки социолога: социологическая публицистика (Сочинения). СПб.: Алетей, 2000. С. 151–153.
10. Бурдьё П. Делегирование и политический фетишизм / П. Бурдьё // Социология политики; [пер. с франц. сост., общ. ред. и предисл. Н. А. Шматко] М.: Socio-Logos, 1993. С. 231–262.