

SOCIOCULTURAL (ARCHETYPAL) TRANSFORMATION OF PUBLIC AUTHORITY: FORMS AND DIRECTIONS

Pavel Baranov^{*}, Aleksey Mamychev^{**}, Aleksey Ovchinnikov^{***}, Anton Komarov^{****}
and Alexandr Samoylichenko^{*****}

Abstract: The article examines socio-cultural (archetypal) foundations for the transformation of the state-legal organisation of society and relations between the people and the Power. The article proposes a system approach to the analysis of state power as a complex and multifaceted socio-cultural phenomenon. It also explains the fact that success and effectiveness of the state power directly relates to sociocultural (archetypal) codes that are vital for the reproduction of the social system and for shaping the legal policy of the state. We hypothesise that the more structured and regulated socio-political interaction is, the more stability and political unity the society acquires. The authors argue that in the post-Soviet countries, the political consciousness shows a stable perception of state-legal organisation as the institutional basis for the reproduction and protection of national and cultural integrity, while legal and political institutions should depend on the socio-cultural dominants of the social system development.

Keywords: Power, state, culture, political system, law.

INTRODUCTION

Archetypal (sociocultural) dominants are consistent factors of the successive reproduction of society's political culture and the evolution of the relations between the public and the government. They act as ideological sources and stable structural elements of the formation and development of a concrete historical political and legal organisation of the society. It is obvious that these sources and elements are inherently impersonal, supra-individual, intersubjective phenomena experienced and lived through simultaneously by all members of a specific social system. At the same time, all legal and political innovations that are contradictory, inadequate to the archetypal core of a specific (original, not universal) culture will be superficial.

^{*} PhD, Professor, Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Russian Federation. *Email: pravosoznanie@gmail.com*

^{**} Doctor of Political Sciences, candidate of Legal Sciences, associate professor, Head of the Theory and History of the Russian and Foreign Law Department, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russian Federation. *Email: mamychev@yandex.ru*

^{***} PhD, Professor, Russian State University of Justice, Russian Federation. *Email: k_fp3@mail.ru*

^{****} Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor of the Criminal Law and Process Department of the Siberian Institute of Management - a branch of the Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration under the President of the Russian Federation. *Email: niko.m_2002@mail.ru*

^{*****} Assistant of the department of philosophy and legal psychology, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russian Federation. *Email: aleksandr.samoylichenko92@vvsu.ru*

They will not be related to the foundation of social and legal thought; instead they will be perceived and evaluated negatively, causing dysfunctional effects in the development of political institutions and anomic phenomena in interactions between the public and the state in the system personality - society - state.

S. Eisenstadt rightly suggested that evolutionary development (natural transformation or modernisation under the influence of Universalist democratic standards) and the traditional sociocultural foundations of society do not form an opposition to each other; on the contrary, their combination leads to stable and balanced development. The depth and nature of societal changes is not arbitrary. It is pre-set by the cultural tradition. In every society, there are “real and symbolic events of the past, the order and images of which are the core of collective identity, the definition of the measure and the nature of its social and cultural changes. Tradition in such a society serves not only as a symbol of continuity, but also as a limit to innovations and the main criterion of their legitimacy, as well as a criterion of social activity” (Eisenstadt, 1973).

Today, the factors influencing the evolution of society are quite diverse, and international political communication is very unstable. Therefore, the problem of harmonisation of socio-cultural dominants of stability and innovative factors of variability is of high relevance. In this article, the authors suggest analyzing the strategies for the evolutionary development of the political and legal organisation of society, as well as the significance and influence of socio-cultural dominants.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In modern sociological and political studies, a gap between state-legal policy and objective historical laws of development of social systems has often been mentioned. For example, G. Rohrmoser noted, “Western sociologists and political scientists have completely lost their historical consciousness and think that it is possible to comprehend the fate of social systems by sociological categories alone” (Rohrmoser, 1996).

This “break with history,” both in research and in political practice, gives a special emphasis in the evolutionary development to unconscious structures (sociocultural, unconscious, but significantly affecting the parameters and directions of evolutionary development). These codes of the social system are the last “protective amulets” of socio-political integrity and identity (Ovchinnikov et al., 2008). M. Remizov’s research position is justifiable in this respect. He states that “as the politician loses connection with history ... it degenerates, losing its function of mediating the future”, of representation the unconscious structures, of connection between the past and the future (Remizov, 2002).

In the twentieth century, various humanitarian studies expressed the ideas that the established linguistic structures and the conceptual-categorical grid substantiated the way of perception and specificity of cognition of political and

legal phenomena and processes (Mordovtsev & Popov, 2007). For example, it is noted that anthropologists have proven the influence of language structures on the perception of reality. Linguistic laws are a means of categorising experience, and construct the conceptual worldview (Moiseeva & Sorokovikova, 2003). In other words, the peculiarities, form and structure of the social and legal life of the society, of particular collectives, groups, and communities are determined by the type of language, the basic national concepts and categories that dictate the style of normative thinking and behaviour (Demetradze, 2012).

Because of this, events and processes in the real world are not described mechanically. They are selected and interpreted, and this procedure is determined by the same linguistic laws. Summarising data of anthropological linguistics, C. Kluckhohn argued, "Every language is also a special means of creating a worldview and interpretation of the world. In the structure of any language lies a whole set of unconscious ideas about the world and life in it. Anthropological linguists came to the understanding that the general ideas of a person about his or her environment are not "set" entirely by external events. It is more appropriate to formulate the problem in the following way: a person sees and hears what the grammatical system of his language makes him sensitive to, what it has taught him to wait from perception" (Kluckhohn, 1998).

Currently, researchers pay attention to the issues of political ethnology, ethnocultural and archetypal foundations of public thought, the development of political relations and the successive transformation of political organisation (Lyubashits et al., 2015). Nevertheless, there have been practically no integrated studies of the theoretical, methodological and conceptual foundations of the sociocultural paradigm, the theory of the legal archetype in the theory of politics and the methodology of political studies. It is worth noting that research related to the identification of archetypal factors and sociocultural dominants was undertaken within the framework of Russian state studies, which in many respects determined the methodological foundations and theoretical plots in foreign and domestic studies of the twentieth century. This includes the research undertaken by S. Pessen, G.D. Gurvich, N.M. Korkunov, M.M. Kovalevsky, L.I. Petrazhitsky, M. Reisner, P. Sorokin, among others.

In domestic political science and law, there is a long-established tradition of research on the phenomenon of public authority. This tradition formed the direction of development of modern political and legal discourse. For example, public authority was traditionally studied within the framework of the complex scientific branch of knowledge - state studies, which analyzed this phenomenon in various aspects of its functioning: political, formal-normative, sociocultural and so on. It was within the framework of state studies that the Russian political science school developed. For example, the history of state studies was taught within massive courses entitled "The History of Political Teachings". Many treatises devoted to the

analysis of public power, the political process, and the socio-political transformation of society were written by scholars in this field.

The well-known pre-revolutionary scientist V.M. Hessen argued that the general doctrine on the state should include at least three sections, where only one section would be devoted to the institutional and normative analysis of public authority; the others should be devoted to the political analysis of this phenomenon (Hessen, 1912).

Firstly, it is the section of state studies, including the historical patterns of development of the state and state power, on the basis of which various types and forms of functioning of the state are formulated; the types of government; various communal theories of the state are defined, etc. In other words, this section is the political encyclopedia of the state (*Allgemeine Staatslehre*),

Secondly, it is the normative section reflecting both the nation-wide legal theory and the national legislature operating in this or that country.

Thirdly, it is the political practice of exercising state power, determining the main priorities for the development of the state, the applied aspects of power interaction and other characteristics of political process, i.e. this section is devoted to politics (*Politika*).

These three sections – “general state law”, “political encyclopaedia of the state”, “politics” - allow to analyse public authority and, in particular, state power comprehensively, taking into account the theoretical-methodological, institutional, political and practical (socio-cultural, psychological, etc.) aspects of its functioning. It seems that this approach, developed by the domestic state studies scholars, is the most adequate for understanding the complex and ambiguous phenomenon of “public authority”.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In contemporary political and legal studies, there is a theoretical proposition that during the transformation period of state and legal organisation, especially in the process of assimilating foreign legal experience, and when borrowing political and legal institutions, the search for common cultural grounds, similar socio-legal and ethnopolitical archetypes is required. “Until the new culture finally “sprouts”, until it wins social space, acquires normative and institutional characteristics, until it becomes a real spiritual (informal) imperative of human behavior, no technological or organisational changes will fit organically into societal reality. That is why the slogan of our changes – “market, democracy and law” can remain meaningless or foreign linguistic sign to Russia if ... there is no reinforcement for it in that spiritual substratum” (Mostovaya & Skoryk, 1995).

In this regard, the theoretical and methodological direction that determines the consideration of the problems stated in the article is the study of political relations

in a specific society, based on a system analysis of all factors and patterns of development of a particular socio-cultural environment. The analysis of behavioural patterns and clichés, as well as stereotypes of thinking becomes particularly important (Kvakin A.V.). In this respect, E. Sapir's research position is valid, which he voiced at the Congress of the British Association of Ethnographers, and according to which culture at the socio-psychological level imposes certain styles of thinking and behavior, including typical rituals and symbols, and even poses and gestures (Mead, 1998).

In this regard, as a working hypothesis, it can be noted that national and political unity, and stability correlates with the orderliness of socio-political interaction and its regulation based on integration of sociocultural (archetypal) images, beliefs, ideas with concrete conditions and factors, receiving its institutional and legal fixation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Modern institutions of state power are in the process of transformation. Modernisationist, conservative, global and local trends significantly influence the meaning and socio-cultural dynamics of this political phenomenon, problematising the essence, basic functions and tasks, as well as the social role of state power in the political life of society.

Non-standard situations, unforeseen risks, atypical threats, crises, etc. caused in the past and continue to cause non-standard (atypical, mixed, convergent) forms of power communication, public authorities, technology, methods of public administration, modes of regulating social relations.

An analysis of state power involves the study of various forms of its functioning, and it is not restricted to the traditional structural-functional and institutional-regulatory approaches. However, despite the fact that the significance of this phenomenon in modern political processes is growing, it is difficult to find a clear definition of the term "state power" in specialised literature. As a rule, the authors analyze various approaches to the generic concept of "power" and find features that allow to distinguish the former from the latter. Hence, in the research practice, there is a conceptual imbalance associated with the fact that the nature of power, its essence, social purpose and specificity of power relations are studied in a broad theoretical and methodological context. As for the state power, such conceptual variety is virtually absent.

In addition, the modern theory of state power is described either as a theory of state law, or as a theory of political power. In both cases, this phenomenon is given little scientific significance.

It should be noted that in modern Russia, liberal-democratic type of political rationality in understanding and organising state power, and institutional and regulatory organisation of its functioning is clearly dominant, while socio-cultural

and ethnopolitical problems are rarely analyzed in modern research projects. This leads to the fact that many categories, concepts, and theoretical-methodological models of cognition of this political phenomenon are taken on faith by the scientific community, without due socio-political and ethno-cultural analysis.

Today we can observe a significant “shortage of analysis and understanding of the nature and the most common parameters (changes) of statehood”, writes the modern state scholar L.S. Mamut (Mamut, 2003). There is also little doubt that a purely legal interpretation of the state life of a society is rarely capable of giving tangible results (both theoretically and in practice), because the various incarnations of sociality never exist in isolation, but complement each other and develop each other. In this respect, from our point of view, a comprehensive socio-political study of the phenomena related to public authority is necessary. Such a view of the problem indicates that when examining state power in a specific society, the researcher always encounters a successively self-reproducing continuum of ideas about state power, i.e., with the socio-cultural mechanism of production and reproduction of the image of power. The role of these socio-cultural factors, according to A.I. Solovyov, “is often much higher than the impact on the political process of institutional structures or constitutional and legislative norms” (Soloviev, 2002). One can generally state that the use of the concepts “power”, “political power”, “state power” is tightly connected with values and spiritual and moral perspective. Today, this fact is pointed out by many foreign (P. Bourdieu, A. Giddens, W. Connolly, S. Lukes, C. Taylor, M. Foucault, etc.), and domestic (A.M. Velichko, V.Yu. Vereshchagin, A.Y. Mordovtsev, A.I. Ovchinnikov, Yu.S. Pivovarov, D.E. Furman etc.) researchers of state power.

It is true that public authority and, more broadly, the national political space (as a socio-cultural phenomenon) is a very persistent phenomenon, notes in this regard N.A. Romanovich. Moreover, various types of public authority and forms of state rule “persist in this or that culture for centuries. In the event of a government change in a peaceful way or even a coup d'état, the former power structures are recreated in their essence, although outwardly they may look quite different ... Forms and structures of power are intrinsic for a particular culture, because they reflect certain aspects of the political outlook of the population, are not formed randomly in society, but in accordance with existing cultural grounds” (Romanovich, 2009).

Today, in political studies there is a clear “theoretical and methodological impulse” in the research of state and legal phenomena, focused on the use of complex (interdisciplinary) approaches to the study of the phenomenon of “state power”. Political science has significantly expanded its knowledge about the institutional and legal configuration of state power.

However, problematic situations in modern humanitarian science give rise to new theoretical and methodological discussions. Some authors argue that state power in its modern understanding does not exist at all, because the state through

its executive bodies uses this abstract concept to cover the institutional structure of domination, the “mechanism” of designing and imposing a certain style of (state) thinking. Therefore, in their opinion, it is necessary to abandon this mask term, which behind legal terminology hides its real face - the will to dominate. It is essential to replace it with something more “useful”, although it is not quite clear with what exactly. For example, J. Baudrillard writes, “in essence, power do not exist: there cannot be one-sided power relationship, on which the “structure” of power, the “reality” of power and its eternal movement would rest. All of these are dreams of the power in the form in which they are imposed on us by the mind” (Baudrillard, 2000). But one thing is clear: when “trying to completely abandon the notion of state power ... or to give this concept a completely derivative meaning, we feel that we have a successful or unsuccessful, but in any case extremely artificial stylisation,” noted the pre-revolutionary state scientist S.A. Kotlyarevsky.

In this respect, there is little doubt that too narrow an understanding of the political foundations of social being as a kind of institutional legal coding of reality has led to the spreading and rooting of the view of power as a legal instrument for regulating society, where “legal” is the meaning and basis of the existence of state power. Here we note that in many political studies, the system of state power is perceived primarily as an institutional and regulatory phenomenon, which should be analyzed by legal science, which is not entirely fair. Thus, the history of political thought and its practical realisation teaches us that neither power nor law is each other’s social demiurge: “Power did not create law, and it was not created by it” (S.A. Kotlyarevsky). Our hypothesis is that the state power is a complex socio-cultural and politico-legal phenomenon. The legal dimension of the system of state power and administration is insufficient. At the same time, the political analysis of state power without referring to its legal framework functioning is also limited.

Leading political scientists have long noted that a formal and normative understanding of the essence of state power leads to the fact that scientific constructions often “miss” the surrounding social and political life. Evaluation of political processes and phenomena often proceeds in exact accordance with the theoretical postulates and heuristic schemes accepted in science, in which other social phenomena are not taken into account in any way, while traditional legal knowledge, as M. Foucault rightly notes, is completely abstracted from them. As a result, the question arises: what if we really “enter into such a type of society, where the legal sphere is less and less capable of coding power and serving as a system of representations for it?” (Podoroga, 1989)

It seems that modern political life is much richer and, accordingly, the phenomenon of state power is more complex, too. Therefore, other analytical tools are needed, the ones that would grasp the complex social character, dynamics and historical conditionality of state power, its architectonic components.

In addition, it is worthwhile to focus on one more theoretical and methodological problem of the study of state power. Today, there is a certain “research fear” in the analysis of traditional problems of the national statehood, as well as in the use of concepts and categories formulated in the national theory of the state. On the contrary, in post-Soviet research projects the advantage was given to the Western European categorical-conceptual apparatus, as well as theoretical and methodological models designed for the analysis of a specific (Western legal-cultural and ethno-political) environment.

Of course, this does not mean ineffectiveness or inexpediency of applying the methodological schemes of Western political rationality. Our reasoning emphasises that these categories, concepts, methods and techniques are taken by the scientific community “just on faith”, without proper conceptual analysis and socio-cultural adaptation. We believe, although it is not indisputable, that the main definitions of modern statehood carry an obvious semantic load of a certain type of political rationality and legal understanding, the style of state thinking and political ideology.

The well-known Russian state scientist N.N. Alexeyev thought in the same way. The researcher noted that the general theory of the state and the state power represents, in fact, the history of political achievements of Western European civilisation that failed to notice and in some cases ignored the achievements and experience of the development of other state and legal spaces: “It is curious to ‘build a general theory of the state’ on experience of the last one hundred years of European history and throw away a thousand-year experience of the history of other cultures. Such a theory will be anything, but not science.” At the same time, criticising the intentional orientation of the majority of theorists of law and state, N.N. Alekseev notes, “Russian scientists, who graduated from Western schools, without any reservations brought the theory of the European state developed in the West onto Russian soil and thereby gave the principles of this theory a normative meaning. Therefore, our state science in the works of its most popular representatives was nothing more than a policy of Europeanisation of the Russian state” (Alekseev, 2008).

Indeed, following the famous Russian political scientist Yu.S. Pivovarov, we should recognise that domestic political science has not yet developed the theoretical principles and methodology for reconstructing the national political rationality. Even today, specific patterns of the evolution of public authority in the system “personality - society - state” are analyzed through a prism of foreign, Western European terminological system that is not quite clear and recognised by the Russian scientific community.

At the same time, the challenges of the present moment determine not only the need for intensive and adequate development and complication of the overall

concept of the system of public authority, but, more importantly, also the need for the general concept of power in modern Russian society (Chirkin, 2008).

The phenomenon of public authority and, in particular, the state power is closely tied with a certain temporary geopolitical and geo-legal continuum, within which the latter obtains its own status in six interrelated projections:

- First, in value-normative (axiological), reflecting the socio-cultural aspect, which influences the ideological-theoretical, doctrinal, ideological and conceptual-semantic perception, understanding and interpretation of the essence, social role and significance of state power, and determines its stability and legitimacy;
- Second, in structural and functional. In this context, state power is associated with a stable system of public institutions of power, its structural and functional characteristics, public and hidden patterns of relationships and interrelationships in the system of exercising state power, as well as issues of optimality, adequacy and the effectiveness of its functioning, regulation of social relations, realisation of interests and needs that dominate the system “personality - society – state”, resolution of conflicts and contradictions;
- Third, in institutional-normative, where the state power is considered as a system of legal powers that constitute the content of state power carried out to achieve goals defined in legislation;
- Fourth, in instrumental and technological, according to which the state power is analyzed as a system of organisational, material and symbolic resources necessary for the implementation by the administrative apparatus of its functional goals and tasks, as a special subject of political activity involved in the accumulation, exchange and implementation of these resources;
- Fifth, in sociological. In this aspect, the system of state power is viewed, on the one hand, as an interconnected set of specific political practices aimed at exercising of public authority in the society, on the other it is interpreted from the point of view of its adequacy to social structures and cultural contexts, as well as the possibility of implementing a socially-oriented legal policy, and managerial decisions that take into account national and cultural characteristics;
- Sixth, in geopolitical, where state power is considered as a sovereign political organisation in a certain territory, with supremacy, unity and socio-political integrity.

We emphasise that state power as a complex political phenomenon is a specific type (link) of the general system of public authority that is realised by various political actors (political parties and movements, public organisations and movements, trade unions, etc.) and other institutions of civil society (for example, institutions of local self-government), and which has a rigid link to the socio-cultural

and territorial space. In addition, the political phenomenon of state power, as noted above, is always realised in strict legal forms, regimes and procedures, which is one of the most fundamental differences of this type of public authority. Outside the institutional and regulatory dimension, it seems impossible to understand the functioning of state power in the modern political process, the basic forms and regimes of state power, the prospects for the development of this phenomenon.

In this respect, state power, from our point of view, should be interpreted as a system of officially recognised (legitimate and legal) practices, procedures and institutions acting on the basis of socioculturally conditioned ideas, images, symbols in a certain space organised politically and territorially, and characterised by sovereignty, functionality and sustainability. In this regard, any state power is territorial, sovereign, national and sustainable.

At the same time, the state power realises the link between various public values, interests and needs and the general political order and, accordingly, carries out its functions and directs the development of the political and legal system of the society, individual political institutions, formal and informal institutions of civil society.

The concrete historical transformation of the political system and the political culture of the society has its own specific trends and civilisational features. Despite all the cataclysms and historical reversals, socio-political evolution still proceeds in accordance with its own "matrix" of development and stable socio-cultural models of public-power relations supported by unconscious archetypal bases, thereby determining the attitude of the individual to the current political process and other phenomena of political and legal reality, as well as behavioral and emotional-psychological self-realisation of the individual.

Today, there is a tendency to comprehend the entire socio-political life of society through the prism of unity and integrity of the development of the social system. At the same time, it is necessary to interpret all the historical turns and transformations of political and legal matter as constituent parts of historically and logically integral, typologically independent state-legal system, both in the institutional and in the spiritual and cultural sense of the word.

Many modern researchers agree that the reason for all the failures in the transformation of the political and legal life of the Russian society lies in the value, spiritual and moral sphere. Thus, ignoring the socio-cultural dominants during political modeling, leads to a disruption of the harmonious development of social relations and the correspondence between the value, subject and semantic component of the social life of the subjects, and also violates the socio-political continuity. Abstractly developed political programs (in isolation from the socio-cultural environment) will inevitably have a destructive impact on the society, no matter how good the intentions are. A change in socio-political order will be successful "only

if the logic of change is developed in the culture itself, allowing the reproductive process to embody such a program that would be aimed at the formation of socio-cultural relations that do not go beyond the limits of irreversibility” (Ahiyezer, Kozlova & Matveev, 1993).

In spite of “fascination” by globalisation processes and the Liberal Democratic universalisation of national state-legal spaces in the XXI century, it became clear that continuity factor plays an important role in the political and legal transformation. It reflects the ability of the political organisation and legal order, despite various negative, and possibly destructive, internal and external impulses, to ensure the existence of the society, to keep the identity of the subjects, the established meaningful and useful social and legal, private and public institutions. In this context, continuity is the only way that can resist entropy destruction of the unity of the political and legal culture. It is obvious that every culture and social system in the process of its development accumulate a complex system of values providing stability even in times of transformation of social and legal order.

The main factor that ensures sustainable development and reproduction of society as a subject of history is precisely the factor of traditional continuity. It is noteworthy that even in the Soviet scientific literature and journalism, the factor of continuity in the state-legal and socio-cultural structure played a very significant role. For example, V.I. Novikov noted, “Not all the old traditions are reactionary and must be destroyed. There are folk traditions that consolidate universal moral norms (love of children, respect for elders, etc.), and progressive national traditions that express the best features of the people” (Novikov, 1963). In this context, the ideas of A. Herzen should be mentioned. He argued that there is, perhaps not in an explicit form, a continuity in the ordering of social relations and public and power relations. Such continuity, from his point of view, can even be seen in the natural growth of the communal way of life into socialism, the reproduction of certain historically established power relations (in the family, in the school, in the collective, in the state, etc.).

One can also agree with the opinion of V.V. Averyanov, who stated that a tradition is in fact a stage of social development, a concrete form of solving new problems based on the results achieved earlier, a specific (archetypally conditioned) way of developing human culture (Averyanov, 2000). At the same time, continuity must be considered in two ways, i.e. we should distinguish between technical and existential continuity. If the former reflects devotion, the obligation to “play by the established rules,” the second is the adoption of a certain way of life, the willingness to become and be historically conditioned by social actors. The adoption of a certain image of legal existence is directly associated with an appropriate way of thinking.

In this regard, the reconstruction of invariant models and institutions of political, legal and economic organisation of society becomes an extremely important task.

Equally important, however, are the questions of what really undergoes qualitative changes, on what basis these changes they proceed and for what purposes such models and institutions receive resources and organisational and administrative support. The Russian historian V.O. Klyuchevsky rightly noted that it is possible and advisable to borrow the method and technology of knitting stockings invented by others, but it is impossible and shameful (we would add – even impossible) to adopt someone else’s way of life, the system of feelings and relations. Each society and each person should have it their own, “as every decent man should have his own head and his own wife” (Klyuchevsky, 1987).

Undoubtedly, in the society, certain properties of individuals can be revealed that in everyday life manifest themselves only partially, if at all. The most important is that the society cannot engender any new properties of national psychology; it can only contribute to a more or less complete manifestation of what is initially present in this psychology (Bondyрева & Kolesov, 2004).

In this context, it is necessary to form an optimal model of operation of the political system. One of the priority tasks is the preservation and reproduction of archetypal dominants (cultural codes) of political and legal development, creation of an adequate national ideology and the implementation of the corresponding legal policy.

Summarising the experience of state-legal transformation of the post-Soviet states, several strategies for a qualitative change in the political and legal organisation can be singled out. These transformation strategies represent several political and ideological projects for the renewal of the political system.

The first strategy reflects the orientation of the entire legal policy of the state, as well as of all political institutions, on the development and institutionalisation of universal (Western European liberal-democratic) values and on adaptation of the traditional way of life to them. The transformational vector in this case is aimed at importing the Western European model of social, political, legal and economic organisation. The traditional identity of citizens, the national system of values, the axioms of legal consciousness are levelled and replaced by theoretically formulated Western ideals interpreted as universal.

The leading political theorist J. Gray rightly notes in this respect that, in fact, modernisation as a socio-political phenomenon today “equates to Westernisation, understood as secularisation or liberalisation, as the spread of the institutions of Western civil society, the acceptance by other cultures of Western morality, individualism or the very idea of progress” (Gray, 2003). It should be noted that this version of modernisation of the state-legal organisation is not only a perception of a certain set of effective principles, tools and institutions, but, above all, of an integral way of life, opposing and replacing the historically formed socio-cultural image of life and coexistence, since the latter contains a complex of socio-legal

principles prescribing the best political, economic, spiritual order and the best institutions for mankind. It is obvious that the aim of this project is to “overcome all historically accidental and culturally heterogeneous and lay the foundations of a single civilisation qualitatively different from everything that existed before ... implies ignoring cultural differences in human life, in a colossal way underestimates the political significance of these differences and even distorts our perspective ... prevents us from perceiving political realities correctly, interpreting nationalism and ethnicity as transitional and even secondary features of modern life” (Gray, 2003).

The second strategy is aimed at the adequate fixation at the institutional, legal and socio-political levels of stable sociocultural models of interaction that have historically evolved in the system “personality - society – state”, of different dominants of development ensuring social cohesion and order. P.I. Novgorodtsev argues that freedom that denies the foundations of general social and cultural connection and social solidarity, leads ultimately to self-destruction and destruction of the basis of legal and state life, especially in those societies where freedom of the individual is traditionally connected with the internal and not the external world of a person (Novgorodtsev, 1991).

Many of our “neighbors in the post-Soviet space” were more restrained and perceived the political slogan of the nineties “Back to Europe!” more sensibly. For example, P. Tomasz, a well-known Hungarian sociologist, writes, “Initially, just like the Russian political and economic elites, we were guided by the recommendations of the World Bank and tried to import American models of social institutions. However, we realised very quickly that those models would not take root on our soil. We needed to take something closer to our culture as a model” (Yadov, 2006).

Ignoring the socio-cultural patterns and archetypal structures of the development of political and legal cultures, the process of importing institutions and borrowing foreign political and legal ideas and doctrines causes an “imitation effect” in public-power interaction at all levels and spheres of social organisation. For example, the results of sociological studies conducted by the Levada Center record the spread of the imitation effect (“public simulacra” – the use of the form of a billboard, words devoid of real meaning) at all points of public-legal communication playing an important (symptomatic) phenomenon of modernity. Liberal democratic reforms and pluralism of the political system are being imitated, as are adherence to Western European standards of democracy and ensuring the privacy of spiritual and moral dominants (their displacement from the sphere of public interaction and political assessments), respect for election procedures, and so on (Levada, 2003).

Recent sociological research captures the continuity of the reproduced attitude towards the state and law, reflecting the almost invariable stratum of the national political and legal mentality. Today, “a triad – welfare, order, social justice – has been formed as the leading paradigm. This triad occupies leading positions in all

electoral groups, and remains practically unchanged,” conclude the authors of the analytical report, devoted to the study of national political and legal consciousness (Citizens..., 2004).

A lot of modern research conducted in 2010 - 2015 persistently recorded that legal and political institutions do not have a self-sufficient value in the Russian political consciousness and receive their sociocultural significance only in conjunction with the basic socio-cultural values for which they are created and function.

CONCLUSION

State power as a form of public authority is a system of officially recognised (legitimate and legal) power practices, procedures and institutions acting on the basis of socioculturally conditioned ideas, images, symbols in a certain politically and territorially organised space and characterised by sovereignty, functionality and sustainability. In the modern political process, the identity of state power is institutionalised and explored in six interrelated dimensions: value-normative (axiological); structural-functional; institutional-normative; instrumental-technological, sociological, and geopolitical. The ideological and state doctrine legitimises and legalises concrete historical functioning of public power institutions through the formation of a special political state of society – political meta-narration. Democratic meta-narration is oriented towards constant re-creation of socio-political unity and state integrity, its modern alternative is conservative meta-narration based on ideocratic stability, continuity of ethnopolitical practices, socio-cultural integrity and historically conditioned socio-political unity in the context of national and collective interests and values. Ideological and conceptual basis of state power is always associated with the socio-political thought of society, its capabilities and boundaries, and represent a combination of trends and vectors of public authority transformation.

The modern strategy of political transformation in the post-Soviet space is guided by the sociocultural conditioning of public-power interaction of citizens, the formation of political organisation and legal order, taking into account the reproducible national dominants. At the same time, there is awareness of the fact that it is on the basis of cultural codes that citizens from generation to generation derive their identity, and a certain order of relationships. A stable perception in the mass political consciousness in the post-Soviet space is the perception of state legal organisation as the institutional basis for the reproduction and protection of national and cultural integrity, where neither legal nor political institutions can and should not be independent of the socio-cultural dominants of the development of the social system. Moreover, they should be assessed and monitored in terms of the goals and norms of the socio-cultural environment in which they operate.

At the same time, we emphasise the fact that the evolution of political organisation and public-power interaction in the system “personality-society-state” proceeds in certain archetypically prescribed limits. The perception of new political and legal experience or innovative elements in certain transitional (transformational) periods is realised through the prism of successively reproduced emotional and psychological readiness and cognitive attitudes, adapted and applied according to the prevailing style of political and legal thinking. Therefore, the existing state-legal system of society cannot be regarded as the result of exclusively rational-volitional efforts of one generation. It forms and develops together with the formation and development of the society, has similar patterns, principles and specific vectors of evolution. Every stage of development of political and legal organisation should be considered: on the one hand, as a relatively independent, integral (in the sociocultural sense) stage of the development of society; on the other hand, as a successive stage of the general national and cultural evolution unfolding around a specific archetypal core (legal-cultural and socio-political codes, and the development dominant).

Acknowledgement

The work was carried out with the financial support of the grant of the President of the Russian Federation No. MD-6669.2016.6.

References

- Ahiyezer A. S., Kozlova N. N. & Matveev S. I. (1993). *Modernization in Russia and the conflict of values*. Moscow: Progress, p. 37.
- Alekseev, N.N. (2008). *Sketches according to the general theory of the state. Main prerequisites and hypotheses of the state science*. Moscow: Moscow scientific publishing house, p. 16.
- Averyanov, V.V. (2000). Tradition and traditionalism in scientific and social thought of Russia. *Social sciences and present, 1*, p. 70.
- Baudrillard, J. (2000). *De la Seduction*. Moscow: Ad Marginem, p. 96.
- Bondyreva, S.K. & Kolesov, D.V. (2004). *Traditions: stability and continuity in life of society*. Moscow: Flint, Moscow psycho-social institute, p. 138.
- Chirkin, V.E. (2008). Russian constitution and public power of the people. *State and right, 12*, p. 24.
- Citizens of new Russia (2004). As feel and what society would like to live? (1998 – 2004)*. Analytical report. Moscow: Institute of complex strategic researches.
- Demetradze, M.R. (2012). *Central area of traditional sociocultural values as information and communicative phenomenon: new approaches to studying of traditions and traditionalism (on the example of Russia)*. Moscow: OOO “NB-Media”.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (1973). *Tradition, Change, and modernity*. New York, Sydney, Toronto, pp. 51-52.
- Gray, J. (2003). *Commemoration for Enlightenment: Policy and culture in the twilight of the present*. Moscow: Praxis.
- Hessen, V.M. (1912). *The general doctrine about the state*. St. Petersburg: Tipo-Lit, pp. 10-23.

- Kluchevsky, V.O. (1987). *Course of the Russian history (Part 1)*. Compositions in nine volume, Vol. 1. Moscow: Thought.
- Kluckhohn, K. (1998). *Mirror for the person. Introduction to anthropology*. St. Petersburg: Eurasia, p. 190.
- Levada, Yu. (2003). Framework and options of the historical choice: several reasons about the course of the Russian transformation. *Monitoring of public opinion, 1*.
- Lyubashits, V.Y., Mamychev, A.Y., Mordovcev, A.Y. & Vronskay, M.V. (2015). The social-cultural paradigm of state authority. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 6(36)*, pp. 301-306.
- Mamut, L.S. (2003). About the state and statehood / the Main concepts of the right and the state in modern Russia (on materials of «a round table» in the Center of the theory and history of the right and state Institute of the state and right of RAS). *State and right, 5*, p. 15.
- Mead, M. (1998). *Culture and world of the childhood*. Moscow: Science, pp. 49-50.
- Moiseeva, N.A. & Sorokovikova, V.I. (2003). Mentality and national character (About the choice of a method of a research). *Sociological researches, 3*, p. 51.
- Mordovtsev, A.Yu. & Popov, V.V. (2007). *Russian legal mentality*. Rostov-on-Don: SFU.
- Mostovaya, I.V. & Skoryk, A.P. (1995). Archetypes and reference points of the Russian mentality. *Political researches, 4*, p. 70.
- Novgorodtsev, P.I. (1991). *About a public ideal*. Moscow: Press.
- Novikov, V.I. (1963). Formation of moral traditions and habits in the Soviet society (Candidate of philosophical sciences). Perm.
- Ovchinnikov, A.I., Mamychev, A.Yu., Monastyrny, A.V. & Tyurin, M.E. (2008). *Legal archetypes in legal policy of Russia*. Rostov-on-Don: SFU.
- Podoroga, V.A. (1989). *Power and knowledge (archaeological search of M. Foucault)*. Moscow: Science, p. 220.
- Remizov, M. (2002). *Experience of conservative criticism*. Moscow: Fund of scientific research of the Pragmatist of culture.
- Rohrmoser, J. (1996). *Liberalism crisis*. Moscow: Institute of philosophy of RAS.
- Romanovich, N.A. (2009). *Formation and reproduction of an image of the power in the Russian society: monograph*. Voronezh: Voronezh State University Publishing House, pp. 5-7.
- Soloviev, A.I. (2002). Political culture: to a problem of identification of national models. *Principles and practice of political researches, p. 126*.
- Yadov, V.A. (2006). *Problems of the Russian transformations*. St. Petersburg: Publishing house St. Petersburg Humanities university of labor unions.