

UDC 159.92+ 159.923+ 1(44)(092)

**Sobolnikov Valery Vasilyevich,**

*Doctor of Psychology, Professor, Professor of the Department of General Psychology and History of Psychology, Employee of the scientific laboratory "Archetypal and addictive identity", NSPU, Russian Federation, 630126, Novosibirsk, Str. Viliuiska, 28, tel: +7 (905) 951 1047, e-mail: vsobolnikovis@gmail.com*

ORCID: 0000-0002-5880-7283

**Собольников Валерій Васильович,**

*доктор психологічних наук, професор, професор кафедри загальної психології та історії психології, співробітник наукової лабораторії "Архетипна й адиктивна ідентичність", НДПУ, Російська Федерація, 630126, м. Новосибірськ, вул. Виллюйська, 28, тел.: +7 (905) 951 1047, e-mail: vsobolnikovis@gmail.com*

ORCID: 0000-0002-5880-7283

**Собольников Валерий Васильевич,**

*доктор психологических наук, профессор, профессор кафедры общей психологии и истории психологии, сотрудник научной лаборатории "Архетипическая и аддиктивная идентичность", НГПУ, Российская Федерация, 630126, Новосибирск, ул. Виллюйская, 28, тел.: +7 (905) 951 1047, e-mail: vsobolnikovis@gmail.com*

ORCID: 0000-0002-5880-7283

DOI <https://doi.org/10.31618/vadnd.v1i14.121>



---

## THE UNCONSCIOUS AS A SOURCE OF THE ARCHETYPE OF EUROPE: THE DISCOURSE OF NOMADISM IN THE CONCEPT OF M. MAFFESOLI

**Abstract.** The article explores the collective unconscious that has become understandable as the basis, which presumably through archetypes determines the specificity of the development of the European mentality. Our discourse as a mechanism is a field continuum where the archetypes of the collective unconscious are primary, and the specific interpretation and modification of the primary to the common meanings, the collective European mentality and the different plan of the semantic communications are secondary. The divergence of the paradigm shift between the epochs of modernity and postmodern quite accurately demonstrates the concept of Michel Maffesoli, penetrated by the institutionalism

of romance. Presented in the teachings of nomadism reveals a new social practice, addressed to European culture. Allocating him the archetypal content as a source of social transformation of the new community necessitated the analysis of a number of conceptual ideas of nomadism on a fragmentary level. It should be emphasized that the term “nomads” and its international synonym for “nomads” do not have a unique use, but in psychology it is used to refer to a pathology based on an irrational one. The subject of the study was the phenomenon of nomadism, which is not only a clear way of life, but also an opportunity to search for the basics of further research into the specifics of civilizational development. As conditions for the genesis of this process are analyzed: the field of social life of nomads; the formation of a community in the form of a nomadic form of existence; the transformation of an identity with mobile properties; the process of destruction, understood as a transition from destruction, but not to death, but to rebirth; etc.

**Keywords:** nomadism, identity, closeness, freedom; alienation, nomadism, modernity, postmodernity, subjectivity, collective unconscious, irrational, archetypes, destructive processes, archetype, discourse.

### **НЕСВІДОМЕ ЯК ДЖЕРЕЛО АРХЕТИПУ ЄВРОПИ: ДИСКУРС НОМАДИЗМУ В КОНЦЕПЦІЇ М. МАФФЕСОЛІ**

**Анотація.** Досліджується колективне несвідоме, що стало зрозумілим, як підстава, що, можливо, обумовлює через архетипи специфіку розвитку європейської ментальності. Закладений нами дискурс як механізм являє собою польовий континуум, де первинним є архетипи колективного несвідомого, а вторинними специфічна інтерпретація і модифікація первинного в загальні смисли, колективну європейську ментальність і різного плану смислові комунікації. Розбіжність парадигмального зсуву між епохами Модерну й Постмодерну досить точно демонструє пронизана інституціоналізмом романтики концепція М. Маффесолі. Представлений в навчанні номадизм розкриває нову соціальну практику, звернену до європейської культури. Виділення ним архетипного змісту як джерела соціальної трансформації нової спільноти зумовило необхідність аналізу низки концептуальних ідей кочівництва на фрагментарному рівні. Слід підкреслити, що поняття “кочівники” і його міжнародний синонім “Номади” не мають однозначного вживання, а в психології використовується для позначення патології, в основі якої знаходиться ірраціональне. Предметом дослідження став феномен номадизму, що не лише являє собою виразний шлях життєдіяльності, а й відкриває можливості пошуку методологічних засад організації подальших досліджень. Як умови генези розвитку цього процесу аналізуються поле соціального буття Номад, розвиток суспільства у вигляді номадної форми існування, трансформація ідентичності, яка має рухливі властивості, ймовірнісний процес деструкції, який розуміється як перехід від руйнування, але не до смерті, а відродження тощо.

**Ключові слова:** кочівництво, ідентичність, близькість, свобода, відчуження, номадизм, Модерн, Постмодерн, суб'єктність, колективне несвідоме, архетипи, деструктивні процеси, архетип, дискурс.

## БЕССОЗНАТЕЛЬНОЕ КАК ИСТОЧНИК АРХЕТИПА ЕВРОПЫ: ДИСКУРС НОМАДИЗМА В КОНЦЕПЦИИ М. МАФФЕСОЛИ

**Аннотация.** Исследуется ставшее понятным коллективное бессознательное как основание, которое предположительно через архетипы обуславливает специфику развития европейской ментальности. Заложенный нами дискурс как механизм, представляет собой полевой континуум, где первичным являются архетипы коллективного бессознательного, а вторичными специфическая интерпретация и модификация первичного в общие смыслы, коллективную европейскую ментальность и различного плана смысловые коммуникации. Расхождение парадигмального сдвига между эпохами Модерна и Постмодерна достаточно точно демонстрирует пронизанная институционализмом романтики концепция М. Маффесоли. Представленный в учении номадизм раскрывает новую социальную практику, обращенную к европейской культуре. Выделение им архетипического содержания как источника социальной трансформации нового сообщества обусловили потребность анализа ряда концептуальных идей кочевничества на фрагментарном уровне. Следует подчеркнуть, что понятие “кочевники” и его международный синоним “номады” не имеют однозначного употребления, а в психологии используется для обозначения патологии в основе, которой находится иррациональное. Предметом исследования стал феномен номадизма, представляющий собой не только явственный путь жизнедеятельности, но и открывающий возможности поиска методологических основ организации дальнейших исследований. В качестве условий генезиса развития этого процесса анализируется поле социального бытия Номад, формирование сообщества в виде номадной формы существования, трансформация идентичности, обладающей подвижными свойствами, вероятностный процесс деструкции, понимаемый как переход от разрушения, но не к смерти, а возрождению и т. д.

**Ключевые слова:** кочевничество, идентичность, близость, свобода, отчуждение, номадизм, Модерн, Постмодерн, субъектность, коллективное бессознательное, архетипы, деструктивные процессы, архетип, дискурс.

---

**Statement of the problem.** The state of modern thought can be characterized as a search for ways to resolve contradictions and the development of mankind, based on the divergence between the epochs of Modernity and Postmodernity. Our discourse as a mechanism is a field continuum where the archetypes of the collective unconscious are primary, and the specific interpretation

and modification of the primary to the common meanings, the collective European mentality and the different plan of the semantic communications are secondary. Researchers everywhere resort to definitions of “archetype” and “collective unconscious”, which serve as original cognitive patterns: the intuitive grasp of the archetype precedes the instinctive action. It is not by chance

that in the European mentality along with the archetypes “Great Mother” and “Great Father”, the archetype of Europe plays an important role. The binary nature of archetypes from their totality to the archetype-empire reveals a trend of gravitation towards the formation of a united Europe. At the same time, the process takes place in very difficult conditions, where the result is not fully understood. In fact, the conflict between Modernity and Postmodernity is carried out within the framework of two mentality and the struggle against repressiveness and totalitarianism for tolerance, pluralism, psychologism, etc. The process of mythologizing of mass consciousness (increasing the number of subcultures, tribalization of society, etc.) draws our attention on a number of conceptual provisions of the theory of Michel Maffesoli [1]. The problem of contradictions between the real life of small social groups and the world of ideological structures of power is considered, in his opinion, a sign of the emergence of a new sociality. One of its manifestations is the phenomenon of nomadism, which is not only a clear way of life, but also the possibility of searching for methodological foundations and principles for studying the specifics of civilizational development. Studying the problem of nomadism in the framework of the concept of M. Maffesoli actualizes the issues we are considering.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** The phenomenon of nomadism in European civilization is considered as one of the central problems of nomadology (nomadism), the subject of which was the “nomadic way of life”, understood as a special kind of

producing economy [2, p. 83–84]. At the same time, not every kind of mobile life, denying the attitude towards the producing economy, can be attributed to nomadism. The origin of Homo sapiens with the process of formation of nomadism is associated with time: from the end of the Paleolithic, the Mesolithic, to the Neolithic period. As it developed, nomadism (wandering life) spread from the Atlantic to China and from East Africa to Siberia [3, p. 171–182]. In general, if the Eurasian nomadism arose in the 4<sup>th</sup>–1<sup>st</sup> millennium BC. E., in Southern Europe nomadism was formed only in the initial period of the Neolithic (IV–III centuries BC) [4].

An analysis of the existing literature on nomadism was reflected in the works of L. Gumilev, I. Zlatkin, G. Markov, A. Khazanov, E. Gelner, L. Kreider, V. Koenig, and others. The works of researchers emphasize the connection of nomadism with the development of civilization, and it is perceived as an important factor in the development of mankind. Since the 90’s of the last century, as a result of a rethinking of the methodological foundations and the scientific paradigm, new approaches to the problems of nomadism in the works of N. Krudin, V. Trepavlov, N. Masanov, S. Vasyutin, K. Ahsanov and others were found. Much attention is paid to the problem being analyzed by the works of foreign researchers Z. Bauman, J. Baudrillard, G. Deborah, J. Deleuze, F. Guattari and others. When carrying out an analysis of the nature of nomadism by J. Deleuze and F. Guattari the perspective of the concept of this phenomenon is looking through. The analogy between nomads and “tribes”,

conducted by M. Maffesoli, is becoming more obvious.

The study of the work of a number of researchers convinces that the main function of nomads is the ability to constantly evolve and the desire to change and renew the thinking of its representatives. With the advent of the nomadic way of life in the history of mankind, there were opportunities for development through the seizure of new territories and their subsequent introduction into production turnover [5]. Simultaneously, the creation of ethnocontact groups led to the emergence of dialects, and then to the formation of conditions for the subsequent division of labor and trade. At the same time, it should be noted that the social system perceived the nomads as “the scourge and punishment of God”, and their members as savage barbarians bearing destruction and death. Obviously, a separate way of life encouraged nomads to be the most mobile, develop new technologies, deal with exchange, generate dialects, etc. [cf. 6]. However, the further evolution of nomadism led to the fact that at the turn of the XIV–XV centuries, under the blows of emerging capitalism, the nomadic system disintegrated.

In general, for the European population, the world of nomads remained a phenomenon incomprehensible, largely closed, little explored, a kind of “terra incognita”. The reflection of the nomadic culture became a centaur – a mythical creature, a semi-human-half-horse, which was perceived as the ideal synthesis of man and beast. The origin of this image researchers attributed to the II millennium B.C.E. (Babylon). Nomads, who came from Iran around 1750 B.C.E. in the boundaries of his

empire erected stone statues of guardian gods, including centaurs. Ancient description of them as a frenzied, desired union of animals, direct our view to the dark side of the female archetype. The “program” inherent in it goes deep into the collective unconscious and the past of mankind. Verification of it can be a gender-archetypal analysis of the process, which confirms the existence in the mental strata of the archetypes “Great Mother – Great Father” and the world of centaurs interacting with them [7].

The mythical characters of Hellenic culture draw us into the animal nature of the unconscious long before it becomes possible to really touch the higher, the divine. As an archetype, a centaur represents a certain part of the wild that is not subject to consciousness control. The only “right direction was to descend into this underworld, which can allow you to emerge enlightened” [8, p. 80–81]. J. T. Toshchenko, exploring the phenomenon of centaur-culture, reveals its destructive nature. In modern conditions, he believes, under the influence of the centaur-culture, the world culture is disintegrated, everywhere replaced by ersatz, quasi- and pseudocultures. In their aspirations to the truth and the need to replace the old content with new ones, fragments of the centaur-culture that set the destructive process are being introduced into real life. It is woven of elements that represent contradictory processes in the development of culture, which exploit, but not always directly, by opposing to unnatural manifestations, various low-taste tastes, aspirations and orientations” [9, p. 172].

**The wording of the purpose of the article:** Problem statement and the analysis of the latest publications determined the purpose of the study. In the context of the foregoing, the goal of this work is to highlight the archetypal discourse of the collective unconscious as a spiritual infrastructure and the driving force of the social transformations of the new community.

**Statement of the main material.** The competition of the paradigms of modernism and postmodernism in Europe generates a high degree of uncertainty [10] in the process of discourse recognition of predictable (unpredictable) events. Psychological understanding of situational (dispositional) factors of subjective uncertainty actualizes various contexts of personal self-determination. As a result, this kind of socialization leads to the allocation of a special group of people (digital nomad – digital nomadism), which conducts a “mobile lifestyle”, constantly changing places of residence and uses digital technologies to perform their professional duties” [11, p. 141]. Staying “in constant movement becomes a way of life, where a person finds the whole “world” [12, p. 16].

At the same time, the transition to a new state is accompanied by an obvious change in the former ways of existence of the individual and the formation of other ways of life. Man, like the community as a whole, will undergo uncertainty testing for “fragility” and “anti-fragility”. At the same time, the need to search for the humanitarian component of the integration of the systems “man-man” and “man-artificial intelligence” will intensify. The problems of identity in the digital age, digi-

tal inequality, socio-cultural forecasting and the construction of the future will become fully apparent. It is not by chance, investigating the problems of the newly emerging community of the postmodern era, M. Maffesoli in many ways connects it with the influence of archetypes of the collective unconscious. The totality of his archetypes becomes, he believes, “the building material” for the development of the society of the future [13].

The presence of a deep layer of the psyche in mankind as a collective unconscious allows us to present the content of the latter through archetypes in the form of “innate ideas, or tendencies to organize experience within the framework of congenital definite patterns” [14, p. 9]. The results of analysis of experimental and clinical studies, ancient myths, customs and rituals, religious teachings, etc., conducted by C. G. Jung [15], showed the existence of a collective unconscious. In fact, the latter is the layer of the psychic that resulted from the evolution of the biological species “man” in the form of a concentrated experience of all mankind in the form of archetypes. At the same time, the scientist realizes theoretical comprehension and attempts to identify and substantiate the central archetype linking all the elements of the psyche into a single whole. For C. Jung, the unconscious (“It”) and the consciousness (“I”) exist in different parameters, therefore, “self” becomes a significant carrier of the integrity of the psyche, a reflection of the principle of totality of the individual. Therefore, “the problem of the unconscious, Foucault stressed, its capabilities, status, mode of existence, as well as the know-



ledge and means necessary for it, is not an internal, accidental problem of the humanities, but, in fact, the problem of its existence" [16, p. 17].

In general, the perspectives of archetypal psychology require a deeper understanding of subjectivity. The unconsciousness of archetypes gives rise to the uncertainty and infinity of their semantic structure, creating a certain field for their realization and interpretation. The person, M. Maffesoli believes, disappears, and "the individual, detached from his connections", explodes "to expand the boundaries of his subjectivity: "Himself" in the tribe, "himself" in nature, "himself" in religion" [17]. Subjectivity as a category reflects the active position of man in the world and occupies a special place in modern psychology. In essence, discovering in its basis an integral characterization of human activity, the energy side of his psychic organization provides an individual activity-transforming way of being. At the same time, its active-transforming function, which has a clearly expressed authorial character, determines the attitude to life as a personal problem, and to itself as a creator. Therefore, the work of the individual on the path to the "creator", according to M. Maffesoli, is carried out in process of creation by him of conditions of definition of the law for the actions outside. The latter is fixed at the level of the appearance of a new value – the integrity of the being. In the new society, in his opinion, the spirit of creativity begins to prevail, the creative and aesthetic basis of life activity is formed [18].

Agreeing with the above, it makes sense to return to the analysis of the archetypal unconscious underlying the

formation of subjectivity of the individual. Being in the form of concentrated experience of mankind in the form of archetypes, the collective unconscious guides us to the necessity of their perception. The synthesized categories of archetypes as nuclear structures that have abstract oppositions give not only a certain form to the content of the psyche, but also the possibility of activating a certain type of perception and action. C. G. Jung, in this connection, stressed that if "the situation corresponding to a given archetype occurs, this archetype becomes active, coercion appears which, like an instinctual attraction, paves its way in spite of all reason and will or produces a pathological conflict, i.e. neurosis" [19, p. 142–143]. At the same time, a lot of opposing tendencies coexist or are twofold, and therefore the possibility of destructive behavior is always revealed. The genesis of this phenomenon is revealed as a variant of realization in the consciousness of the sociocultural potential of an archetype that is able to identify, manifest and formalize certain images in the mind of the individual.

The existing reality using images and symbols to synthesize the destructive experience of human generations, in essence, prepares the conditions for personal regression. At the rupture of contradictions, a negative identity, with a different system of needs, abilities and beliefs and individual history, and destructive behavior towards subjects with a positive identity begin to form. At the same time, a connection is found between destructive changes and the archeization of socio-psychological structures. Their aspiration for forms that have developed in a sim-

plified version and in simpler conditions is perceptible. This can lead to inadequate perception of the current time and incoming information and to strengthen the process of process de-structurization. The greatest interest in this regard is the possible transformation of one of the central concepts of psychoanalysis, such as "attraction". Within the theory of drives, attraction is the desire to satisfy the weakly conscious (unconscious) needs, which are the primary source of action and behavior. Quite often it is manifested in destruction (to death), aggression, complexes of sadomasochism, Oedipus and Electra, archetypes of Anima/Animus. Moreover, attraction as a motivation can arise by the type of both unconditioned and conditioned reflexes.

Conceptually, the idea of craving for destruction (destruction) as the basis for the transition to revival was first formalized with the support of Z. Freud and C. G. Jung, S. Spielrein [20]. However, the psychological mechanism of this process was not disclosed. The explanation of the mechanism of the influence of archetypes on man's consciousness and behavior became possible on the basis of an understanding of modern psychoanalysis, not as "an exciting doctrine of the unconscious, but of the reorganization of the "I" [21, p. 37].

S. Nacht and his collaborators, whose logic of knowledge was based on the introduction of a conditioned reflex, actualization of the characteristics of the personality and the external environment, orientation to the activation of the "I", etc., attempted to uncover the mechanism for the formation of destruction, etc. Thus, endowing the

"I" with an aggregate of the most important functions (the synthesis of personality, its adaptation to the external or internal world and protection from the destructive influence of the environment), a deficit of self-energy was identified in the "I", which the individual is forced to borrow from "It" [22, p. 95–101]. Disorientation of the "I" under the influence of unintegrated aggressiveness, feelings of fear and other impulses coming from "It", induce the "I" to be modified in order to prevent the penetration of instincts. This understanding of the psychological mechanism of interaction has led S. Nacht to identify conflicts as the central problem associated with the collapse of values and the loss of the meanings of their existence [23, p. 157].

The possibility of destructive modification of the "I" under the influence of the external world becomes also real because of its origin from "It" and is a part of it. Standing out from the "Super-ego", the part of "I" is an unconscious. Because of this, the protective activity of the "I" is to a certain extent unconscious and, therefore, can not be independent from unconscious. The presence of features in the "I" structure (it can be flexible or inflexible) as the main determining moment allows us to determine the strength or weakness of the "I". So, for example, with the weakness of the "I", firstly, the narcissistic elements of the personality predominate; secondly, the personality is masochistic; third, homosexual structures predominate; fourthly, there is increased excitability, ease of transition from one action to another; fifth, there are traits of mental deficiency in the intellectual sphere [21, p. 95–108].



At the same time, the “I” can not go beyond the limits of its natural nature and include the social conditions of its life activity. External reality ceases to be an objective reality and unfolds before the subject, depending on the characteristics of the individual. As a result, it becomes possible to form a destructive identity of the individual, whose consciousness is self-destructing if it is impossible to eliminate the contradictions contained in it (antinomies). In order to diagnose the destructiveness of consciousness, it is necessary to isolate the existing contradictions.

The latter should be taken into account in relation to another phenomenon – the tribal world. Against the background of world wide globalization, “tribes” unite among themselves by certain sensory experiences and cultivate such personality traits as loyalty to the clan, personal dignity, nationalistic and religious feelings, etc. [24, p. 46].

M. Maffesoli, creating a new model, predicts the likelihood of changing the traditional forms of the family, the school and the nation-state. The nomadic way of life programs social mobility, embracing all spheres of human life. “The structure of the nomadic way of life”, he believes, “will become widespread, and it is only natural that people for their lives will be replaced by several families, several professions”, transform the gender aspects of their identity, life styles, etc. [25].

The foregoing opens up wide opportunities for studying the human psyche in the process of interaction with archetypes and revealing the complex, in many ways, contradictory influence of

internal and external factors of the formation of a destructive identity [26]. Here, following Z. Freud, C. G. Jung, S. Nacht and others, it is worthwhile using not only traditional means (interpretation of dreams, methods of free associations, transfer, determination of the “I” force, etc.), but also to go on quasi-experimental methods. In the process of studying the personality, it is also advisable to apply the anamnestic method in order to analyze the sexual, affective and social realizations of the subject as a person and evaluate its behavior in special states of consciousness. In this case, according to S. Nacht, we should beware of the contact between the forces of instincts and the “I”. “We can not, he claimed, change the requirements of the unconscious, but we can change the answers that are given to him by “Ego” and “Super-ego” [21], thereby determining the main direction of further work on the problems of the formation of destructive identity.

**Conclusions and prospects for further research.** In general, the proposed by M. Maffesoli model of postmodern society fully conveys the feeling of increasing unreliability of rooted social, religious and other institutions and creates a vision for future development of society. As a result, the paradigm developed by him acquires the features of a complex theory, which, according to E. A. Afonin, allows a person to “cross” the boundaries of his individuality and merge with the community to which he belongs [26]. On the basis of the above, it seems to us important to further study the problems of the formation of the destructive component of the new community. At the same time, one of

the most significant directions is the study of the nature of internal and external mechanisms of the socio-psychological rhythm of development within the framework of psychological, biological and social time and habitat. The modern level of ideas about a person as a social being is impossible without revealing the psychological patterns of the formation and functioning of the personality, including destructive consciousness and behavior of a person. Before archetypal psychology are the tasks of studying the general patterns of the formation of the “nomadic” personality, the destructive aspects of its socialization. Moreover, it remains important to conduct an analysis of its internal dynamics in the system of interaction between conscious and unconscious processes, as well as research on the stability of its mental organization.

## REFERENCES

1. *Okoldovannost' mira ili bozhestvennoye sotsial'noye* [The bewilderment of the world or the divine social] / M. Maffesoli // Socio-logos. Issue. 1. — M.: Progress, 1991. — P. 274–283.
2. *Khazanov A. M.* (2002). Kochevniki i vneshniy mir [Nomads and the outside world] / A. M. Khazanov. — 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, add. — Almaty: Dyke-Press. — 604 p.
3. *Spooner Brian.* (1975). Nomadism in Baluchistan [Nomadism in Baluchistan] / Brian Spooner // Pastoralists and Nomads in South Asia. — Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz. — P. 171–182.
4. *Gongor D. A.* (1970). Kratkaya istoriya Khalkhi. Khalkha-mongol'skiye plemena i khalkhaskoye khanstvo. XIII–XVII vv. [Brief History of Khalkha. Khalkha-Mongolian tribes and the Khalkha Khanate. XIII–XVII centuries] : Part 1 / D. Gongor. — Ulaanbaatar. — 390 p.
5. *Kradin N. N.* (2001). Kochevniki v mirovom istoricheskom protsesse [Nomads in the world historical process] / N. N. Kradin // Philosophy and Society. — Issue. № 2 (23). — P. 108–138.
6. *Markov G. Y.* (1998). Ye. Iz istorii izucheniya nomadizma v otechestvennoy literature: voprosy teorii [From the history of the study of nomadism in Soviet literature: theory issues] / G. Y. Markov, Vostok. — № 6. — P. 110–123.
7. *Sobol'nikov V. V.* (2015). Arkhetipicheskoye obosnovaniye destruktivnosti v kontekste binarnosti kak strukturo-obrazuyushchego printsipa [Archetypical justification of destructiveness in the context of binary as a structure-forming principle] / V. V. Sobol'nikov // Siberian Pedagogical Journal: a scientific periodical. — № 3. — P. 15–18.
8. *Hillman James.* (2004). Vnutrenniy mrak: bessoznatel'noye kak problema morali [Inner darkness: the unconscious as a moral problem] / James Hillman // Internal search: Sat. works of different years / trans. with English. — M.: Cognite Center. — 335 p.
9. *Toshchenko Zh. T.* (2011). Kentavr-kul'tura: sovremennyye liki [Centaur-Culture: Contemporary Faces] / Zh. T. Toshchenko // Dialogue of Cultures in the Context of Globalization: 11<sup>th</sup> International Likhachov Scientific Readings, May 12–13, 2011: T. I. Reports. — St. Petersburg. : SPbGUP. — P. 166–173.
10. *Psikhologiya neopredelennosti: yedinstvo intellektual'no-lichnostnogo potentsiala cheloveka : kollektivnaya monografiya* [The psychology of uncertainty: the unity of the person's intellectual-personal potential]: a col-

- lective monograph / T. V. Kornilova, M. A. Chumakova, S. A. Kornilov. — M.: Sense, 2010. — 334 c.
11. *Gusseklou A.* (2016). Digital Nomads: How to Live, Work and Play Around the World / A. Gusseklou, E. Jacobs. N.-Y. : Location-Independent Publishers. — 280 p.
  12. *Rushkoff D.* (2011). Program or Be Programmed: Ten Commands for a Digital Age / D. Rushkoff. — New York. — 152 p.
  13. *Maffesoli Michel.* (2012). L'homme postmoderne / Michel Maffesoli. — Paris. — 216 p.
  14. *Jung K. G.* (1991). Archetype and the symbol / K. G. Jung. — M.: Renaissance. — 150 p.
  15. *Jung K. G.* (1997). The notion of the collective unconscious (1936) / K. G. Jung // Consciousness and the unconscious. — St. Petersburg; M.: University Book. — P. 69–79.
  16. *Foucault M.* (1965). Madness and civilization: a history of insanity in the age of reason / M. Foucault; edited by R. D. Laing, D. G. Cooper. — New York: Pantheon Books. — 299 p.
  17. *Afonin E. A.* (2017). Neotribalism and modern policy of decentralization: analysis of professor Michel Maffesoli's ideas / E. A. Afonin, V. A. Pliushch // Public management. — № 4 (9). — P. 34–47.
  18. *Maffesoli M.* (2005). Utopia or Utopias in the Gaps: From the Political to the “Domestic”, Diogenes / M. Maffesoli. — English edition Fiesole. — Vol. 52, Iss. 2. — P. 24–25.
  19. *Jung K. G.* (1994). Psychology of the unconscious / K. G. Jung; trans. with him. — M.: Canon. — 320 p.
  20. *Spielrein S.* (1912) Destruktion als Ursache des Werdens, Internat. Zeitschr / S. Spielrein // Fur Psychoanal. — № 4. — 97 p.
  21. *Nacht S.* (1963). La presence du psychanalyste / S. Nacht. — Paris. — 450 p.
  22. *Sobolnikov V. V.* (2015). Arkhetipicheskiye problemy formirovaniya destruktivnoy identichnosti [Arche-typical problems of formation of destructive identity] / V. V. Sobol'nikov // Humanities and Education in Siberia: a scientific and practical journal. — № 2. — P. 95–101.
  23. *Nacht S.* (1956). La psychanalyse dau-jourd'hui / S. Nacht. — Paris. — 390 p.
  24. *Bauman Z.* (2014). Globalization. Consequences for man and society / Z. Bauman; trans. with English. — M.: The whole world. — 188 p.
  25. *Maffesoli M.* (2017). Neotribalism and the modern policy of decentralization: an open lecture at the National Academy of Sciences under the President of Ukraine (June 29, 2017) [Electronic resource] / M. Maffesoli. — Access mode: <https://www.youtube.com/watch>

## СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Околдованность* мира или божественное социальное / М. Маффесоли // Социо-логос. — Вып. 1. — М.: Прогресс, 1991. — С. 274–283.
2. *Хазанов А. М.* Кочевники и внешний мир / А. М. Хазанов. — 3-е изд., доп. — Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2002. — 604 с.
3. *Spooner Brian.* Nomadism in Baluchistan / Brian Spooner // Pastoralists and Nomads in South Asia. — Wiesbaden, Germany : Harrassowitz, 1975. — P. 171–182.
4. *Гонгор Д.* Краткая история Халхи. Халха-монгольские племена и халхаское ханство. XIII–XVII вв.: Ч. 1 / Д. Гонгор. — Улаанбаатар, 1970. — 390 с.
5. *Крадин Н. Н.* Кочевники в мировом историческом процессе / Н. Н. Кра-

- дин // *Философия и общество*. — 2001. — Вып. № 2 (23). — С. 108–138.
6. *Марков Г. Е.* Из истории изучения номадизма в отечественной литературе: вопр. теории / Г. Е. Марков // *Восток*. — 1998. — № 6. — С. 110–123.
  7. *Собольников В. В.* Архетипическое обоснование деструктивности в контексте бинарности как структурообразующего принципа / В. В. Собольников // *Сибирский пед. журн. : науч. периодическое изд.* — 2015. — № 3. — С. 15–18.
  8. *Хиллман Джеймс.* Внутренний мрак: бессознательное как проблема морали / Джеймс Хиллман // *Внутренний поиск : сб. работ разных лет / пер. с англ.* — М. : Когнито-Центр, 2004. — 335 с.
  9. *Тощенко Ж. Т.* Кентавр-культура: современные лики / Ж. Т. Тощенко // *Диалог культур в условиях глобализации : XI Междунар. Лихачевские научные чтения, 12–13 мая 2011 г. : Т. I. Доклады*. — СПб. : СПб-ГУП, 2011. — С. 166–173.
  10. Психология неопределенности: единство интеллектуально-личностного потенциала человека: коллективная монография / Т. В. Корнилова, М. А. Чумакова, С. А. Корнилов. — М. : Смысл, 2010. — 334 с.
  11. *Gussekloo A.* Digital Nomads: How to Live, Work and Play Around the World / A. Gussekloo, E. Jacobs. — N.-Y. : Location-Independent Publishers, 2016. — 280 p.
  12. *Rushkoff D.* Program or Be Programmed: Ten Commands for a Digital Age / D. Rushkoff. — New York, 2011. — 152 p.
  13. *Maffesoli Michel.* L'homme postmoderne / Michel Maffesoli. — Paris, 2012. — 216 p.
  14. *Юнг К. Г.* Архетип и символ / К. Г. Юнг. — М. : Ренессанс, 1991. — 150 с.
  15. *Юнг К. Г.* Понятие коллективного бессознательного (1936) / К. Г. Юнг // *Сознание и бессознательное*. — СПб ; М. : Университет. кн., 1997. — С. 69–79.
  16. *Foucault M.* Madness and civilization: a history of insanity in the age of reason / M. Foucault ; edited by R. D. Laing, D. G. Cooper. — New York : Pantheon Books, 1965. — 299 p.
  17. *Afonin E. A.* Neotribalism and modern policy of decentralization: analysis of professor Michel Maffesoli's ideas / E. A. Afonin, V. A. Pliushch // *Public management*. — 2017. — № 4 (9). — P. 34–47.
  18. *Maffesoli M.* Utopia or Utopias in the Gaps: From the Political to the “Domestic”, Diogenes / M. Maffesoli. — English ed. Fiesole, 2005. — Vol. 52, Iss. 2. — P. 24–25.
  19. *Юнг К. Г.* Психология бессознательного / К. Г. Юнг ; пер. с нем. — М. : Канон, 1994. — 320 с.
  20. *Spielrein S.* Destruktion als Ursache des Werdens, Internat. Zeitschr / S. Spielrein // *Fur Psychoanal.* — 1912. — № 4. — 97 p.
  21. *Nacht S.* La presence du psychanalyste / S. Nacht. — Paris, 1963. — 450 p.
  22. *Собольников В. В.* Архетипические проблемы формирования деструктивной идентичности / В. В. Собольников // *Гуманитарные науки и образование в Сибири : науч.-практ. журн.* — 2015. — № 2. — С. 95–101.
  23. *Nacht S.* La psychanalyse daujourd'hui / S. Nacht. — Paris, 1956. — 390 p.
  24. *Бауман З.* Глобализация. Последствия для человека и общества / З. Бауман ; пер. с англ. — М. : Весь Мир, 2004. — 188 с.
  25. *Маффесоли М.* Неотрайбализм и современная политика децентрализации: открытая лекция в НАГУ при Президенте Украины (29 июня 2017 г.) [Электронный

- ресурс] / М. Маффесоли. — 2017. —  
Режим доступа: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zeh3LIn5uNM>.
26. Хиллман Дж. Архетипическая психология / Дж. Хиллман; пер с англ. — М. : Когнито-Центр, 2006. — 351 с.