Sushyi Olena Vladimirovna,
Doctor of Science in Public Administration, Head of depurtment, Institute of Social and Political Psychology of the NAES of Ukraine, 04070, Kyiv, Andriivska str., 15, tel.: +38 067 9109926, e-mail: a_s_y2000@yahoo.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-4364-7571

Суший Олена Володимирівна,
доктор наук з державного управління, завідувачка лабораторії методології психосоціальних і політико-психологічних досліджень, Інститут соціальної та політичної психології НАПН України, 04070, м. Київ, вул. Андріївська, 15, тел.: +38 067 9109926, e-mail: a_s_y2000@yahoo.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-4364-7571

Суший Елена Владимировна,
доктор наук по государственному управлению, заведующая лабораторией методологии психосоциальных и политико-психологических исследований, Институт социальной и политической психологии НАПН Украины, 04070, г. Киев, ул. Андреевская, 15, тел.: +38 067 9109926, e-mail: a_s_y2000@yahoo.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-4364-7571

SOCIAL ARCHETYPIC AT THE SERVICE OF PUBLIC ANTI-CRISIS MANAGEMENT

Abstract. The article presents an analytical projection of the societal crisis in Ukraine. Its coordinate systems are described, in which the corresponding sections of the social crisis are manifested, namely: system coordinates reflect the main spheres of the societal system crisis (political and legal, economic, social, cultural); structural coordinates reflect such poles as: a crisis of institutions, a crisis of interests and goals, a crisis of values, a crisis of identity; temporal coordinates reflect the crisis cycles of the national-state development of Ukraine; socio-psychological coordinates allow us to consider the problem of crisis (mass) consciousness at the level of socio-psychological phenomena (behind the dominant type of social experiences and forms of socio-psychological thinking). Each of the crisis sections characterizes a quite specific side of the societal crisis, which can be considered both in relative autonomy and in tight interdependence with its other parties. In its combination, in each new slice, the components of the societal crisis reproduce its new quality (synergy effect). Together, they form a complex (mul-

tifactorial), contradictory (multi-vector) and dynamic architectonics of the societal crisis in Ukraine, where each phenomenon (its structural component) can be viewed both as a cause and as a result of the conflict-confrontational tendencies of the national-state development of Ukraine. It is argued that a deep societal crisis actualizes the problem of ensuring security and stability of sustainable development in Ukraine. In turn, the practical implementation of the concept of development of the situation in Ukraine in the context of a social crisis depends on the effectiveness of state crisis management, its strategy and tactics, the ability to predict and take into account the risks that provoke a crisis situations. The analytical projection of the societal crisis reveals the potential and possibilities of the social archetypika as a diagnostic tool of the public crisis management.

Keywords: crisis, societal crisis, crisis management, public crisis management, social archetypika.

СОЦІАЛЬНА АРХЕТИПІКА НА СЛУЖБІ ДЕРЖАВНОГО АНТИКРИЗОВОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ

Анотація. Презентовано аналітичну проекцію соцієтальної кризи в Україні. Описано системи координат, що виявляють відповідні зрізи соцієтальної кризи, а саме: системні координати, відображені кризою основних сфер соціальної системи (політико-правової, економічної, соціальної, культурної); структурні координати, полюси якої складає криза інституцій; криза інтересів та цілей; криза цінностей; криза ідентичностей; темпоральні координати, що відтворюють кризові цикли національно-державного розвитку України; соціально-психологічні координати, що дають змогу розглянути проблему кризової (масової) свідомості на рівні соціально-психологічних феноменів (за домінуючим типом соціальних переживань та формами соціально-психологічного мислення). Кожен з кризових зрізів характеризує цілком конкретну сторону соцієтальної кризи, яка може бути розглянуто як у відносній автономності, так і у щільній взаємозалежності з іншими її сторонами. У своєму поєднанні в кожному новому зрізі компоненти соцієтальної кризи відтворюють її нову якість (ефект синергії). У сукупності вони формують складну (багатофакторну), суперечливу (різновекторну) та динамічну архітектоніку соцієтальної кризи в Україні, де кожне явище (її структуруючий компонент) можна розглядати і як причину, і як наслідок конфліктно-конфронтаційних тенденцій національно-державного розвитку України. Стверджується, що глибока соцієтальна криза актуалізує проблему забезпечення безпеки і стабільності сталого розвитку в Україні. У свою чергу, практична реалізація концепції сталого розвитку в Україні в умовах соцієтальної кризи залежить від ефективності державного антикризового управління, його стратегії і тактики, можливостей прогнозування та врахування ризиків, що провокують кризові стани. Здійснена аналітична проекція соцієтальної кризи розкриває потенціал та можливості соціальної архетипіки як діагностичного інструментарію державного антикризового управління.

СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ АРХЕТИПИКА НА СЛУЖБЕ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО АНТИКРИЗИСНОГО УПРАВЛЕНИЯ

Аннотация. Представлена аналитическая проекция социетального кризиса в Украине. Описаны системы координат, в которых проявляются соответствующие срезы социетального кризиса, а именно: системные координаты, отражающие кризис основных сфер социальной системы (политико-правовой, экономической, социальной, культурной); структурные координаты, отражающие такие полюсы, как: кризис институтов, кризис интересов и целей, кризис ценностей, кризис идентичности; темпоральные координаты, отражающие кризисные циклы национально-государственного развития Украины; социально-психологические координаты, позволяющие рассмотреть проблему кризисного (массового) сознания на уровне социально-психологических феноменов (за доминирующим типом социальных переживаний и формами социально-психологического мышления). Каждый из кризисных срезов характеризует вполне конкретную сторону социетального кризиса, который может быть рассмотрен как в относительной автономности, так и в плотной взаимозависимости с другими его сторонами. В своем сочетании в каждом новом срезе компоненты социетального кризиса воспроизводят его новое качество (эффект синергии). В совокупности они формируют сложную (многофакторную), противоречивую (разновекторную) и динамическую архитектонику социетального кризиса в Украине, где каждое явление (его структурный компонент) можно рассматривать и как причину, и как следствие конфликтно-конфронтационных тенденций национально-государственного развития Украины. Утверждается, что глубокий социетальный кризис актуализирует проблему обеспечения безопасности и стабильности устойчивого развития в Украине. В свою очередь, практическая реализация концепции устойчивого развития в Украине в условиях социетального кризиса зависит от эффективности государственного антикризисного управления, его стратегии и тактики, возможностей прогнозирования и учета рисков, которые провоцируют кризисные состояния. Осуществленная аналитическая проекция социетального кризиса раскрывает потенциал и возможности социальной архетипики как диагностического инструментария государственного антикризисного управления.

Ключевые слова: антикризисное управление, государственное антикризисное управление, кризис, социетальный кризис, социальная архетипики.

Problem statement. Our time is called the era of crises: crises of different scales, levels and orders have become an integral part of the modern world, which adapts to the existence in crisis conditions. And this case is becoming

more and more difficult, because unlike its, so to speak, classical analogues in the past, modern crises occur in the form of spontaneous mutagenesis. That is why, more precisely, we exist in an era of societal crises. The mutation of crises, the formation of new complex forms due to combinations of crisis elements, the transformation of crises into "self-feeding process" by playing or flowing into new formats — this is the new reality of the societal crisis. This is the scale of the crisis we are witnessing in Ukraine. In fact, we are dealing with several crises that were located at all levels of social space (micro-, meso-, macro-): from the personal to the societal one. Some of them arose almost simultaneously, others, as a consequence, were driven by the causes and consequences of previously released, but unfinished crises.

Deep societal crisis in Ukraine actualizes the problem of security and stability of sustainable development. In turn, the practical implementation of the concept of sustainable development in Ukraine in the context of the societal crisis depends on the effectiveness of state crisis management, its strategy and tactics, the ability to predict and take into account the risks that provoke crisis conditions.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Despite the fact that the theory of crisis management is actively developing over the past decades, a significant number of scientific papers in this area mainly relate to the crisis management of individual enterprises or socio-economic systems, while researchers pay much less attention to the problem of public crisis management (A. Adamska, A. Babych, T. Bez-verhniuk, K. Voronina, V. Dziundziuk, L. Kostetska, N. Liba, S. Stavchenko, I. Chykarenko, I. Yarova).

Modern researchers understand crisis management (CM) as a type of management focused on foresight, recognition of crisis situations, as well as readiness to manage in a crisis and get out of it with a new impetus for the further development of the organization, a particular industry or system as a whole. Considerable emphasis is placed, on the one hand, on understanding the subjective and objective causes of the crisis in the conditions of cyclical development of the system (industry, organization) [1], and on the other — on the analysis of processes that provide synergy, that is, a situation where the whole is greater than the simple sum of its parts [2]. The strategy of the CM is considered to be effective provided that in a crisis situation successful activity in one direction does not compensate for failure or failure in the other. Accordingly, in a situation of uncertainty, the purpose of crisis management is to develop and implement anti-crisis solutions aimed at comprehensive neutralization of the most dangerous factors leading to a crisis. In turn, diagnostics of system development (industry, organization), detection of traps and contradictions that lead to a crisis state is the primary task of the CM.

While there is no dispute that the study and forecasting of crisis situations should be based on an interdisciplinary approach, from the standpoint of economics, sociology of management, management theory, social psychology (psychology of individual and group behavior), etc., respectively, crisis management as a theoretical discipline

can successfully develop, integrating the concepts and methods of these and other sciences. However, here, in my opinion, there are several problems, especially dangerous in the context of public crisis management. First, the developments of these branches of scientific knowledge are used chaotically: in a complex crisis phenomenon, some parties or aspects are identified that are studied from the standpoint of specific scientific disciplines, and then from the data obtained an attempt is made to recreate a complete picture of the causes and consequences of the crisis, which affects the system (industry, organization). The result is a dichotomous transcription of the crisis (which can be symbolically expressed as: $2 + 2 = 4$) and remains behind the scenes of its energy effect (which can be symbolically expressed as: $2 + 2 = 5$). For this reason the development and implementation of anti-crisis strategy inevitably falls into the trap when the success of mastering certain crisis manifestations at one stage or in a particular area is offset by failure at another stage or another area (which can be symbolically expressed as: $1 \times 0 = 0$, whereas it should be like this: $1 \times 1 = 1$).

Secondly, the scientific and expert environment is quite conservative in its essence, and therefore seeks to apply the usual approaches and methods and is suspicious of experimental methodological developments until they have received universal recognition. In this aspect, the importance of the analysis of the irrational sphere of mass (collective) consciousness in the unity of its conscious and unconscious components is partly underestimated. The possibilities of social archetypics, first of all, at the initial stage of CM — diagnostics of crisis states and processes, which allows to plunge into the deep layers of the collective unconscious, remain almost completely without attention. Perhaps it is in the perspective where the archetype is the horizon and context of understanding the phenomena of social reality and at the same time the phenomenon of specific psychosocial process underlying the new social and power-management reality, we can get an alternative vision of the causes and consequences of the crisis and ways of their development.

Now we have a situation when the real state of social transformations in Ukraine, including the state anti-crisis management, does not meet the modern scale of changes. In other words, the modern social experience in Ukraine, as it was rightly noted by S. Rymarenko, is based on past social schemes and patterns that cannot make real changes in society, because despite the fact that they have lost their legitimacy, they still remain, in fact, "a guiding force" [3, p. 179]. So there is a special crisis style of social movement inherent in the post-Soviet states. It is characterized, according to A. Babych's apt observation, by the fact that the contradictions of social development do not disappear soon after their detection as a result of adjusting the chosen course while maintaining its general orientation, but remain and develop, generating another "false trend", until they lead to a new crisis. Under such circumstances, the way out of the next crisis is not stabilization or even movement to it, but the prologue of the next crisis [4].

The purpose of the article is to reveal the potential of social archetypic

as a scientific approach and diagnostic tools from the arsenal of the state of crisis management that gives one the opportunity to make analytical projection of societal crisis in Ukraine.

Presentation of the main material. The domestic scientific community does not have sufficiently established opinions regarding social archetypic as interdisciplinary areas of research and its methodological foundations. The basis for critical judgments on the part of some of them is the ambiguous attitude to the teachings of C. Jung about the archetypes of the collective unconscious and psychoanalytic trends in general, which were ironically proclaimed "a new religion of the twentieth century". Others disparagingly call social archetypes to be the pseudoscience, positioned as a panacea for solving all sorts of social troubles of the present.

In her previous publications [5–7] I repeatedly emphasized that the actualization of the problem of the mass (collective) unconscious, including the archetype, which acts as the horizon and the context of understanding the phenomena of social reality, is not only and not so much a return to the archaic foundations of spirituality, but a turn to the future, since the archetypes embody the hopes and dreams of the people. In archetypal representations, images, symbols and the like, there is a hidden deep nature of the desires, expectations, aspirations and hopes of people that arise as a result of the joint work of consciousness and the collective unconscious. And since the archetype can be considered to be the information that has a social and managerial value, so the appeal to social archetypes in modern social science, in particular

in public administration, is quite natural.

However, now there is a need to reduce the degree of critical attitude to social archetypics and delicate adjustment of its perception by the scientific and expert community as an interdisciplinary area of research in the subject field of public administration. The solution of the task will depend on compliance with a number of conditions. First — the correct use of ideas that influenced the formation and development of social archetypes, especially to the concept of C. Jung "on the archetypes of the collective unconscious", as well as socio-psychological concepts that can be used for its representation, in particular: "the concept of the social psyche" (A. Donchenko), "universal epochal cycle" (E. Afonina, A. Martynov), "socio-psychological thinking" (M. Sliusarevskyi) and the like. Secondly — an adequate understanding of both the horizon of possibilities of social archetypics, which is determined by its original ways of explanation and methods of analysis of difficult to grasp social phenomena, which can become a guide for further theoretical and empirical research, and theoretical and practical limitations of the archetypal approach. That is why social archetypics is positioned as an interdisciplinary area of research, which, in particular, can be effectively used at the initial-diagnostic stage of CM.

Social archetypics is not a universal scientific apparatus and unorthodox imitation of Yung ideas. Rather it is a scientific tool that allows to establish the laws and features of modern social development, to touch the deep nature of modern threats, to deal with a

wide range of new motives for human development, to anticipate the likely scenarios of the future, and most importantly — to offer a consensus vision of possible solutions to the key problems of present and future. Its practical application has considerable potential to provide an effective solution to urgent problems arising in the course of social transformation. And sometimes it is just a metaphor by which the researcher is invited to plunge into a broader psychosocial and socio-cultural context of social phenomena and processes. It is on the basis of these postulates that I propose to diagnose the societal crisis in Ukraine and determine its coordinate system.

We will proceed from the fact that the crisis is a natural phase in the development of any system. However, a protracted, chronic crisis is extremely dangerous and threatens the existence of any system. In social sciences, the crisis is understood as an acute form of manifestation of social contradictions, which makes the stable, sustainable development of society as a whole or its vital subsystems impossible. For this reason the concept of "social crisis" is used in broad and narrow meanings. In a broad sense, the concept of "social crisis" is defined by such a maxim: any crisis associated with the development of society can be considered to be a social one. They can be transformational, cyclical, systemic/structural, conjunctural, local, local, regional and the like. The concept of social crisis in a narrow sense is used in the differentiation of spheres of society. That is, we can talk about the economic, political, social, psychological crisis [8]. The concept of "systemic crisis" can be defined as

a combination of crises of economic, political, social, psychological nature, where the objectivity of the aggravation of the situation is combined with subjective factors expressed in the "crisis consciousness", which can be manifested both in the form of acute protest and in the form of political apathy and cynicism [9, p. 101]. In the case when crises covers social units of different levels, in their integral, system-wide sense — the whole society, its main systems and subsystems, institutions, relations and processes — we talk about the societal[1] crisis.

[1] The concept of "societal" appears in sociological theory at the turn of the XIX–XX centuries (V. Sumner, A. Keller, T. Parsons, P. Sorokin, etc.), when there was a need for concepts that can reflect the essence of a new wave of transformational processes at the macro level, but the tradition of using the term "social" in Western empirical sociology did not correspond to this task. American sociologist W. Sumner with the help of this term sought to identify patterns of certain collective or group organization of the individual. His pupil and follower of A. Keller usee this concept for the sociological analysis of the organizational aspects of society, seeking to build a comprehensive theory of societal evolution [10]. T. Parsons applies the concept of "societal", describing the processes that occur in society as a whole (macro level), that is, when it comes to characteristics, concepts and processes related to the level of society consolidation as a whole, and the concept of "social" — to social phenomena and processes (micro level). The specificity of society as a special type of social systems, according to T. Parsons, is that, on the one hand, it is a societal community with an adequate level of integration (or solidarity) and a characteristic status of membership, and on the other hand, a societal community is a complex network of interpenetrating groups and collective loyalties, a system characterized by differentiation and segmentation [11]. P. Sorokin writes about societal and cultural changes in

The concept of the "societal crisis" is multifaceted and ambiguous. To give a substantial justification of this term, first, apparently, it would be necessary to give an academic lecture on the course of sociology on "Society as a societal system", tracing the evolution of the use of this concept in the works of classics of Western sociological thought — E. Durkheim, M. Weber, T. Parsons, P. Sorokin, etc. Due to the lack of volume of the publication, I can note that the concept of "societal" is used in cases when it comes to the characteristics, concepts and processes related to the macro level of the functioning of society, and ensuring the preservation and integrity of society, consolidation and reconstruction of social life. At the societal level, the social system goes to a qualitatively different level of integration of the social system, therefore, in a generalized form, the societal system can be characterized by the formula: "integrity, which is much larger than the total number (amount) of elements forming it".

The societal system constantly reproduces the social quality of its structures and, accordingly, the social qualities of individuals and groups of individuals included in their functioning. If this process meets, let's say, the "ideal" (in M. Weber's understanding) rules of the game, there is a tendency to adapt to the forms and methods of functioning of the social system of its structural and personal elements, which together, respectively, form a new quality of the societal system, to have signs of distinct dynamics of its development (evolution, progress). If in the process of behavior of the societal system there is a "substitution" of functions, when the subjects of social relations included in the functioning of this system begin to perform unusual functions; or the "incompetence" of personal elements of this structure increases, as a result, the balance in the functioning of both structural and personal elements of the system is disturbed. In this case, the behavior of societal system becomes dysfunctional. Actually, both described tendencies of behavior of the societal system are dialectically connected with each other, these processes with one or another intensity permeate the society at all — from micro to macro-levels.

Despite the fact that the term "societal" firmly entrenched in the scientific thesaurus in the broad sense of system-wide, societal crisis is not reduced to a systemic social crisis, that is, it is not a reduction of the crisis of political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural. So, on the one hand, it arises as a result of the accumulation of systemic contradictions and absorbs all kinds of crises of a systemic nature, but on the other hand it is the personification of a structural crisis (institutions, goals or values), which affects other structural elements of the social system is the opposite effect of the crisis provoked by itself.

his four-volume monograph "Social and cultural changes" [12]. The scientist presents the social system as a macroscopic, integral and dynamic cultural and social complex and believes that it is composed of "personality, society and culture as an indissoluble triad". None of the components of this inseparable triad — the personality as a subject of interaction; the society as a set of interacting individuals with its socio-cultural relations and processes; the culture as a set of values and norms possessed by interacting persons, and a set of carriers that objectify, socialize and reveal these values — can not exist outside the other two components [13].

The societal crisis in Ukraine did not arise by chance and this is not an exceptional case of Ukrainian transformation. To clarify its semantic context, it should be recalled that with the destruction of the Soviet system, newly formed independent national states — the former Soviet republics — faced the need to radically reformat the socio-economic and political foundations and basic values of social organization in order to enter the country on new tracks of social and state development. In the most general sense, this meant a transition from a totalitarian political system of government to a democratic one, from a planned economy to a market one, from a single true Communist ideology to pluralism of opinions, from censorship to freedom of speech, from the values of collectivism to civil and political rights and freedoms, from paternalism to civil political culture, from command and administrative to civilized "rules of the game" and much more that highlights the global strategy of liberalization as a modification of relations between the state and civil society, and democratization, as a modification of the relationship between the state and the political community.

It is worth noting that the post-socialist transformation, which unfolds as a societal process, has as its consequence, first of all, the complications (multidimensionality) of social space. That is why the fundamental changes in the system of "man – society – state" affect the deployment of systemic dysfunction that comprehensively permeate the social sphere. The spread of their chain manifestations in various spheres of social life inevitably acquires reasoned character. In this regard, the parameters of the societal crisis, in my opinion, are quite naturally structured in relation to several dependent coordinate systems that discover relevant sections of the social crisis in Ukraine, namely:

• system coordinates revealed by the crisis of the main spheres of the social system: political, legal, economic, social, spiritual;

• structural coordinates, the poles of which are the crisis of institutions; crisis of interests and goals; crisis of values; crisis of identities;

• temporal coordinates reproducing crisis cycles of national-state development of Ukraine;

• socio-psychological coordinates, which allows us to consider the problem of crisis (mass) consciousness at the level of socio-psychological phenomena (the dominant type of social experiences and forms of socio-psychological thinking).

Contour two-dimensional model of societal crisis (system-structural coordinates). In its system-structural coordinates, the societal crisis has two dimensions: one direction is presented as a crisis of the main spheres of the social system: politically legal, economic, social, spiritual; the second as a crisis of its main structural components: institutional crisis (deformation — disintegration); value crisis (conflict – leveling), crisis of interests and goals (collision – struggle); crisis of identity (polarization – erosion). Systemic and structural crises are interrelated and interdependent, they form a dense connection of systemic dysfunctions, passing from one plane to another. Some arise in the course of direct changes in the main spheres of public life (the main of them

are: economic crisis, political and legal, socio-cultural, derived from them, partial — financial, parliamentary, party, migration, information, etc.), others — arise due to disproportion in the development of its segments in the course of structural changes and transformations. Crisis manifestations acquire their expression at two main levels: institutional and value levels, which are closely interlinked. Their continuation and addition is the conflict of interests and the conflict of identities. Unresolved socially important problems inevitably give rise to conflicts, and unresolved conflicts lead to a systemic crisis. In turn, the unresolved systemic crisis causes new outbreaks of conflicts, which leads to another round of systemic crisis. Institutions, values, interests and identities are equivalent to all subsystems and spheres of social life, providing social integrity of society, and, accordingly, constitute a subsystem (structural) components of the social crisis: institutional crisis, crisis of values, crisis of interests and crisis of identities.

Cyclic model of societal crisis (*temporal coordinates*). The wave-like nature of national processes, with tides, the increase of crisis phenomena and their overcoming makes it possible to systematize the time rhythms and periods of the social crisis in Ukraine in the appropriate temporal coordinates[2].

_____
2 The concept of "temporality" is applied, according to M. Heidegger, in the ontological aspect, as the horizon of understanding of being, which becomes clear only in the horizon of temporality [16]. In this sense, the concept of temporality is not identical to the concept of physical time: physical time must be strictly distinguished from the ontological time, i.e. the changeability of being.

The latter, in fact, coincide with the terms of the presidential cadences [14] and have a wave-like (cyclic) dynamics of changes in the trends of "democratic advancement" and "authoritarian rollback", which characterizes the current system-wide crisis state of development of society and the state [15]. In the transition stages of development of complex social systems, changes in socio-political trajectories in two cardinal aspects — the system of values and institutional structure — can guide the further development of the social system both towards democracy and towards autocracy. However, a rather thorny path of democratic reform shows that in the process of social transformation fundamental changes occur not only at the external — socio-institutional level of the social system, but also in the deep structures of the mental life of people. We can say that the measure of weakening or strengthening of authoritarian tendencies and, accordingly, strengthening or weakening of democratic principles in the course of systemic transformations is determined in general by the ratio of psychosocial, socio-cultural and institutional components. In fact, this circumstance allows us to comprehend the specifics of the deployment of the social crisis in Ukraine in temporal coordinates, since it is in this perspective — at the level of building a democratic state, the formation of civil society and the formation of a new social identity — that institutional, socio-cultural and psychosocial features of transformational changes in Ukrainian society and the state are becoming more familiar [see: 15; 17].

Socio-psychological model of societal crisis (socio-psychological coordi-

nates). Socio-psychological interpretation of the societal crisis in Ukraine allows one to plunge into a broader psychosocial and socio-cultural context of social phenomena and processes that impede the course of the Ukrainian nation- and state creation, and to carry out its "archetypal reconstruction". Under the conditions of cardinal societal changes, the manifestation of which is, in particular, a societal crisis, there is an accentuation of archetypal programs of the conflict (the term D. Lvov [18]). The latter can bring both potential elements of destabilization and latent means of integration and optimization of the social system. However, since the archetype organizes and structures a "pattern" in which various specific fillings can be embedded, it can perform both stabilizing and destabilizing functions in society. For example, cultural stereotypes, aggressive clichés, sometimes outright hostility and the like are able to penetrate so deeply into the mass (collective) consciousness/unconsciousness, become the formula of "thinking" of people about themselves and "actions", according to a given program. In other words, they turn into a form of socio-psychological thinking that contains conflict potential. That is, we interpret the archetypal program of the conflict as a form of socio-psychological thinking, containing the conflictological potential and requiring its deactivation. Accordingly, it can be assumed that the value orientations that embody the vision of the desired future and feed on the principles of human creative activity, are also rooted in the mass (collective) consciousness/unconscious, and therefore constitute the archetype

of the consolidation program as a form of SPM, containing the nation-forming factor potential and requires its activation [see: 19].

So, now we need to explain the principle by which in certain coordinates complex (multifactorial), contradictory (multi-vector) and dynamic design of the social crisis in Ukraine is recreated, where each phenomenon can be considered as the cause and as a consequence of the conflict-confrontational trends of national-state development of Ukraine. To do this, I offer the reader a little mental exercise. Let us imagine several different items from our everyday life: a telescopic tumbler, consisting according to the principle of an accordion of rings of different diameters, which when unfolding form a sealed cone-shaped cup; matrioshka which is folded/unfolded based on the principle of the location of one figure inside another, which, in turn, is inside the third, etc.; children's toy — a pyramid that folds/unfolds consisting of the rings based on the principle of the largest to the smallest; finally — volume puzzles of varying complexity and configuration, that provide a complete picture of the subject of modeling and develop spatial thinking.

Next, let us try to make a 3-D projection of the societal crisis in Ukraine based on the principle of creating a system of each new level of societal crisis from the systems of the previous level and previous levels. Let us start with its deepest socio-psychological coordinates, presented through the archetype of the conflict program, that reveals the features of the crisis (mass) consciousness at the level of socio-psychological phenomena (the dominant type of so-

cial experiences and forms of socio-psychological thinking) and relevant practices. Next, move through the temporal coordinates of the societal crisis, reproducing the crisis processes of national and state development of Ukraine, where at the level of building a democratic state, the formation of civil society and the formation of a new social identity institutional, socio-cultural and psychosocial features of transformational changes in Ukrainian society and state become more distinct. In the end, go through the system-structural coordinates, represented by the crisis of the main spheres of the social system: politically legal, economic, social, spiritual, the poles of which are the crisis of institutions; crisis of interests and goals; crisis of values; crisis of identities.

Now try to make an instant "snapshot" of societal crisis in Ukraine, presented, on the one hand, mythologems — ideologemes of the "split Ukraine" and "dichotomist Ukrainian national identity" reflecting polarization of the Ukrainian society (one can provide other examples: the case of N. Savchenko, Saga of M. Saakashvili, the phantom of the servant of the people), on the other hand — pulsars of presidential races that absolutize the confrontation of cognitive and affective, rational and irrational, real and ideal, conscious and unconscious in public discourse, which revealed, on the third hand, the complete weakness of institutional, value, ideological and even self-cherished foundations of national-state development of Ukraine. This is how (in the first approximation) now a societal crisis in Ukraine looks like.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. Anti-crisis policy, especially in the realities of modern Ukraine, can be really effective — that is, able to bring the country out of the existing, extremely unfavorable situation on the rails of sustainable development — only if it is really systemic. In other words, it does not respond to individual crises, but takes into account the totality of the crises that we are dealing with, as well as the causes that have prompted them and may have common roots.

Each of the crisis sections described above characterizes a very specific side of the societal crisis, which can be considered both in relative autonomy and in close interdependence with its other parties. Being combined in each new slice the components of societal crisis play new roles. Accordingly, in their totality they form a complex (multifactorial), contradictory (multi-vector) and dynamic architectonics of the societal crisis in Ukraine, where each phenomenon (its structuring component) can be considered as the cause and as a consequence of the conflict-confrontational trends of national-state development of Ukraine. In fact, we have a multi-factor model of the societal crisis in Ukraine, which reveals the dialectics of consolidation and confrontation of the Ukrainian nation, and which is structured by a number of derivative models, consistently inherit its crisis sections.

Let us note, that in its parameters — a system of positive (consolidation) and negative (deconsolidation) values, space-temporal and system-structural elements — the analytical design of the social crisis is close to its analogues in the exact sciences (for example, in cartography), that is, provides frames of reference of these data to the corresponding coordinate sys-

tem, allows them to coordinate with other data, to carry out their projection with the highest possible accuracy, as well as a wide-profile diagnosis and examination in real time and a specific location. Accordingly, with respect to this coordinate system, it makes sense to develop a road map of the CM for the purpose of national unity and consolidation of Ukrainian society in general and minimization of confrontational manifestations in particular.

When developing anti-crisis strategies, it should be remembered that the fundamental difference between the latest crises and their classical versions is the cumulative effect of the combination and mutual strengthening of dysfunctions that occur in completely different areas and have a different nature. If the anti-crisis measures proposed by experts/managers are designed exclusively to overcome the crisis situation and at the same time to ignore other negative processes that, although occurring simultaneously, have a different nature, such anti-crisis solutions may not gain the desired effect.

The social archetypics should be included in the pool of diagnostic approaches of CM. Now it is obvious that implicit meanings, carried through the depths of the unconscious and time, not only contain and store vital information, but also act as deep stimuli. For example, in the transition of socio-cultural mythology in the plane of political urological structures and collective representations become part of the socio-political everyday life with its symbolic, mythological, ritual and ceremonial forms addressed to the mass conscious and unconscious. Hence, in fact, an extremely thin line originates

that lies between the art of harmonizing goals, principles, ideals and the art of manipulation and substitution of meanings, values, ideas. The violation of this border opens the way for manifestation of spontaneous mass unconscious. In this case, there is a situation when rational consciousness, which operates by analysis, logic, comparison, search for differences, checking information and reflexive testing of its own grounds, enters into an open struggle with the manifestations of the unconscious, where other tools work: analogy, identification, emotions, non-contradiction to contradictions, image, synthesis. Among them there is no reflection, which contributes to the lack of control of its existence [20, p. 25].

The prospect of further research will determine a number of tasks related to the analysis in the coordinates of the societal crisis of the current national- and state processes in Ukraine, and the further development of psychologically sound strategies and technologies of crisis management, which will improve the ability of the state-management bodies foк the perspective vision and strategic thinking, to enrich the possibility of social forecasting and social design in strategic planning of sustainable development, the modeling of variable scenarios of social and state development, the design and adjustment of the course of political and socio-economic reforms.

REFERENCES

1. *Korotkov E. M.* (2014) Antykryzysnoe upravlenye [Crisis management]. Moskva: Yurait [in Russ.]
2. *Zub A. T.* (2014) Antykryzysnoe upravlenye [Crisis management]. Moskva: Yurait [in Russ.]

3. *Rymarenko S.* (2017) Hlobalizatsiia ta kryza identychnosti [Globalization and identity crisis]. Naukovi zapysky IIIEND NAN Ukraint — Scientific Proceedings of the Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies. Ivan Kuras NAS Ukraine, 5–6 (91–92), 171–181. [in Ukrainian].

4. *Babich A. O.* (2009) Formuvannia kontseptsii derzhavnoho antykryzovoho upravlinnia v Ukraini [Forming of conception of state antikrisis administration in Ukraine]. Derzhavne budivnytstvo — State building, 1. Retrieved from: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/DeBu_2009_1_6, [in Ukrainian].

5. *Sushyi O. V.* (2018) Sotsialna arkhetypika yak metodolohichnyi pidkhid do piznannia masovoho (kolektyvnoho) nesvidomoho [Social archetypica as a methodological approach to the knowledge of the mass (collective) unconscious]. Sotsialno-psykholohichne myslennia: heneza, osnovni formy ta perspektyvy rozvytku — Socio-psychological thinking: genesis, basic forms and prospects of development, (p. 107–125). Kropyvnytskyi : Imeks-LTD [in Ukrainian].

6. *Sushy O. V.* (2018) Sotsialna arkhetypika u problemnomu poli publichnoho upravlinnia: suchasnyi stan i perspektyvy rozvytku [Social archetypic in the public administration field problem: contemporary state and prospects of development]. Publichne uriaduvannia — Public management, 4 (14), 325–338 [in Ukrainian].

7. *Sushyi O. V.* (2016) Teoretychni zasady sotsialnoi arkhetypyky [Theoretical basis of social arhetypiky]. Publichne uriaduvannia — Public management, 3 (4), 168–180 [in Ukrainian].

8. *Protasenko Y. N.* (2002) Kryzys, obschestvo y hosudarstvo [Crisis, society and state]. Sotsyalnыi kryzys y sotsyalnaia katastrofa — Social Crisis and Social Disaster. (151–156). St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg Philosophical Society [in Russ.].

9. Kruhlyi stol fakulteta polytolohyy MHU [Round Table Of The Political Science Faculty, Moscow State University], Shestopal Ye. B., Urnov M. Yu., Komarovsky V. S., Mezhuyev B. V., Fedosov P. A., Salutskiy A. S., et al. (2009). Kryzys v zerkale polytycheskoi psykholohyy [The crisis in the mirror of political psychology]. Polys. Polytycheskye yssledovanyia — Polis. Political Studies, 5. [in Russ.].

10. *Keller A. G.* (1915). Societal Evolution: A Study of the Evolutionary Basis of the Science ofSociety by Albert Galloway Keller. Science, New Series, 42(1084), 498–499. [in En.].

11. *Parsons T.* (1998) Systema sovremennykh obschestv [The system of modern societies]. Moskva: Aspekt Press [in Russ.].

12. *Sorokyn P. A.* (2017) Sotsyalnaia y kulturnaia dynamyka [Social and cultural dynamics]. Moskva: Akademycheskyi proekt [in Russ.].

13. *Sorokyn P. A.* (1992) Chelovek. Tsyvylyzatsyia. Obschestvo [Person. Civilization. Society]. Moskva: Polytyzdat [in Russ.].

14. *Voynalovych V., Biloshitskiy S.* (2013) Konsensusno-kompromisni vidnosyny iz suspilstvom u praktytsi suchasnoi ukrainskoi derzhavy: tendentsii, problemy, shliakhy harmonizatsii [Consensual and compromise relationships with the society in practice of the modern Ukrainian state: tendencies, problems, ways of harmonization]. Naukovi zapysky IIIEND NAN Ukraint — Scientific Proceedings of the Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies. Ivan Kuras NAS Ukraine, 6 (68), 29–31 [in Ukrainian].

15. *Afonin E. A., Sushyi O. V.* (2015) Zakonomirnosti ta osoblyvosti ukrainskoi suspilnoi transformatsii [Ukrainian laws and features transformation].

Stratehichna panorama — Strategic panorama, 1, 94–108 [in Ukrainian].

16. *Khaidehher M.* (2001) Osnovnye problemy fenomenolohii [The main problems of phenomenology]. St. Petersburg: Vysshaia relihiozno-filosofskaia shkola [in Russ.].

17. *Sushyi O. V.* (2012) Psykhosotsialna kultura derzhavnoho upravlinnia : monohrafiia [Psychosocial culture of public administration]. Kyiv: Svitohliad [in Ukrainian].

18. *Lvov D. V.* (2012) Arkhetypycheskaia sostavliaiuschaia orhanyzatsyonnoi kultury [Archetypical component of organizational culture]. Krasnoiarsk [in Russ.].

19. *Sushyi O. V.* (2017) Hlybynni ryfy ukrainskoho natsiietvorennia: arkhetypna prohrama konfliktu [Deep rifes of ukrainian nation-building: Archetypal program of conflict]. Problemy politychnoi psykholohii — Problems of political psychology, 5 (19), 103–121. [in Ukrainian].

20. *Sykevych Z. V., Krokynskaia O. K., Possel Yu. A.* (2005) Sotsyalnoe bessoznatelnoe: sotsyolohycheskyi y sotsyalno psykholohycheskyi aspekty [Social unconscious: sociological and socio-psychological aspects]. St. Peterburh: Pyter [in Russ.].

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Коротков Э. М.* Антикризисное управление: учеб. для бакалавров / Э. М. Коротков. — М. : Юрайт, 2014. — 406 с.

2. *Зуб А. Т.* Антикризисное управление : учеб. для бакалавров / А. Т. Зуб. — М.: Юрайт, 2014. — 343 с.

3. *Римаренко С.* Глобалізація та криза ідентичності / С. Ю. Римаренко // Наукові записки ІПіЕНД НАН Україн. — 2017. — Вип. 5–6 (91–92). — С. 171–181.

4. *Бабич А. О.* Формування концепції державного антикризового управління в Україні [Електронний ресурс] / А. О. Бабич. // Державне будівництво. — 2009. — № 1. — Режим доступу: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/DeBu_2009_1_6

5. *Суший О. В.* Соціальна архетипіка як методологічний підхід до пізнання масового (колективного) несвідомого / О. В.Суший // Соціально-психологічне мислення: генеза, основні форми та перспективи розвитку: [монографія] / [М. М. Слюсаревський, В. В. Жовтянська, О. В. Суший, В. О. Татенко та ін.]; за наук. ред. М. М. Слюсаревського. — Кропивницький : Імекс-ЛТД, 2018. — 296 с.

6. *Суший О. В.* Соціальна архетипіка у проблемному полі публічного управління: сучасний стан і перспективи розвитку / О. В. Суший // Публічне урядування. — 2018. — № 4 (14). — С. 325–338.

7. *Суший О. В.* Теоретичні засади соціальної архетипики / О. В. Суший // Публічне урядування. — 2016. — № 3 (4). — С. 168–180.

8. *Протасенко И. Н.* Кризис, общество и государство / И. Н. Протасенко // Социальный кризис и социальная катастрофа / Сб. материалов конф. — СПб.: Санкт-Петербургское философ. об-во, 2002. — С. 151–156.

9. Кризис в зеркале политической психологии: Круглый стол факультета политологии МГУ / Е. Б. Шестопал, М. Ю. Урнов, В. С. Комаровский, Б. В. Межуев и др. // Полис. Политические исследования. — 2009. — № 5. — С. 99–127.

10. *Keller A. G.* Societal Evolution: A Study of the Evolutionary Basis of the Science of Society by Albert Galloway Keller / A. G. Keller // Science, New Series. — Vol. 42. — № 1084 (Oct. 8, 1915). — P. 498–499.

11. *Парсонс Т.* Система современных обществ / Т. Парсонс. — М.: Аспект Пресс, 1998. — 270 с.

12. *Сорокин П. А.* Социальная и культурная динамика / П. А. Соркин. — М.: Академ. проект, 2017. — 964 с.

13. *Сорокин П. А.* Человек. Цивилизация. Общество / П. А. Сорокин. — М.: Политиздат, 1992. — 543 с.

14. *Войналович В. А., Білошицький С. В.* Консенсусно-компромісні відносини із суспільством у практиці сучасної української держави: тенденції, проблеми, шляхи гармонізації / В. А. Войналович, С. В. Білошицький // Наук. записки ін-ту політ. і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України. — 2013. — № 6 (68). — С. 29–31.

15. *Афонін Е. А., Суший О. В.* Закономірності та особливості української суспільної трансформації / Е. А. Афонін, О. В. Суший // Стратегічна панорама : Наук.-практ. журнал. — 2015. — № 1. — С. 94–108.

16. *Хайдеггер М.* Основные проблемы феноменологии / М. Хайдеггер; пер. с нем. А. Г. Чернякова. — СПб.: Высш. религиозно-философская шк., 2001. — 446 с.

17. *Суший О. В.* Психосоціальна культура державного управління : монографія / О. В. Суший. — К. : Світогляд, 2012. — 344 с.

18. *Львов Д. В.* Архетипическая составляющая организационной культуры : автореф. дис. ... канд. филос. наук / Д. В. Львов. — Красноярск, 2012. — 22 с.

19. *Суший О. В.* Глибинні рифи українського націєтворення: архетипна програма конфлікту / О. В. Суший // Проблеми політичної психології. — 2017. — № 5 (19). — С. 103–121.

20. *Сикевич З. В.* Социальное бессознательное: социологический и социально психологический аспекты / З. В. Сикевич, О. К. Крокинская, Ю. А. Поссель. — СПб.: Питер, 2005. — 266 с.