



UDC: 321:352

Kozakov Volodymyr Nikolaevich,
Doctor of Sciences in public administration, Professor, Professor of the Department of state policy and social development, National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, Kyiv, Str. Eugene Pottier, 20, tel.: (050) 393 12 12, e-mail: v.kozakov@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0003-1330-5244

Козаков Володимир Миколайович,
доктор наук з державного управління, професор, професор кафедри державної політики та суспільного розвитку, Національна академія державного управління при Президентові України, м. Київ, вул. Ежена Пот'є, 20, тел.: (050) 393 12 12, e-mail: v.kozakov@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0003-1330-5244

Козаков Владимир Николаевич,

доктор наук по государственному управлению, профессор, профессор кафедры государственной политики и общественного развития, Национальная академия государственного управления при Президенте Украины, г. Киев, ул. Эжена Потье, 20, тел.: (050) 393 12 12, e-mail: v.kozakov@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0003-1330-5244

UKRAINIAN MENTALITY AS ARCHETYPAL FACTOR OF HARMONIZATION OF SOCIAL POWER RELATIONS

Abstract. The article explained the theoretical bases of influence Ukrainian mentality as archetypal factor to harmonize the social and power relations, it turns archetypes influence national conscious and unconscious on social and governmental processes in Ukraine, the theoretical approaches to reduce mental and value conflicts in the Ukrainian society and Directions improving social and power relations with the peculiarities of national mentality.

Keywords: archetypes, mental, social and power relations, public administration, the values of civil society, political culture.

УКРАЇНСЬКА МЕНТАЛЬНІСТЬ ЯК АРХЕТИПНИЙ ФАКТОР ГАРМОНІЗАЦІЇ СУСПІЛЬНО-ВЛАДНИХ ВІДНОСИН

Анотація. У статті обґрунтовуються теоретичні засади впливу української ментальності як архетипового фактора на гармонізацію суспільно-владних

відносин. З'ясовується вплив архетипів національного свідомого та підсвідомого на суспільно-владні процеси в Україні. Розглянуто теоретичні підходи щодо скорочення ментальних та ціннісних протиріч в українському соціумі й визначено напрями вдосконалення суспільно-владних відносин з урахуванням особливостей національного менталітету.

Ключові слова: архетипи, ментальність, суспільно-владні відносини, публічне управління, цінності громадянського суспільства, політична культура.

УКРАИНСКАЯ МЕНТАЛЬНОСТЬ КАК АРХЕТИПИЧЕСКИЙ ФАКТОР ГАРМОНИЗАЦИИ ОБЩЕСТВЕННО-ВЛАСТНЫХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ

Аннотация. В статье обосновываются теоретические основы украинской ментальности как архетипового фактора гармонизации общественно-властных отношений. Выясняется влияние архетипов национального сознания и подсознания на общественно-властные процессы в Украине. Рассмотрены теоретические подходы к сокращению ментальных и ценностных противоречий в украинском социуме и определены направления совершенствования общественно-властных отношений с учетом особенностей национального менталитета.

Ключевые слова: архетипы, ментальность, общественно-властные отношения, публичное управление, ценности гражданского общества, политическая культура.

Target setting. For centuries, foreign elites have imposed on Ukraine and its regions various principles and principles for organizing life. Therefore, we entered the independent phase with different goals and views, which were formed on the basis of regional, cultural, ideological, religious and linguistic dividing lines. We met independence broken to sometimes warring segments. Such an inheritance contains a potential threat to social conflicts and tensions. The divisions of society into alienated groups — according to the level of self-consciousness, religious confessions, political views, social orientations, mentality — are one of the factors that significantly, which impedes their consolidation. This, in turn, makes pos-

sible political manipulation of public consciousness, increases political apathy and disbelief of the population in political power. In the absence of genuine democratic institutions of public administration and social cooperation, with a low ability of the population to organize themselves and with a lack of common systemically important social values, political forces are able to conduct “administrative” methods by the will of isolated groups of citizens, using language, ethnic and mental tensions, in bad faith, to obtain political capital.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The question of archetypes and mentality has been studied for a long time. Within the framework of national and ethnic psychology, specific

features of the national character and mentality are analyzed (A. Blazheny, G. Gegel, C. Gelvetius, N. Danilevsky, I. Kant, M. Latsarus, Platon, I. Fichte, D. Hum, K.-G. Young and others)

A significant contribution to the study of the Ukrainian mentality and its influence on public-power relations was made by E. Afonin, V. Gorskyy, V. Dziundziuk, V. Donchenko, B. Kravchenko, S. Krymsky, V. Kryukov, J. Kuts, A. Mayboroda, P. Nadolishny, M. Pirenn, A. Radchenko, V. Rebkalov, O. Sushi, V. Troshchinsky and others.

However, the content-functional boundaries of the concept of “mentality” as an archetypal factor of harmonization of social-power relations have not yet been adequately determined. The points mentioned above determine the relevance of the topic of the article, its main purpose and objective.

The purpose of the article is to substantiate the theoretical foundations of the influence of the Ukrainian mentality as an archetypal factor on the harmonization of social and power relations in Ukraine.

Achieving this goal has made it necessary to solve the following problems:

- to consider the theoretical approaches to reducing the mental and value contradictions in the Ukrainian society

- to substantiate the directions of improving social-power relations taking into account the peculiarities of the national mentality.

The statement of basic materials. The concept of “mentality” is interpreted ambiguously in the framework of various scientific approaches. In modern science, according to the researcher O. Terentyevoy, there are at least

three approaches: the first – the mentality is considered as a set of conscious representations, symbolic images and values; The second – the emphasis is on the collective-subconscious components; The third – emphasizes that the mentality is a sphere of both conscious and subconscious, connected with each other. Based on the generalization of the characteristics of this phenomenon, the following definition is proposed: mentality is a stable way of perception of the world, which determines the form of the person's response, the community to various social irritants, has a collective manifestation and assumes an active perception of the world that is characteristic of those who live in a particular culture and refers to one Nation and directly affects the form and political-legal regime of the state system. Archetypes, stereotypes, mythologies, traditions, hierarchical norms and values are the core of the mentality that set certain guidelines for the individual's behavior. Mentality is the basis for ideology and politics. Over time, it can change due to changes in the factors of its formation [1; 5]. It is conditioned by socio-cultural and historical contexts with characteristic axiological concepts, but the archetype does not depend on time and place, that is, axiologically neutral. Mentality is a nationally colored archetype. Therefore, this concept in its meaning is broader than the concept of “archetype”. In each such society (national culture) their archetypes dominate, which determine the features of the functioning of mentality [2].

In general, the concept of “mentality” is not an identical world view, national character, consciousness, etc.

Since it is considered in the context of the collective consciousness, we can talk about the existence of a national mentality with its subspecies, one of which is the political mentality – a steady, conscious and unconscious representation of a certain group of people about the political and social reality based on memory that is reflected in value political orientations and influences the formation of a new social and power paradigm in Ukraine.

It should be noted that the current stage of development of Ukrainian society and its culture are in a situation of value chaos and uncertainty. There is a process of changing the value paradigm: the previous system of values is being forced out of the mass consciousness, and the new one has not been sufficiently formed. Ukrainian society is built not so much on the common values that are rooted in the life world, but rather on a certain regulatory system that is a certain compromise between the interests of certain social, political and ethnic groups. And even the basic classical values of modern society, such as equality, freedom, justice, solidarity, which have become slogans of democratic revolutions around the world and basic for modern democracy, are actually formal.

Therefore, in these new conditions, at the level of philosophical reflection, it is necessary to comprehend the situation and carry out a scientific and theoretical analysis of the influence of the mentality of the Ukrainian people on the harmonization of social and government relations in the country, which will allow to provide a new level of political culture, and, most importantly, to form a new understanding

of values in the interaction of the state and civil society.

The values of Ukrainian culture are especially archetypal, among which, in our opinion, for the harmonization of social and power relations in the country, the following mental values: 1) individualism as an essential feature of Ukrainian life. Ukrainian individualism is based on a certain attitude to society – it is Khutorian individualism, the correlate of which is the immediate community. Such individualism is based not on the autonomy of the individual, on the sovereignty of his mind, on the ability to discursively legitimize social and ethical norms that would ensure social integration, but on a direct opposition to society [3].

At the same time, one can not agree with the opinion of I. Polishchuk that “peculiar Ukrainian individualism can be an important prerequisite for the development of an extensive civil society based on liberal principles in Ukraine. But for this, a substantial transformation of the substantive essence of individualism itself must take place, which must go beyond the domestic level and encompass the higher, socio-political level of relations” [4].

It is clear that liberal individualism is fundamentally incompatible with the principle of integration based on common universal values, which democratic solidarity needs, and therefore this contradiction is a logical result of Ukraine’s political development. Because of this state of the value basis of society in Ukraine, it is not surprising that the phenomenon of citizens’ distrust of power arises and is constantly growing.

And here there is an objective explanation for this. According to the researchers, one of the reasons for such discrepancies is “long-term stay in the colonial position. Demonstrating its own failure to the sovereign development of the state, the Ukrainian community naturally appeared depending on the more united and powerful neighbors. Unfortunately, we have to state that throughout its history, the tormented Ukrainian people were forced to submit more to foreigners than to build their own state. Therefore, for most generations, Ukrainian state power was perceived as something alien, foreign” [4].

The mistrust of the state, that is, a lack of legitimacy, is an illustrator of the engaged disease of illusory splitting of the values of the political and civil space of Ukrainian society in the mid-1990s. XX century, in which sometimes diametrically opposite ideas acted. The institutionalization of power through the prism of selective technologies has not solved the issue of legitimacy. As a result, there was only “formal legitimacy” for a long time, the essence of which was: “... in insignificant support by a society of an incompetent state, despite selective legitimacy” [5]. So, the accumulative average score of confidence from 1 – “do not trust at all” to 5 – “completely trust” in 1994–2005. According to some reports, the President of Ukraine – 2,4; The government – 2,2; The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine – 2,1 [6, p. 174]. In these conditions, it was possible to state in Ukraine the presence of the so-called “Delegative” democracy syndrome, in which there are a number of formal institutions of democracy (elections, parliament, president,

multi-party system), but the society does not have mechanisms to control the power structures after the elections, and therefore the policy does not have Feedbacks with other spheres of society’s life, and state officials are not responsible for their actions [7, p. 22]. Hence a proverb appeared in Ukrainian folklore as “my hut with an edge, I do not know anything”, which reflects my, mental attitude of the Ukrainian authorities.

The next mental value is world outlook tolerance, expressing the ability of the Ukrainian people to take into their culture the mental attitudes of other peoples and their cultures. Tolerance is an absolute value in the conditions of sociocultural pluralism in a society of competing interests, sometimes colored by national or confessional intolerance. The idea of tolerance has a semantic meaning. It was born as a religious tolerance, passed its formation as the principle of the optimal relationship between church and state, and, finally, developed as a basic principle of interpersonal and intergroup relations, mitigating differences related to ethnic and religious affiliations, gender and age, material and social status in Society. [3].

The repressive system of Soviet society created a “new man”, which was marked by such features as intolerance, aggressiveness, claims to monopoly ownership of truth, opportunism. These signs finally formed completely unstructured in the ideal-value dimension of a person, one-dimensional in its inactivity. For Soviet society, there was an imbalance between individual and collective integration, here the identity that was formed on an ideological

and class basis was dominant, while the ethnic, religious, cultural identity was almost pushed into the sphere of individual identity, which at the same time played a secondary role. Therefore, it is understandable why the tendency to preserve its national identity becomes dominant today, which is manifested not in political but in ethno national identification. It should be noted that such an identity not only gives way to the lost collective identity, but also serves as a kind of the rescue from the process of homogenization typical for Western countries, that, in the words of C. Taylor, "...allows absolutely traditional bases of identification" [8, p. 133].

3) The conservativeness of the Ukrainian mentality, in our opinion, is not a negative characteristic, since in the Western tradition there is a fundamentally different understanding of it. "Conservatism is an independent system of absolute ideas, it is defined by such universal values as balance, order, restraint" [9, p. 455], S. Huntington believes. "After all, people are being pushed to conservatism by the shock caused by events, the terrible feeling that society or its institutions will cease to exist" [reference, p. 470].

The founder of the theory of the Ukrainian nation, I. Lysyak-Rudnitsky, wrote that conservatism as a "spontaneous spiritual attitude of a large part of Ukrainian society played a significant role and embodied in the strong preservation of the native language, faith, customs and rituals, traditional forms of family and social life" [10, p. 125]. This attitude did not prevent the Ukrainians from being a modern nation that "... can be defined as a ter-

ritorially designated community of people who share a certain version of modern culture and which are linked by a strong sense of unity and solidarity" [ibid., p. 125].

4) Finally, an important mental feature of the Ukrainian society is the desire for personal freedom. The creative individualism of a Ukrainian is personal independence and respect for the freedom of every person as something sacred and inviolable. The historical example of such a subject of freedom is the freedom-loving Cossack and precisely the Cossacks in Ukraine.

So, both opposing at first glance, Ukrainian aspirations as individualism and conservatism, conditioned by the only value motives. In our thinking, the stereotype of the de-factualization of values is rooted. We are not able to fully and deeply experience social being as the present. Thoughts, views are addressed either to the past or to the future. Do not forget that this round the clock is very urgent for engaging totalitarian doctrines and practices. We also have no approximately legal state, but we already state the existence of a social state, which is a "continuation and complementation" of the state of law" [11]. And it is here, in our opinion, that the duality of the Ukrainian character is most fully manifested: the love of freedom and reconciliation with slavery, the Cossack democratic government and the dictatorship of the ataman or hetman, amateur and paternalism, and the like.

The modern political elite mostly bears the mental features of the Soviet system, which leads to the use of outdated methods of public administration and, accordingly, contradictions in so-

cial and power relations. The first step in the way of harmonization of public-power relations in the country should be the creation of an adequate model of the spiritual and value mechanism for the development of the national consciousness of the political elite and state employees of Ukraine. The state power elite will be able to perform the functions of a social and cultural guide if it is based on a strong system of legal regulation, a system that involves overcoming the eternal contradiction between politics and law. However, the paradox is that in a disdainful attitude to the law (as a leading managerial value), there is a strange spiritual solidarity of the top and the majority of society. Probably, the barbaric rejection of legality is inherent in the Slavic soul. Consequently, the lack of fundamental value-legal orientations feeds on us not only at the expense of the elite, but is conditioned by a much more stable mental tradition. The latter is all the more tangible because the internal denial of the value of law is reinforced by the constant availability of double standards of responsibility that have taught the leaders of different levels to avoid any real responsibility to society. This tendency is confirmed by the so-called "Byzantine style" of management, oriented mainly to shadow and semi-shadow methods of decision-making, behind-the-scenes methods of personnel selection, and the like, for local rulers, at least until recently. The organic deficit of responsibility (by the way, not only in the ruling classes, but also among all participants in the political process) turns out to be a fairly typical feature of our political mentality in general. So it turns out those

even ordinary citizens: on the one hand, states are afraid, not hoping for their legal protection from the arbitrariness of its institutions, on the other – without a twinge of conscience, they steal and deceive their "virtue".

In this connection, within the framework of our analysis, the question arises of the place and role of culture as one of the archetypal prerequisites for the harmonization of social and power relations in Ukraine? Indeed, culture as a system of public civic values, representations, behaviors, motives and communications that regulate and regulate the general behavior and professional activity of people, should cause and direct social and authoritative interaction as an appropriate system of connections, relations and interactions between society and the state, people, Their public associations and state institutions into a civilizational nationwide development.

In general, the cultural environment of public administration includes various archetypes and mentality, habits and traditions that adapt the current context to the main orientations and values of various groups of public managers and politicians. The stability of such characteristics of managers shows that even an optimal redistribution of functions between management structures and the restructuring of organizational structures is not always, and especially not immediately, capable of leading to changes in cultural standards and the real management practices that they have set. In the organizational context, culture personifies a set of "high symbols" (civil, moral, ideological and other values and landmarks) that form the appropriate standards of

joint activity, drawing all these managers to these cultural norms and thereby forming powerful incentives for the professional conduct of civil servants. The mental structure of an organization reflects the level of creativity and conservatism, tolerance and closeness, internal tension and leniency (including ethnic, confessional, gender) apparatus, influences the perception of new ideas, attitude to the goals of state policy. At the same time, various sources of cultural influence, different value systems that cause internal links between state actors and citizens and politicians can take place within the organization, noting typical habits and abilities of joint activity, forms of coordination and coordination of positions, interpretation of collective traditions, standards and norms of activity, which are recognized as positive. In this connection, culture not only unites people on a common civil platform, but also is able to influence their actions more than management orders and service functions [12 p. 284].

Conclusions and prospects for further research. Thus, the scrapping of the old system of value-normative orientations leads to the need to create a new hierarchy of social-power values. The content components of the value orientation of the Ukrainian mentality (freedom, individualism, tolerance, conservatism) provide for the possibility of their inclusion in the European cultural space. After all, we are talking about a conscious orientation to new values, personal and collective, solidarity “direct participation” in organizing the life of society as a whole and every citizen. Therefore, the main thing is that the rational consensus of civil society

and the state is a factor of universal public discourse, that is, the factor of resolving the contradictions of society on the basis of cultural, linguistic and solidary communication through consensus, which lies in the foundation of the vital world.

The task of harmonizing public-power relations in the country should be the development of a mechanism for the transition to a new model of solidarity, taking into account all the conflicting positions in the mentality of Ukrainians.

REFERENCES

1. *Terentyeva A. L.* Mentality as a factor of development of the state in Ukraine / O. L. Terentieva / Thesis for a Candidate of Science Degree in Public Administration in specialty 25.00.01 – Theory and History of Public Administration. – Kharkov, 2010. – 16 p.
2. *Azina A.* National Specificity of archetypal values / O. Azyna // Theory and Practice of the Public development. – 2013. – № 11. – P. 45.
3. *Remenets A.* Origins of Ukrainian culture values [electronic resource] / O. Remenets. – Mode of access: <http://jrn1.nau.edu.ua/index.php/VisnikPK/article/download/7487/8545>
4. *Polishchuk I.* Mentality of Ukraine: the political aspect [Electronic resource] / I. Polishchuk. – Access mode: [//www.national.org.ua/library/poliszczuk.html](http://www.national.org.ua/library/poliszczuk.html)
5. *Makeev S.* Ten-year crisis of legitimacy of ruling elites / S. Makeev // Political thought. – 2001. – № 3. – P. 5–9.
6. *Stepanenko V.* Problems of Civil Society Formation: Institutions, Practices, Values / V. Stepanenko // Ukrainian

- Society: Ten Years of Independence. — M., 2001. — P. 174.
7. *Philosophy*: Textbook. Allowance / I. F. Nadolny, V. P. Andrushchenko, I. V. Boichenko and others; ed. I. F. Nadolno. — M.: Vikar, 1998. — 623 p.
 8. *Taylor Ch. Hegel and Modern Society/ Ch. Taylor*. — Cambridge, 1999. — P. 133.
 9. *Hungtington S. Conservatism as an ideology / S. Hungtington // American Science Review*. — 1997. — Vol. 51. — № 2. — P. 454–473.
 10. *Lysyak-Rudnitsky I. Conservatism / I. Lysyak-Rudnitsky // Historical essays: Per. From English: in 2 tons*. — M.: Basics, 1994. — T. 2. — P. 119–125.
 11. *Kulchitsky A. Ukrainian personalism: philosophical and ethnopsychological synthesis / O. Kulchitsky*. — Munich-Paris, 1985. — 192 p.
 12. *Kupryashin G. L. Theory and mechanisms of modern state management / G. L. Kupryashin, A. I. Soloviev; Moscow. State. Un-t them. M. V. Lomonosov*. — M.: Univ. The humanities Lyceum, 2013. — 642 p.