



UDC: 35.077

Hasanov Ruslan Rafisovich,

Post-Graduate Student, Department of Public Policy and Political Analytics, National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, 03057, Kyiv, Str. Sofii Perovskoi, 5, tel.: (067) 418 26 42, e-mail: hasan.ruslan@mail.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-2029-3950

Хасанов Руслан Рафісович,

аспірант кафедри публічної політики та політичної аналітики, Національна академія державного управління при Президентові України, 03057, Київ, вул. Софії Перовської, 5, тел.: (067) 418 26 42, e-mail: hasan.ruslan@mail.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-2029-3950

Хасанов Руслан Рафісович,

аспірант кафедри публічної політики и политической аналітики, Національна академія державного управління при Президенте України, 03057, Киев, ул. Софьи Перовской, 5, тел.: (067) 418 26 42, e-mail: hasan.ruslan@mail.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-2029-3950

DOI <https://doi.org/10.31618/vadnd.v1i11.35>

SOCIAL CONFLICT: ARCHETYPAL NATURE AND RESOLUTION MECHANISM

Abstract. On the basis of the archetypic analysis of development trends of a conflictological paradigm the author's model of minimization of conflict potential in modern society is offered. Institutional construction is the basis for model that is harmonized with a factor of societal identity.

It is noted that the problems of social conflicts, according to data from monitoring studies of the Ukrainian school of archetype, are increasingly shifted into the sphere of interpersonal relations. It is stimulated by the progression in society of so-called self-sufficient personalities, the "subjectification" of the social space, and at the same time narrowing down to the solution of entirely specific situations in which there is a collision of the interests of two or more parties.

Instead, in order to find the optimal solution for resolving the conflict, it is necessary to have interdisciplinary knowledge, in particular understanding of the

deep nature of such conflicts. Collision of points of view, thoughts, positions — a very frequent phenomenon of modern social life. In order to develop the correct line of behavior in various conflict situations, it is important to adequately understand the nature of the emergence of the modern conflict and the mechanisms for resolving them in substance. Knowledge of conflict nature enriches the culture of communication and makes human life and social groups not only more calm, but also creates conditions for constructive development. It is proved that in modern life one can not but agree with the statement that an individual carries first responsibility for his own life and only then for the life of the social groups to which he belongs. And while making decisions within the framework of modern mechanisms (consensus), the properties of human psychology such as extroversion, emotionality, irrationality, intuition, externality, and executive ability will not at least contribute to such a task.

That is why in the author's research attracted attention to the archetypal nature of the conflict — the primitive images, ideas, feelings inherent in man as a bearer of the collective unconscious.

Keywords: social conflict, social identity, societal identity, societal changes, archetypic nature of the conflict.

СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ КОНФЛІКТ: АРХЕТИПНА ПРИРОДА ТА МЕХАНІЗМ РОЗВ'ЯЗАННЯ

Анотація. На основі архетипного аналізу тенденцій розвитку конфліктологічної парадигми пропонується авторська модель мінімізації конфліктного потенціалу в сучасному суспільстві. В основу моделі покладено інституційну побудову, що гармонізується з фактором соціетальної ідентичності. Відзначено, що проблематика соціальних конфліктів, як свідчать дані моніторингових досліджень Української школи архетипіки, дедалі зміщується у сферу міжособистісних відносин. Вона стимулюється прогресією в суспільстві так званих самодостатніх особистостей, “суб’єктивацією” соціального простору і водночас звужується до рішення цілком конкретних ситуацій, в яких спостерігається зіткнення інтересів двох або більшого числа сторін.

Натомість, аби знайти оптимальне рішення щодо розв’язання конфлікту, потрібно мати міждисциплінарне знання, зокрема розуміння глибинної природи такого роду конфліктів. Зіткнення точок зору, думок, позицій — дуже часте явище сучасного суспільного життя. Щоби виробити вірну лінію поведінки в різних конфліктних ситуаціях, важливо адекватно розуміти природу виникнення сучасного конфлікту і механізми їх вирішення по суті. Знання конфліктної природи збагачує культуру спілкування і робить життя людини та соціальних груп не тільки більш спокійним, але і створює умови для конструктивного розвитку. Доведено, що в сучасному житті вже не можна не погодитись із твердженням, що індивід несе передусім відповідальність за власне життя і лише потім за життя соціальних груп, до яких він належить. А під час прийняття рішень в межах дії сучасних механізмів (консенсусу) такі властивості людської психології, як екстраверсія, емоційність, іраціо-

нальність, інтуїтивність, екстернальність та екзекутивність вже щонайменше не сприятимуть такому завданню.

Саме тому в авторському дослідженні привернуто увагу до архетипної природи конфлікту — первісних образів, ідей, почуттів, властивих людині як носію колективного несвідомого.

Ключові слова: соціальний конфлікт, соціальна ідентичність, соціетальна ідентичність, соціетальні зміни, архетипна природа конфлікту.

СОЦИАЛЬНЫЙ КОНФЛИКТ: АРХЕТИПИЧЕСКАЯ ПРИРОДА И МЕХАНИЗМ РЕШЕНИЯ

Аннотация. На основе архетипного анализа тенденций развития конфликтологической парадигмы предлагается авторская модель минимизации конфликтного потенциала в современном обществе. В основу модели положено институциональное построение, что гармонизируется с фактором социетальной идентичности. Отмечено, что проблематика социальных конфликтов, как свидетельствуют данные мониторинговых исследований Украинской школы архетипики, все смещается в сферу межличностных отношений. Она стимулируется прогрессией в обществе так называемых самодостаточных личностей, “субъективации” социального пространства и одновременно сужается к решению вполне конкретных ситуаций, в которых наблюдается столкновение интересов двух или большего числа сторон.

Вместо того, чтобы найти оптимальное решение по решению конфликта, нужно иметь междисциплинарное знание, в частности понимание глубинной природы такого рода конфликтов. Столкновение точек зрения, мнений, позиций — очень частое явление современной общественной жизни. Чтобы выработать верную линию поведения в различных конфликтных ситуациях, важно правильно понимать природу возникновения современного конфликта и механизмы их решения по существу. Знание конфликтной природы обогащает культуру общения и делает жизнь человека и социальных групп не только более спокойной, но и создает условия для конструктивного развития. Доказано, что в современной жизни уже нельзя не согласиться с утверждением, что индивид несет прежде всего ответственность за собственную жизнь и только потом за жизнь социальных групп, к которым он принадлежит. А при принятии решений в пределах действия современных механизмов (консенсуса) такие свойства человеческой психологии, как экстраверсия, эмоциональность, иррациональность, интуитивность, экстернальность и екзекутивность уже как минимум не будут способствовать такому заданию.

Именно поэтому в авторском исследовании привлечено внимание к архетипной природе конфликта — первобытных образов, идей, чувств, присущих человеку как носителю коллективного бессознательного.

Ключевые слова: социальный конфликт, социальная идентичность, социетальная идентичность, социетальные изменения, архетипическая природа конфликта.

Statement of a problem. Social development the indicator of which are the current transformation processes, provokes the essential growth of number of the social conflicts, complicates their nature and at the same time aggravates deficiency of theoretical representations concerning mechanisms of settlement of the social conflicts. Against the background of the general growth of number of the publications devoted to a conflictological problematics there are practically no works which would be directed to studying of the deep reasons of the social conflicts and their influence on life of the certain person and society in general. The problematics of the social conflicts as evidenced by monitoring data from the Ukrainian school archetypic, further is displaced to the sphere of the interpersonal relations. It is stimulated by a progression in the company of so-called self-sufficient persons, subjectification of social space and at the same time is narrowed to the solution of quite concrete situations in which collision of interests of two or bigger numbers of the parties is observed.

Instead of finding an optimal solution on resolution of conflict, it is necessary to have interdisciplinary knowledge, in particular understanding of the depth nature of such conflicts. Collision of the points of view, judgements, positions is very frequent phenomenon of the modern public life. To work out a right line of behavior in different conflict situations, it is important to understand adequately the nature of origin of the modern conflict and mechanisms of their decision in fact. Knowledge of the conflict nature

enriches the culture of communication and does human life and social groups not only quieter, but also creates conditions for constructive development.

For this reason in an authoring research attention to the archetypic nature of conflict — the primitive images, the ideas, feelings inherent in the person as to the carrier collective unconscious is drawn.

Analysis of the last researches and publications. One of the key ideas of last half a century is connected to world processes of globalization and according to models of the conflict of civilizations that hide the global social conflict between center and a periphery colonized by it [1, p. 172]. From now the conflictological problematics is considered as a separate direction of scientific research, and their results become a reliable source of a statement of the social world and public safety.

For today in scientific literature on conflictology theoretical and practical problems of an essence, nature and mechanisms of different conflicts are discussed in detail. In particular, according to the nature of the modern — Postmodern society the probable nature of causativity of the conflicts is revealed in it and at the same time, in the context of action of society stereotypes of an era of the Modernist style it is claimed that without effective institutes of the practician of settlement of the conflicts falls into decay [2, p. 31].

The American sociologist Pitirim Sorokin in details analyzed a phenomenon of social revolution as the embodiments of system conflict collision of different social interests. He has come to a conclusion that the recipe of avoi-

dance of revolutions are timely reforms. However, exactly lack of efficiency of reforms, in her opinion, creates premises for explosion of revolution. Reforms can be successful if they:

“1) do not destroy human nature and do not contradict basic instincts;

2) careful scientific research of specific social conditions shall precede any practical stage of the beginning of reforms;

3) each reform needs to be tested at first on objects of smaller social scale;

4) reforms shall be put into practice by legal and constitutional means” [3, p. 271].

But such ideal status of carrying out reforms is very rarely seen in a real story.

The considerable contribution to understanding of the public nature and to questions of a unification of people in society was realized by the representative of the French sociological school Emil Durkheim. For sociology there is no more humane task, than to understand what induces people to live together, why the stable social order appears the highest value for them, what laws control the interpersonal relations. But not only to understand, but also to offer the government specific recommendations about the organization of the modern life. Not the fight of classes, but coexistence of comprehensively developed persons (which is not shorted in class, professional or exclusive interests), “solidary life” is the prime target in E. Durkheim [4, p. 315–326].

According to such humanistic intention he builds all program of his activities which can be divided into four parts:

1) creation of the “correct” methodology shall equip the sociologist with the reliable instrument of knowledge;

2) analysis of historical evolution of division of labor is designed to show the “correct” way of movement of mankind from mechanical (primitive and forced) to organic (conscious and voluntary) solidarity;

3) specific (statistical) research of an essence of suicide aims to reveal the abnormal statuses, deviations from the “correct” way (i. e. solidarity) and to warn mankind about possible consequences of public order corrupting;

4) doctrine about religion and education equips us with the “correct” technology of overcoming crisis statuses and solidifying of solidarity.

Social solidarity – the main force which cements and unites society, creating public unity. It arises as a logical consequence of public division of labor, that is specialization and distribution of people by professions. The individuals connected by labor functions in the uniform system of the public relations become already not just carriers of professional roles, but also socially mature persons. Solidarity is based on collective consciousness – set of the general beliefs and feelings which are shared by members of one group or society. Collective consciousness reflects character of the people, its ideals and traditions.

So, for creation of steady society with the minimum risk of conflictness it is necessary to put natural evolutionary model of identity in the basis of its construction or, in other words, to develop social institutes according to stages of development of identity which was theoretically planned by the

German-American psychologist Erik Erikson [5] and the domestic sociologist Eduard Afonin has subjected to the practical archetypical analysis and verification within the Ukrainian society [6, 7].

Concerning integrated society, then “Solidary life” (according to Durkheim), which individuals get the societal¹ identity relying on individual values, can become an example of it.

The purpose of the article is the author’s attempt to formulate and prove prerequisites of minimization of potential for conflict in modern society.

Statement of basic materials. In present difficult conditions of a transitional era of social development when the anomy absorbs society, causes disintegration processes and disintegration of system of social norms which guarantee public order (according to E. Durkheim) not only facial layers of public system (social institutes) are

modified. Cardinal changes is happening with human nature, its conscious and unconscious. Respectively the conflictological cultural paradigm of society changes. In particular, the institutional bases connected with social-class public consciousness become exhausted in it and, on the contrary, internal and psychological factors and new institutes connected with democratic mechanisms of conflict resolutions become priority.

There is a need for new knowledge about the conflicts and ways of their peaceful solution. At the same time many heads “from the past” prefer to solve the conflicts and conflict situations by power methods, even without guessing that for today there is a wide arsenal of new constructive methods of an exit from the conflict, they can conditionally be designated as situations “a prize – a prize”.

Taking into account the fact that the person always acts as a conflict source, we will try to carry out the psychological analysis of the conflict, and for this purpose we will address the personal theory of the American psychologist Erik Erikson [5]. In this context we will try to understand what is the “social” and “societal” identities and also how new – societal nature of public system influences its development during the Postmodern era. Respectively we will be able to understand how to reach constancy – non-conflictual public existence in the conditions of new, dynamic by its nature public system, that the factor of societality is a determining factor in it, and a phenomenon of “solidary life” (according to E. Durkheim) – complementary (supplementing) factor.

¹ The term “societal” was introduced for scientific use in 1906 in the context of approach of public and transformational processes of “a great depression” by the first professor of Yale University (USA) William Sumner. He connected relevance of his innovation with new (more difficult and developed) social nature; he sought to mark out regularities of a certain collective or group organization of the individual activity (Sumner W. G. Folkways. A study of the sociological impotence of uses, manners, customs, mores, and morals. – Boston, 1906). His pupil and the follower, professor of Yale University Albert Keller uses this concept for the sociological analysis of organizational aspects of activity of society, seeking to construct the complete theory of societal evolution (see: Keller A. G. Societal evolution: study of the evolutionary basis of the science of society. – New Haven, 1915). The American sociologist Talcott Parsons uses the term “societal” for the characteristic of the processes happening in society in general, and the term “social” – to the social phenomena and processes.

The theory of identity of E. Erikson opens stages and factors of development of the personality in society, defines the key psychosocial qualities of the personality necessary for a harmonious entrance of the personality to a social group [5]. E. Afonin in his researches claims that development stages are characteristic for society, besides they are identical to stages of the personality development. He investigated and detailed an archetypic nature of these stages [6, 7].

Having studied and having analysed development of identity processes, it will become possible to construct social system in which the purpose of each of individual or collective social subjects will make harmonious joint unity. How it is possible? One of the most exact answers is offered by E. Durkheim in its work about public division of labor in which he offers constructions of “organic” and “mechanical” solidarity.

So, to understand how the personality develops, we will consider the personal theory of E. Erikson [5].

From all theories of analytical psychology, appeared in the second half of the 20th century, perhaps, the personal theory of E. Erikson became the most recognized and widespread. It is connected with the fact that his thoughts of integrity of the personality, its sameness (identity) to itself and to society in which it lives became relevant for the majority of the modern countries in which one of the most painful public problems is the dissociation and loneliness of people.

Being a pupil and follower of Anna Freud (daughter of Sigmund Freud) E. Erikson studied and further developed rather the initial ideas of psy-

choanalysis than the allocated concept of “Ego psychology”. At the heart of this concept intended by A. Freud and A. Kardiner the idea that a main part of personality organization is not unconscious “Id” as in S. Freud, but the reportable part of the Ego which seeks in the context of self-development for maintaining its integrity and identity.

No less important, the personal theory of Erikson has connected together several tendencies in development of personality psychology. It has connected psychoanalytic approach of Freud with the important ideas of humanistic psychology of K. Rogers, in particular thoughts about an ambiguous role of adaptation which stops self-development of the personality, and importance of maintaining by the identity of own identity and integrity. Basic provisions of E. Erikson’s concept have been by him in the book “Childhood and Society” (1950) which has brought him broad popularity. His following works as “Young Man Luther” (1958), “Identity” (1968) and “Gandhi’s Truth” (1969) have laid the foundation of new approach to the analysis of relationship between the person and society including in the analysis of historical events and characters. Thereby the separate direction in the history of psychological science, received the name “psychohistory”, has been put.

Personal theory of Erikson not only reconsiders Freud’s positions concerning hierarchy of the personality structures, but also in understanding of a role of the environment, culture and a social environment of the child which, from his point of view, have huge influence on development. He places special

emphasis on the relations “the child – family”, and is more concrete on the relations the child – mother”. At the same time he considers that “congenital inclinations” of the person are fragments of aspirations which have to gather, gain value and be organized in the period of long children’s age. Lengthening of the childhood period of just is also connected with this need of socialization of children. For this reason E. Erikson proved that “instinctive arms” (sexual and aggressive) of the person are much more mobile and more plastically, than at animals. The organization and the direction of development of these congenital inclinations are connected with methods of upbringing and education which change from culture to culture and are predetermined by traditions. Each society develops its own institutes of socialization to help children with various individual qualities to become full-fledged members of this social group.

Social sciences traditionally operate with the term “*social identity*” which means belonging of subjects to certain social groups and identification with them. Such theoretical approach quite corresponded to an era of a revolutionary modernist style. More precisely, it corresponded the psychosocial nature of (“emotionally sensitive”) that time person with a certain set of psychosocial properties: “*extraversion*”, “*emotionality*”, “*irrationality*”, “*intuitivism*”, “*externality*”, “*executivity*” [7, p. 265–266]. Exactly this set of human properties was the cause of domination in the society of materialistic views of history”, and in the context of public consciousness – distribution of identification practitioners, based on class,

age, ethnic, professional and others social (read as social and material) differences and kinds of social identity.

But in modern life it is no longer possible to agree with a statement that the individual bears first of all responsibility for own life and only then for life of social groups to which he belongs. And during decision-making within operation of modern mechanisms (consensus) such properties of human psychology as extraversion, emotionality, irrationality, intuitivism, externality and executivity already at least won’t promote such task. What psychosocial properties of the individual are capable for its successful activity today?

The response to this question opens a concept essence “societal identity” which was introduced for scientific use by professor E. Afonin [7, p. 267]. In its judgement, the new psychosocial type of the personality is inherent to a new socio-historical era of the Postmodern. In particular, it is about counteraverse in relation to “emotional sensitive” person of the Modernist style era, “rational” psychosocial type of the personality and contradictory sign of qualities: introversion, pragmatism, rationality, sensitivity, internality, intentionality. He defines an essence of each of these signs as:

1) extraversion/*introversion*: reveals mental installation on view of life, characterizes a directivity of mentality on an external, object and material essence of objects and things (materialistic pattern of the world), or, on the contrary – on an internal, subject and idealistic entity of objects and things (idealistic pattern of the world);

2) emotionality/*pragmatism*: defines the mental and qualitative charac-

teristics oriented on socially important (moral) behavior or on utilitarian values (the material favor, economic efficiency etc);

3) irrationality/*rationality*: defines a decision-making method (as the evaluation and strong-willed act, or in a consequence of reasonable calculation);

4) intuitivism/*sensitivity*: reveals features of interaction of the person with the world;

5) externality/*internality* (or as it is called scale locus monitoring): defines tendency of the subject to attribute responsibility for results of its activities to external (state and public) or internal (personal and personal) forces;

6) executivity/*intentionality*: shows gender identification of people as mental property and tendency to implementation of the sociocultural roles which are traditionally carried to the woman (functioning/reproduction of integrity) or the man (a development/output out of limits of unity).

These results of researches acquire nowadays extreme relevance of virtuality and social networks. If in the society of a former era of the Modernist style the personality was guided, first of all, by needs of community or society, and the conflicts were solved as class-irreconcilable ("or/or"). Perhaps a compromise was possible ("consent on a negative"). Now, in the conditions of the Postmodern, we pass to existence model in which decisions are made by the individual on the basis of preferentially own interests, and the all-social decision is made on a formula "consensus" ("consent on a positive").

In other words, if earlier (during an era which passes) conflict situations

were solved by force methods, then now the logical decision on the "win-win" model is peculiar to overcoming the conflicts.

The considerable contribution to understanding of the public nature and to questions of a unification of people in society was realized by the representative of the French sociological school Emil Durkheim. For this sociology there is no more humane task, than to understand what induces people to live together, why the stable social order appears the highest value for them, what laws control the interpersonal relations. But not only to understand, but also to offer the government specific recommendations about the organisation of the modern life. Not the fight of classes, but coexistence of comprehensively developed persons (which is not shorted in class, professional or exclusive interests), "solidary life" is the prime target in E. Durkheim [4, p. 326].

According to such humanistic intention he builds all program of its activities which can be divided into four parts:

1) creation of the "correct" methodology shall arm the sociologist with the reliable instrument of knowledge;

2) the analysis of historical evolution of division of labor is designed to show the "correct" way of movement of mankind from mechanical (primitive and forced) to organic (conscious and voluntary) solidarity;

3) the specific (statistical) research of an essence of suicide sets as the purpose to reveal the abnormal statuses, deviations from the "correct" way (i. e. solidarity) and to warn mankind about possible consequences of corrupting of public order;

4) the doctrine about religion and education arms us with the “correct” technology of overcoming crisis states and strengthenings of solidarity.

Social solidarity – the main force which cements and unites society, creating public whole. It arises as a logical consequence of public division of labor, that is specialization and distribution of people by professions. The individuals connected by labor functions in the uniform system of the public relations become not just carriers of professional roles, but also socially mature persons. Solidarity is founded on collective consciousness – set of the general beliefs and feelings which are shared by members of one group or society. Collective consciousness reflects character of the people, its ideals and traditions, is inherent the Modernist style (industrial) society.

Modern Postmodern society is made, mainly, by “self-sufficient individuals” with the corresponding individual and valuable principles and rational consciousness. As the uniting mechanism of such individuals the phenomenon “organic solidarity” acts and it needs scientific and empirical verification. But by the monitoring researches of the Ukrainian school of an archetype which are already conducted within archetypal methodology and tool base (1992–2017) [6] it is established that “orange revolution” (2004) became manifestation the birth in Ukraine new – the self-sufficient person, the carrier of societal identity.

So, among total of Ukrainian, carriers of identity as of 2004 (34 %), the part of carriers of societal identity has made 21,3 %, and carriers of social identity – 12,4 %. Within the last 13

years there was an essential progression as general part of carriers of identity in Ukraine (46,8 %), and its components – societal (25,5 %) and social (21,3 %) identities. And the mode of the first, by all means, remained the leader. In the nearest future, on monitoring expectations, the cumulative indicator of identity has to reach 2/3 of adult populations, and it radically will change a situation in Ukraine.

So, in Ukraine the state forming processes, leaning on all society based on the self-sufficient *personality with its* societal identity, have to make development of the public and imperious relations with the minimum risk of conflictness.

Conclusions:

1. The carried-out analysis has shown radical changes which are endured by a conflictological paradigm with globalization of public and transformational processes. In particular, the analysis has confirmed conclusions of other researches on the shift of epicenter of the conflict in modern – the Postmodern world with externally – material plan, on internal-psychological plan, from the sphere of conscious to the sphere archetypic unconscious.

2. The research has confirmed the opinion of the French psychologist Serge Moscovici on the importance of a psychological factor in the modern world [8, p. 7]. In particular, it has proved that modern public and transformational processes make actual deep interrelations in social system, removing the psychological mechanism of identity to the place of a backbone factor.

3. Key prerequisite of minimization of conflictness in modern society is

institutional construction that is harmonized with a factor of societal identity.

REFERENCES

1. *Panarin A. S.* (2003). Strategicheska-ya nestabilnost v XXI veke [Strategic instability in the XXI century]. – Moscow : Algoritm [in Russian].
2. *Afonin E. A., Martynov A. Yu.* (2017). Arkhetypika sotsialno-politychnykh konfliktiv: vid modernu do post-modernu [Archetype of socio-political conflicts: from the modern to the postmodern]. Publichne uriaduvannya. – Public administration, 3 (8) [in Ukrainian].
3. *Sorokin P. A.* (1992). Chelovek. Tsivilizatsiya. Obshchestvo [Man. Civilization. Society]. Moscow: Izd-vo politicheskoy literatury [in Russian].
4. *Aron R.* (1992). Etapy razvitiya sotsiologicheskoy mysli [Les Étapas de la pensée sociologique]. P. S. Gurevich (Ed.). Moscow : Izd. gruppа “Progress” – “Politika” [in Russian].
5. *Afonin E. A., Sushyi O. V.* (2015). Zakonomirnosti ta osoblyvosti ukrainskoi transformatsii [Patterns and Peculiarities of Ukrainian Transformation]. Stratehichna panorama – Strategic Panorama. – № 1. – 94–108 [in Ukrainian].
6. *Afonin E. A., Berezhnyi Ya. V., Valevskiy O. L.* et al. (2010). Liudska identychnist ta osoblyvosti yii vplyvu na polityku y derzhavne upravlinnia [Human Identity and Peculiarities of its Influence on Politics and Public Administration]. Kontseptualni zasady vzaiemodii polityky y upravlinnia – Conceptual Principles of Policy-Governance Interaction. V. A. Rebkal, V. A. Shakhov, V. V. Holub, V. M. Kozakov (Eds.). (p. 265–289). Kyiv: NADU [in Ukrainian].
7. *Erik Erikson* i ego-psikhologiya [Erik Erickson and ego-psychology]. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.erikson.psy4.ru/theory.htm> [in Russian].
8. *Moscovici S.* (1998). Mashina tvo-ryashchaya bogov [La machine des dieux créateurs]. Moscow: “Tsentr psikhologii i psikhoterapii” [in Russian].

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Панарин А. С.* Стратегическая нестабильность в XXI веке / А. С. Панарин. – М. : Алгоритм, 2003. – 559 с.
2. *Афонін Е. А.* Архетипіка соціально-політичних конфліктів: від модерну до постмодерну / Е. А. Афонін, А. Ю. Мартинов // Публічне урядування: зб. – № 3 (8). – 2017 (спецвип.). – К. : ДП “Вид. дім “Персонал”, 2017. – 422 с.
3. *Сорокин П. А.* Человек. Цивилизация. Общество. – М. : Изд-во полит. лит., 1992. – 544 с.
4. *Арон Р.* Этапы развития социологической мысли / общ. ред. и предисл. П. С. Гуревича. – М. : Изд. группа “Прогресс”–“Политика”, 1992. – 608 с.
5. *Эрик Эриксон* и эго-психология [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа : <http://www.erikson.psy4.ru/theory.htm>
6. *Афонін Е. А.* Закономірності та особливості української трансформації / Е. А. Афонін, О. В. Суший // Стратегічна панорама. – 2015. – № 1. – С. 94–108.
7. *Афонін Е. А.* Людська ідентичність та особливості її впливу на політику й державне управління / Е. А. Афонін // Концептуальні засади взаємодії політики й управління: навч. посіб. / Авт. кол. : Е. А. Афонін, Я. В. Бережний, О. Л. Валевський та ін.; за заг. ред. В. А. Ребкала, В. А. Шахова, В. В. Голубь, В. М. Ко-

закова; Нац. академія державного управління при Президентіві України. — К. : НАДУ, 2010. — С. 265–289.

8. *Московичи С.* Машина? творящая богов; пер. с фр. — М. : Центр психологии и психотерапии, 1998. — 560 с.