Sudakov Volodymyr Ivanovich,
Professor, Doctor of Sociological Science, Head of the Theory and History of Sociology dpt., Faculty of Sociology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. 01601, Kyiv, Str. Volodymyrska, 58, tel.: +38 (067) 502 86 48 e-mail: vl_sudakov@ukr.net
ORCID: 0000-0002-2032-1093

Судаков Володимир Іванович,
доктор соціологічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедрою теорії та історії соціології факультету соціології Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка, 01601, м. Київ, вул. Володимирська, 58, тел.: +38 (067) 502 86 48, e-mail: vl_sudakov@ukr.net
ORCID: 0000-0002-2032-1093

Судаков Владимир Иванович,
доктор социологических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой теории и истории социологии факультета социологии Киевского национального университета имени Тараса Шевченко. Украина, 01601, г. Киев, ул. Владимирская, 58, тел.: +38 (067) 502 86 48, e-mail: vl_sudakov@ukr.net
ORCID: 0000-0002-2032-1093

THE ARCHETYPES OF CULTURE AND SUBCULTURE AS THE DETERMINANTS OF SOCIAL ACTIONS AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT

Abstract. The conceptual argumentation that the processes of the cultural globalization are important stimuli for development of scientific studies of the contemporary culture and its functional and technological peculiarities is presented in the article. It is underlined that the cultural development of the human civilization has always been stimulated by the influence of different subcultures. Therefore the specialized scientific investigations, which are oriented to the substantiation of the archetypal status of culture and subculture as the determinative factors of social actions and social management today, are very important. It is proved that active use of such concepts as "global culture", "multiculturalism",

"transculturalism", "intercultural communication", "cultural capital", "subcultural capital", "subcultural lifestyle" by scholars now is the positive factor for the creation of scientific programs for analysis of the ontological specifics of the archetypes of culture and subculture in the context of globalization, virtualization and individualization of social life. Attention is paid to the contradictions of the conflict interpretation of subculture as the culture of social minority" that is caused by such social phenomena as social alienation, marginalization and poverty. The author defines the archetype of subculture as the multifunctional social phenomenon that emerges and reproduces itself in society as the attributive consequence of the cultural differentiation. It is argued that the significant innovative problem of the social management is the elaboration of the effective technologies for social control over different forms of activities of subcultural groups that emerge as critical human attitudes to the existing social order and as the creative values of the progressive social constructivism.

Key words: culture, subculture, archetypes of culture and subculture, global culture, multiculturalism, transculturalism, intercultural communication, cultural capital, subcultural capital, subcultural lifestyle, social management.

АРХЕТИПИ КУЛЬТУРИ ТА СУБКУЛЬТУРИ ЯК ДЕТЕРМІНАНТИ СОЦІАЛЬНИХ ДІЙ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ

Анотація. Аргументовано, що процеси глобалізації культури є важливим стимулом розвитку наукових досліджень сучасної культури, її функціональної та технологічної специфіки. Підкреслено, що культурний розвиток людської цивілізації завжди реально обумовлювався впливом різних субкультур. Саме тому особливе значення мають спеціалізовані наукові дослідження, спрямовані на обґрунтування архетипного статусу культури та субкультури як детермінант соціальних дій та соціального управління. Надано докази активного використання вченими таких понять, як "глобальна культура", "мультикультуралізм", "транскультуралізм", "міжкультурна комунікація" "культурний капітал", "субкультурний капітал", "субкультурний життєвий стиль" є позитивним чинником розробки інноваційних наукових програм аналізу онтологічної специфіки архетипів культури та субкультури в контексті тенденцій глобалізації, віртуалізації та індивідуалізації суспільного життя. Визначено суперечності конфліктологічної інтерпретації субкультури як "культури соціальної меншості", поява якої спричинена такими соціальними явищами як соціальне відчуження, маргіналізація та бідність. Автор визначає архетип субкультури як поліфункціональне соціальне явище, що виникає та відтворюється у суспільстві як атрибутивний наслідок культурної диференціації. Аргументовано, що важливою інноваційною проблемою соціального менеджменту є розробка технологій ефективного соціального контролю різних форм активності субкультурних груп, приймаючи до уваги ту обставину, що ця активність демонструє як критичне ставлення людей до існуючого соціального порядку, так і є виразом креативних цінностей соціального конструктивізму.

Ключові слова: культура, субкультура, архетипи культури та субкультури, глобальна культура, транскультуралізм, міжкультурна комунікація, культурний капітал, субкультурний капітал, субкультурний життєвий стиль, соціальне управління.

АРХЕТИПЫ КУЛЬТУРЫ И СУБКУЛЬТУРЫ КАК ДЕТЕРМИНАНТЫ СОЦИАЛЬНЫХ ДЕЙСТВИЙ И СОЦИАЛЬНОГО УПРАВЛЕНИЯ

Аннотация. Аргументировано, что процессы глобализации культуры являются важным стимулом развития научных исследований современной культуры, ее функциональной и технологичекской специфики. Подчеркнуто, что культурное развитие человеческой цивилизации всегда реально было обусловлено определенным влиянием различных субкультур. Именно поэтому особую значимость приобретают специализированные научные исследования, направленые на обоснование архетипного статуса культуры и субкультуры как детерминант социальных действий и социального управления. Представлены доказательства, что активное использование учеными таких понятий, как "глобальная культура", "мультикультурализм", "транскультурализм", "интеркультурная коммуникация", "культурный капитал", "субкультурный капитал", "субкультурный жизненный стиль" являются позитивным фактором разработки инновационных научных програм анализа онтологической специфики архетипов культуры и субкультуры в контексте тенденций глобализации, виртуализации и индивидуализации общественной жизни. В статье обращено внимание на противоречия конфликтологической интепретации субкультуры как "культуры социального меншинства", возникновение которой обусловлено такими социальными явлениями как социальное отчуждение, маргинализация и бедность. Автор определяет архетип субкультуры как полифункциональное социальное явление, которое возникает и воспроизводится в обшестве как атрибутивное последствие культурной дифференциации. Аргументировано, что актуальной инновационной проблемой социального управления является разработка технологий эффективного социального контроля различных форм активности субкультурных груп, принимая во внимание то обстоятельство, что эта активность демонстрирует как критическое отношение людей к существующему социальному порядку, так и является выражением креативных ценностей социального конструктивизма.

Ключевые слова: культура, субкультура, архетипы культуры и субкультуры, глобальная культура, транскультурализм, интеркультурная коммуникация, культурный капитал, субкультурный капитал, субкультурный жизненный стиль, социальное управление.

Problem statement. It is well-known, that in the contemporary social sciences the most significant in theoretical and practical dimensions

have become fundamental and applied research that is related to the study of the innovative tendencies of sociocultural changes, cultural differentiation and technological potential of human culture. Obviously, the newest processes of the globalization of culture significantly complicate the task of scientific understanding as the phenomena of the contemporary culture and its functional and technological peculiarities. Therefore, the vast majority of scholars underline the need to clarify the content of the category "culture" as the fundamental concept of social philosophy and social theory because the popular understanding of culture as a complex of human achievements during the entire period of the historical human development is excessively abstract. Firstly, such understanding does not explain the general structural characteristics of the human culture and also the dynamics of its historical changes, which occurred under the influence of different subcultures. Secondly, one should also pay attention to the important fact that human culture always has been formed and developed as the pragmatic system of social management, which has been used by the power elite in the certain ways to other people. It should be noted that the various scientific attempts to define the attributive ontological features of culture as the set of cultural universals cannot be recognized today as a significant contribution to the development of the special research programs, which propose to study the culture as a social phenomenon and as the process that determines the sense of 'social actions by the individual and collective actors of social life. Introduction to the contemporary scientific discourse of such concepts as "global culture", "multiculturalism", "transculturalism", "intercultural communication", "cultural capital", "subcultural capital", "subcultural lifestyle" stimulates scholars to provide analytical studies the problem of ontological specifics of the archetypes of culture and subculture under the context of the tendencies of globalization, virtualization and individualization of social life. So the purpose that the author tries to achieve in this article is to develop analytical approach in order to create the stimulating conceptual argumentation for further research of this problem.

Analysis of the recent researches and publications. The study of the main research directions of the social phenomena of culture and subculture in contemporary social sciences evidently reflects the certain cognitive difficulties that are connected with the correct identification of the cognitive status of the concepts of "culture" and "subculture". Therefore it is reasonable to indicate that the scholars today in their works [1, 2, 3] emphasize the importance of studying the new trends of the cultural changes, which reflect the growing role of cultural practices in the global development of mankind. That is why the research efforts of scientists are aimed at substantiating the archetypal status of culture and subculture as the determinative factors of social actions and social management [4, 5, 6]. An important scientific direction is the study of the creative potential of subcultures as fundamental ontological stimulus for progressive social changes [7, 8, 9, 10]. At the same time Ukrainian sociologists in their works [11, 12,

13, 14, 15] have underlined the need to develop innovative technologies of social management, since the spontaneous processes of cultural changes were the real moving force in increasing social tensions and conflict interactions.

Presenting main material. First of all, it should be noted that the general content of contemporary studies of cultural issues reflects the situation of the need to create new fundamental theories of culture and cultural development. Many scholars rightly draw attention to this fact, emphasizing that the concept of "culture" in the latest interpretations is a concept that captures only the most important attributive qualities and qualities that are inherent in social life and human behavior. "Sociologists and anthropologists use "culture" as a collective noun for the symbolic and leaned, non-biological aspects of human society including language, customs and convention by which human behavior can be distinguished from that of other primates" [1, p. 99].

According to K. Kammeyer, G. Ritzer and N. Yetman, in defining the concept of "culture" it is important to take into account the archetypal social status of this concept, which signifies the most important conditions for the collective life of people. "Culture is the entire complex of ideas and material objects that the people of a society (or group) have created and adopted for carrying out the necessary tasks of collective life" [4, p. 85]. Scientists believe that this definition contributes to the further development of innovative studies of the different forms of human behaviors and as the phenomena of cultural relativism and ethnocentrism, the

functional role of knowledge, symbols and beliefs, as well as norms "that govern everyday conduct" [4, p. 86].

It is obvious that other scholars are not satisfied with the overall perspective of such a research strategy. Thus, Cr. Calhoun, D. Light, and S.Keller propose a more "narrow" general definition of culture by identifying its attributive components as cultural universals: "Culture is the language, norms, values, beliefs, knowledge, and symbols that make up a way of life. It is the an understanding of how to act that people share with one another in any stable self-reproducing group"[5, p. 7].

It is important to emphasize that this definition also clearly captures the archetypal social status of the concept of culture. At the same time, it should be noted that a certain advantage of such a more "narrow" interpretation of the content of this concept is that these scientists propose to study the social ontological characteristics of culture under the context of elucidating its connection with other attributive properties of social life, which are denoted by three such known concepts such as: "social action", "functional integration" and "power". I believe that this research strategy should be recognized as promising for further development, as it generally facilitates specialized differentiated study of 1) cultural integration, 2) cultural diversity and subcultures, 3) cultural reproduction, 4) cultural and media communication, 5) internationalization and globalization culture [5, p. 86].

The similar view is also formulated by G. Bechmann, who defines culture as a reflexive form of human experience [6, c. 109–117]. This scholar argues that

the concept of culture has a reflexive meaning and it is based on comparison. "Culture is something that defines people's lifestyles, and it creates preconditions for comparison. That is, culture is what makes it possible to compare what cannot be compared: a way of life. At the same time, the observation horizon is expanding both regionally and nationally, providing, above all, the historical depth of the differences. Culture as a reflexive form creates a distance to everything non-native in the society, but at the same time it allows to approach this society to a foreign culture rather as distant and remote" [6, c. 111].

It is noteworthy that G. Bechmann tries to avoid a purely formal description of the social functions of the contemporary culture, which, according to his opinion, has the single functional orientation, which should be indicated in three dimensions:

• firstly, culture is very important for the formation and development of a human individual as a personality; it is a system of conventional customs in a particular society that is different from the customs of other societies and cultures;

• secondly, culture is a significant virtue that indicates the difference between culture and the simple everyday existence of people; in this expression culture demonstrates itself as a purification of life and denotes their social division into "high culture" and "mass culture";

• thirdly, culture divides society into historical epochs — it allows people, who are looking at the past, to have opportunity to define the factors of progress in human relations towards the nature and also to evaluate the pro-

gressive changes in the existing system of social interactions. [6, c. 111–112].

Obviously, this interpretation of the functional orientation of the contemporary culture also indicates to the specific attributive property of the culture — its competitive character. It is known that under the context of globalization, the competition between cultures significantly increases, and this process has been explained in different ways in the sociological theories of global modernization and global dependence. However, I consider that G. Bechmann, paying attention to the phenomena of competitiveness of the contemporary cultures, underestimates the important fact that the culture as the embodiment of the productive tendencies of social and historical practice is the significant resource for the legitimation and technologization of the systems of individual and collective social actions and social claims, which are the important source for the emergence and existence of various subcultures.

Focusing on the identification of the epistemological features of the subculture category, it is important to emphasize the need to overcome the simplified interpretations of the subculture in the specific ontological sense – as "culture of a social minority", the emergence of which is caused by such social phenomena as social alienation, marginalization and poverty.

P. Williams draws attention to this fact in monograph "Subcultural Theory. Traditions and Concepts"[7]. In this work the author proves that contemporary scholars are no longer satisfied with the image of a society with a particular dominant culture with

different dysfunctional subcultural elements. Today the developed societies are rather a set of different social groups whose members do not wish to speak about subcultures. According to Williams, the concept of "subculture" reflects not only a certain system of humanitarian values of non-conformism, resistance, protest, freedom of choice, self-expression, which usually characterize people's critical attitude to the existing social order. It is also important to keep in mind that this concept is a specific expression of the values of the progressive social constructivism. Therefore, the prospects for developing a scientific subcultural theory should be connected with a creative understanding of the following questions: "What is and what isn't subcultural? In other words, where are the boundaries of subcultures, and where do they start and end? And how can we find answers to such questions" [7, p. 6].

It should be noted that R. Heienfler in her work [8] emphasizes the creative ability of subcultures to formulate alternative views of people in relation to the established way of life. The presence of such alternative views determinates the need for "a careful study and a better understanding of the motivations, thoughts and practices of subcultural groups" [8, p 3]. In this work, the author has made a scientific argumentation for the importance of taking into account a wider range of conceptual problems, the specialized study of which will help to determine the epistemological principles of subcultural analysis. She identifies and analyzes the content of the following 8 fundamental problems:

1. What are subcultures?

2. How do subcultures emerge and why do people participate?

3. How do subcultures resist the "mainstream" of society and are they successful?

4. Who are the participants in subcultural practices?

5. Who are the "authentic" participants and who are the "posers"?

6. How does society react to subcultures?

7. Have subcultures gone virtual and global?

8. What happens to subcultures as they "grow up"?

Obviously, the attention of scientists to further scientific study of these problems in order to identify the new functional characteristics of modern subcultures requires the use of the cognitive potential of some important concepts. Thus, J.Lewis points to the importance of a wider use of the concept of "transculturalism", which as methodological instrument can explain certain modes of growth of global influence of the various subcultural social movements [2]. K. Sorrels believes that in order to explain the regimes of such movements, it is useful to choose the concept of "intercultural communication" [3]. The effective use of the cognitive potential of these concepts, as demonstrated by V. Lapina's work [11], contributes to the understanding of the tendency of global spread of subcultural practices of such cultural and ideological phenomenon as consumerism.

British scholar S. Thornton proposes to introduce into the scientific circulation the concept of "subcultural capital". She argues that this concept has important cognitive sense for the studies of the process of internalization

of cultural norms, which determines the creative potential of different subcultures [9, pp. 200–208].

Developing this position, D. Hebdige in his monograph "Subculture: The Meaning of Style (new accents)" [10] underlines that any culture of the class society in some way is oriented to the ideal of "aesthetic perfection". A variety of practical ways of ontologization this ideal gives rise to different "subcultural lifestyles" that can have both functional and dysfunctional manifestations. It is noteworthy that the scholar recognizes the functional significance of the subcultural styles as an important attribute feature of social life. Therefore, as he considers, the various counter-cultures today are the inappropriate scientific subject-matter to be regarded as subcultures because of the social locality of these counter-cultures, which reflects the specific value challenge of the youth groups as a small part of the middle-class [10, p. 2–7].

As I believe, these suggestions generally point to the importance of the scientific conceptual understanding of subculture as an archetypal multifunctional phenomenon of social life that constantly reproduce itself in societies (as socio-historical systems of different types) due to the process of differentiation of cultural practices of the individual and collective actors of social life.

At the same time, it should be noted that at present the issue of developing technologies for managing influence to the social activity of the subcultural groups is important not only for scientific researchs but also for the modernization of the regulative functions of the political institutions. So J. Lewis believes that the use of the methodo-

logy of transculturalism allows us to identify the differences among humanist, antihumanist and post-humanist technologies [2, p. 22]. The choice and the effective use of these technologies depends on the scientific validity of the empirical data and also the scientific evaluations that reflect as the current state and the possible destructive consequences of social tension and protest activity of the different social groups.

It should be noted that in the scientific works of Ukrainian sociologists also have been emphasized the need for the development of innovative technologies of social management, since spontaneous processes of cultural change were actually factors of the increasing social tension, conflict interactions and communications. Therefore, evaluating the results of the recent research, it should be noted that important fields of the scientific work are: 1) the identification of the peculiarities of activity of the youth subcultural groups in the cities of Ukraine [12]; 2) the development of the conceptual model and empirical indicators of cultural determinants of social tension and protest behavior in the regions of Ukraine [13]; 3) the analysis of the process of transformation of social actions by the subcultural groups in Ukrainian society[14]; 4) the identification and characterization of dysfunctional social consequences that are connected with the low effectiveness of the democratic reforms in Ukraine [15].

Conclusions and the prospects for further researches.

1. The processes of globalization of culture are an important stimulus for the development of the scientific research of the contemporary culture, its functional and technological pe-

culiarities. The cultural development of the human civilization has always been stimulated by the influence of different subcultures. The new trends in cultural changes today indicate the growing role of cultural practices as the organization factors of social order in different societies. Therefore specialized scientific investigations are very important today, which are oriented to the substantiation of the archetypal status of culture and subculture as the determinative factors of social actions and social management.

2. The active use by scholars such concepts as "global culture", "multiculturalism", "transculturalism", "intercultural communication", "cultural capital", "subcultural capital", "subcultural lifestyle" now is the positive factor for the creation of scientific programs for analysis of the ontological specifics of the archetypes of culture and subculture under the context of the tendencies of globalization, virtualization and individualization of social life.

3. The important innovative problem of social management is the development of technologies for the effective social control over the various forms of activities of the subcultural groups. But it is useful to understand that these activities demonstrate both the critical attitude of people to the existing social order and is an expression of the values of the progressive social constructivism which stimulates the humanistic trends in the contemporary social life.

REFERENCES

1. Abercombie, N., Hill, S., Turner, B. (1994). Culture. The Pinguine Dictionary of Sociology. (3rd ed.). (p. 99). London: Pinguine books Ltd [in English].

2. Lewis, J. (2002). From Culturalism to Transculturalism. Iowa Journal of Cultural Studies, 1, 14-32 [in English].

3. Sorrels, K. (2013). Intercultural communication, Globalization and Social Justice. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage publ. [in English].

4. Kammeyer, K., Ritzer, G., Yetman, N. (1997). Sociology: experiencing changing societies. Boston: Allyn & Bacon [in English].

5. Kelhoun, C., Light, D., Keller, S. (1994). Sociology. (6th ed.). New York: Mc Graw Hill [in English].

6. Bekhmann, G. (2010). Sovremennoe obshchestvo: obshchestvo riska, informatsionnoe obshchestvo, obshchestvo znaniy [Modern society: risk society, information society, knowledge society]. (A. Yu. Antokolskiy, G. V. Gorokhovyy, D. V. Efremenko, V. V. Kaganchuk, S. V. Mesyats, Trans). (2nd ed.). Moscow: Logos [in Russian].

7. Williams, P. (2011). Subcultural Theory. Traditions and Concepts. Cambrige: Polity Press [in English].

8. Haenfler, R. (2014). Subcultures: The basics. New York: Routlege [in English].

9. Thornton, S. (1997). The Sociologic of Subcultural Capital. The Subcultures Reader. K. Geldner and S. Thornton (Eds.). (pp. 200-212). London; New York: Routlege [in English].

10. Hebdige D. (2002). Subculture: The Meaning of Style (new accents). London: Routlege [in English].

11. Lapina, V. V. (2018). The archetype of consumption and its contradictions in the contemporary European space of economic and social interactions. Public management, 4(14), 159–170 [in English].

12. Gran, D. S. (2016). Sub/kultury: protest, kommunikatsiya ili obretenie sebya? [Sub/culture: protest, communi-

cation or gaining oneself?]. Kherson: FLP [in Russian].

13. Sudakov, V. I., Siryi, Ye. V., Lapina, V. V., Saveliev, Yu. B., Chernykh, H. A., Kondov, K. V., Nakhabich, M. A. (2018). Sotsialna napruzhenist v rehionalnykh vymirakh: problemy teorii, metodolohii ta metodyky sotsiolohichnoho doslidzhennia [Social tensions in regional dimensions: problems of theory, methodology and methodology of sociological research]. Kyiv: Lohos [in Ukrainian].

14. Kostenko, N., Ruchka, A. (Eds.). (2010). Subkulturna viriatyvnist ukrainskoho sotsiumu [Subcultural virativity of the Ukrainian society]. Kyiv: In-t sotsiolohii NAN Ukrainy [in Ukrainian].

15. Shulha, M. (2018). Zbii sotsialnoi matrytsi: monohrafiia [The failure of the social matrix]. Kyiv: In-t sotsiolohii NAN Ukrainy [in Ukrainian].

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Culture // Abercombie N., Hill St, Turner Br. The Pinguine Dictionary of Sociology. – Third ed. London: Pinguine books Ltd., 1994. P. 99.

2. Lewis J. From Culturalism to Traansculturalism // Iowa Journal of Cultural Studies., 2002. N1 (spring). P. 14–32.

3. Sorrels K. Intercultural communication, Globalization and Social Justice / Katryn Sorrels. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage publ., 2013. 290 p.

4. Kammeyer K., Ritzer G., Yetman N. Sociology: experiencing changing societies. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1997. 650 p.

5. Kelhoun Cr., Light D., Keller S. Sociology. 6th ed. New York: Mc Graw Hill, 1994. 651 p.

6. Бехманн Г. Современное общество: общество риска, информационное общество, общество знаний / Готтхард Бехманн; пер. с нем. А. Ю. Антокольского, Г. В. Гороховой, Д. В. Ефременко, В. В. Каганчук, С. В. Месяц. 2-е изд., М.: Логос, 2012. 248 с.

7. Williams P. Subcultural Theory. Traditions and Concepts. Cambrige: Polity Press, 2011. 224 p.

8. Haenfler R. Subcultures: The basics. – New York: Routlege, 2014. 192 p.

9. Thornton S. The Sociologic of Subcultural Capital // The Subcultures Reader / K.Geldner and S.Thornton (eds). L.- N.Y: Routlege, 1997. P. 200–212.

10. Hebdige D. Subculture: The Meaning of Style (new accents). L.: Routlege, 2002. 286 p.

11. Lapina V. V. The archetype of consumption and its contradictions in the contemporary European space of economic and social interactions / V. V. Lapina // Public management : collection. № 4 (14). June 2018. \Kyiv: ДП "Видавничий дім "Персонал", (Special edition). P. 159–170.

12. Sub/культуры: протест, коммуникация или обретение себя? Херсон: ФЛП Грань Д.С., 2016. 239 с.

13. Соціальна напруженість в регіональних вимірах: проблеми теорії, методології та методики соціологічного дослідження: Монографія / В. І. Судаков, Є. В. Сірий, В. В Лапіна та ін.; за заг. В. І. Судакова. К.: Логос, 2018. 197 с.

14. Субкультурна віріативність українського соціуму / за ред. Н. Костенко, А. Ручки. К.: Ін-т соціології НАН України, 2010. 288 с.

15. Шульга М. Збій соціальної матриці: монографія / Микола Шульга. К.: Ін-т соціології НАН України, 2018. 284 с.