MAN IN INDIA

Abstracted/Indexed/Reviewed

INTERDISCIPLINARY AND "POST-DISCIPLINARY" APPROACHES IN THE ARCHETYPAL STUDIES OF THE PUBLIC-POWER ORGANIZATION OF SOCIETY

Pavel Baranov[*], Alexey Mamychev[**], Alexey Ovchinnikov [***], Galina Petruk[****] and Valeriya Krupnitskaya[*****]

Abstract: The paper presents the original interpretation of the development of interdisciplinary and post-disciplinary strategies and practices of scientific research. The correlation and interaction of the latter in the context of cognition of the archetypal basis of the sociocultural organization is carried out. The paper provides a description of the "post-disciplinary field" of archetypal research, focused on the reconstruction of various elements, relationships, links, contexts and sociocultural artifacts involved in the thinking and communicative interaction of people. Separately, the article discusses the problems of the post-disciplinary strategy of archetypal research and its main program provisions. The authors substantiate that the archetypal bases are stable "axial elements", general orientations and formal models involved in concrete historical practices of continuation (reproduction), restructuring and living of socio-cultural integrity. In turn, sociocultural archetypes are considered as "specific material", ensuring a successive reassembly of political, legal, socio-economic spaces at different stages of the evolution of a particular society.

Keywords: Archetype, discourse, culture, society, public and power organization, social integrity, the transformation of sociality, value-normative system.

INTRODUCTION

The attempt of any of social sciences and humanities to reconsider (and more often than not to radically revise!) its value-normative (axiological), epistemological foundations and fundamental (ontological) principles of social reality, clarifying its subject, goals, and tasks is possible only in the process of "dialogical" interaction with other strategies and practices of scientific knowledge. A vivid example is the fact that a number of modern authors are doubtful as to the very subject field of sociology, its classical theoretical foundation, the basic (classical) scientific problems; they insist on the methodological revision and the "re-assembly"

[*] Doctor of Law, Professor, Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Russia. *Email: pravosoznanie@gmail.com*

[**] Doctor of Political Science, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia. *Email: mamychev@yandex.ru*

[***] Doctor of Law, Professor, Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Russia. *Email: k_fp3@mail.ru*

[****] Candidate of pedagogy, Associate Professor, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia. *Email: Galina.Petruk@vvsu.ru*

[*****] Candidate of Law, Head of the Department of Criminal Law and Process, Siberian Institute of Management, a branch of the Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration under the President of the Russian Federation

of a number of fundamental categories and concepts. Here we can distinguish various stages of the "revision" of sociological science, for example: structural constructivism (Bourdieu, 1993) and constructivism in the sociology of knowledge (Berger, Lukman, 1995); Ethnomethodology and micro-sociological analysis (Garfinkel, 2002); Actor-network sociology (Latour, 2014) or the return of material/natural "objects" into sociological analysis (Hoffman, 2003), etc.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In various theoretical and methodological "versions" of revision or radical revision an interdisciplinary field is formed, from the position of which a "theoretical sentence" is issued to one or another classical disciplinary postulates and regulations. The way out for the "constructed horizon" and the "predetermined research strategy" obviously allows us to put absolutely provocative questions, to present "methodological claims", etc. An example of such "exposing programs" is the methodological anarchism of Paul Feyerabend (Feyerabend, 1986) or postmodern social and philosophical thought (Baudrillard, 2000; Derrida, 2000; Deleuze & Guattari, 2007).

It is no coincidence that a number of modern methodologists and philosophers of science note that interdisciplinary character is typical for real scientific research, which positively affects the progressive development of each of the disciplines-participators. (Kerimov, 2001; Ovchinnikov, 2003; Rozin, 2000). Moreover, the complexity of the problems and questions to be solved, their multidimensional nature, requires today the adjustment of a broader research optics that allows one to grasp and analyze a particular social phenomenon or process in its complexity. Even if theoretical and methodological monism, as is known from recent scientific history, initially "disciplines" scientific knowledge, directs it to the solution of actual and acute problems, ultimately it forms a "bony", immobile scheme that breaks away from reality (or constructs its own?!) (Foucault, 1994). At the same time, alternative theoretical and methodological "injections", for giving abstract schemes flexibility and adequacy of existing social reality, are tabooed. Of course, there is another extreme: it is the dispersion of the subject-target boundaries of a particular scientific discipline.

THE MAIN PART

1. "Post-discipline field" of archetypal research. All of the foregoing fully applies to archetypal research, which is now forming a "post-disciplinary field" in the humanities. In this regard, we agree with the stance of Stuart Hall that the disciplinary approach significantly reduces the potential of socio-cultural research (Hall, 1992). Thus, the study of the archetypal foundations of a particular sociocultural integrity (either real or imagined,

i.e., reproduced from generation to generation in people's thought activity) suggests an architectonic (multilayered) "structure" of conscious (rationally constructed), unconscious (unconscious but reproducible socially significant everyday plots and forms, cultural axioms, dominant value orientations, etc.), emotionally-psychological (emotional stamps, readiness, etc.) factors.

In this regard, the study of the archetypal foundations, for example, of a power organization or legal order, will be not so much interdisciplinary (for example, using political-psychological, sociological, legal, cultural-economic and other complex research strategies), but, rather, integrative. Let us explain our understanding of the difference between interdisciplinary research program and post-disciplinary approach.

First of all, the interdisciplinary approach, at least in the framework of archetypal research, was originally an integrated strategy, unfolding on the platform of one scientific discipline. Thus, the study of archetypes mainly focused on the positions of analytical psychology, involving, for the analysis of individual moments, verification of specific provisions, sociological methods and techniques, empirical data, materials and developments in political science, jurisprudence and other social and human sciences. Often, the field of archetypal research involved the positions of biology, mathematics, physics, etc. At the same time, the adjustment of "research optics", accentuation of attention, formulation of categories, concepts was realized and controlled by a disciplinary style of thinking.

Here is a small example: quite often archetypal studies "involve" material from various social and humanitarian systems of knowledge, with the aim of forming a different approach to understanding and significance of the archetype. However, the latter is structured on the basis of "disciplinary dominants", which does not allow you to go beyond the established boundaries, to form another program and the "procedure of truth". Thus, involving the new forms of cognition and the registers of thought in the context of the archetypal program, the researcher places them in an "established theoretical and conceptual track", which ultimately leads to the eternal return of the same ideological and semantic basis, which does not allow us to think archetypally otherwise.

In modern archetypal studies, the necessity of updating the theoretical and methodological base is justified, and, first of all, the necessity to take into account the fact that any socio-cultural activity is, in fact, a process of free and creative interaction of subjects. It is also justified that the very interaction of actors in the political, economic, legal field is not only archetypally but also socioculturally conditioned. At the same time, the socio-cultural

forms specific contexts and patterns of communication, styles of people's thought activity and the forms of their concrete historical interaction. This update of the methodological program of archetypal research is based on the integration of the provisions and achievements of "cultural-historical theory, symbolic interactionism, the activity, and value concept of culture" (Monina, 2011).

However, this Cardinal renewal of the archetypal research project, although it justifies the need for an interdisciplinary approach to the problem, at the same time largely reproduces the "authoritative disciplinary track", and the proposed definitions represent the connection of various knowledge systems on a disciplinary basis, in particular, analytical psychology.

Here cultural archetypes (a concept in itself new and not characteristic of analytical psychology) are treated as "archaic cultural primitive images, representations - symbols about a person, their place in the world and society; normative-value orientations that set the patterns of people's life, that have "sprouted" through centuries-old layers of history and cultural transformations and retained their meaning in the normative-value space of modern culture" (Monina, 2011).

As can be seen in the proposed definition, archaic nature is the fundamental basis of socio-cultural development, and it is not entirely clear how archaic leaves room for creative interaction. Is the process of sociocultural development itself not an eternal return of the archaic, once formed and invariably repeated (played out in different variations and contexts)? The difficulty arises even when the ratio of the "cultural unconscious" to the value-rational and socio-normative values of culture, the process of cultural transformation, the semantic and symbolic variations with the unchanging archaic basis of culture. In general, such interdisciplinary projects form more questions than reveal the essence of the research program.

From our point of view, if we talk about the archetypal heritage, then, rather, as general forms and models worked out by people at the ancient stages of development, having formed the original foundations of community/ solidarity (Dronov, 2016), related to the focus on preserving the human in man, the reproduction of this community, the elimination or, rather, the replacement of natural aggression with sociocultural forms of legitimate violence, institutional support for the elements of social integrity, its reproduction, and so on. This is due to the formation of social norms and institutions having a superbiological character aimed at restraining natural laws and natural aggression. Moreover, the formed artificial environment develops mechanisms of protection not only for its integrity but even for all the "weakest elements" included in it: "people artificially preserve and maintain life contrary to all natural laws for many biologically inferior

individuals. It is known that caring for the old, sick, injured, biologically is not only meaningless but also harmful. Nature takes care of the fastest change of generations and the cutting off of unpromising ... On the contrary, for the culture, the presence of old people becomes an urgent necessity for the transfer of social heritage, and in general concern for the relatives with weakened viability shows that solidarity has acquired a supernatural, extra-instinctive motivation "(Chestnov, 2012).

For example, the elaborated symbolic forms and imitative mechanisms form the first mimetic complexes, which are first based on imitation of "natural" nature, and then reproduction/imitation of already formed artificial nature (social order of relationships), past symbolic and cultural forms and practices of interaction. For example, the famous French researcher René Girard describes in detail and systematically these archaic forms, especially the principle of mimesis in the organization of social societies and their reproduction. So he notes that "today, in the sciences of man and culture, a one-sided view of everything that we call mimetism, imitation, and mimesis prevails. At the same time, there is nothing or almost nothing in human behavior that would not have been appropriated through study, and every study is reduced to imitation. If people suddenly cease to imitate, all forms of culture will disappear. Neurologists constantly say that the human brain is a huge imitative device. For the development of science about man, it is necessary to compare human imitation with mimicry in animals, to determine human forms of mimetic behavior" (Girard, 2016).

In this aspect, the archaic nature formed the basis, the basic authentic forms of social integrity, the prototypes for subsequent sociocultural transformations.

Therefore, the specificity of the "updated" archetypal research projects, mentioned above, is that any study of local archetypes, ethnonational community memory codes, unconscious models and forms of social interaction, etc. should be carried out on the basis of knowledge of the specifics of psychological reflection and regulation at the level of consciousness/unconscious, with the involvement of the provisions and achievements of other sciences (Gostev, 2015). In this case, for example, the study of sociocultural mentality is also carried out mainly through the reconstruction of archaic structures, stable images, and plots: "being complex in its nature ... developed in various branches of knowledge ... However, the main role in its study is undoubtedly due to psychology" (Koltsova, 2015).

Another aspect of the post-disciplinary research platform is that the classical disciplinary structure of social and humanitarian science is a convention. For example, in the research project of M. Demetradze,

various disciplines (sociology, political science, jurisprudence, cultural studies, etc.) are integrated on a sociocultural basis. And, accordingly, the theoretical, conceptual, and methodological basis of various social and humanitarian disciplines is a "set of complementary techniques and techniques" agreed upon on an anthropological basis. This research setting does not appear as a doctrine or hegemonic system that sets a new paradigm but as a general matrix of socio-cultural methodology "having the ability to identify problems, to characterize them, and to provide researchers with the information necessary for effective state management" (Demetradze, 2014).

The post-disciplinary campaign focuses not on disciplinary "belonging", from the platform of which the interaction of various sciences is realized, but on the phenomenon itself. Here, different positions, methods, and techniques of different disciplines are involved in joint co-creation, in scientific communication about the cognizable phenomenon. At the same time, the complexity of the phenomenon under investigation and the "variety of the object-object field, the specificity of many research tasks, presuppose the widest possible use in the analysis of data not only in the humanities (social) but also in the natural sciences and disciplines, as well as interdisciplinary approaches and methods" (Irkhin, 2012).

2. The post-disciplinary strategy of archetypal research. "Post-disciplinary field of research" by and large should be regarded as a scientific metaphor, rather than a strictly scientific concept since the latter is based on a whole series of ideological and semantic bases and a system of key concepts developed in different disciplines. Thus, V. Kurennoy argues that sociocultural studies are generally positioned by outlining a particular field or research strategy, using the metaphor of the "post-disciplinary field of research associated with a certain ensemble of key concepts and practical attitudes" (Kurennoy, 2012).

It should be noted that the latter does not replace or cancel the interdisciplinary principle of cognition characteristic of post-non-classical rationality (Kiyashchenko & Stepin, 2009); on the contrary, post-disciplinarity complements the interdisciplinary approach and "insures" it from the priority of one disciplinary measure. "Post-disciplinary field" forms holistic thinking, based not on the fragmentation of various aspects of the phenomenon under study and on the representation of the system, knowledge of it in a structural form, but on the holistic perception, experience, and living of the latter.

At the same time, the disciplinary framework itself is viewed as conditional analytical tools and techniques, since the research project is based on a

free, equitable communicative dialogue between different knowledge systems. There is a transfer of "cognitive schemes from one disciplinary area to another", a platform for joint research projects is being formed, "synergy between disciplines is being stimulated and the knowledge is truly integrated. It lies in the mainstream of the current practice of transforming knowledge, searching for constructive solutions to problems and involving scientists in solving real-world problems" (Knyazeva, 2011).

The post-disciplinary research strategy is not built on the basis of any discipline, setting and thus limiting the problem field and the theoretical and methodological arsenal. On the contrary, "complex subject orientation" is formed, not limited to strict disciplinary frameworks, but "drawing" into the communicative process achievements and positions, first of all, of various social and human sciences. Although quite often, as noted above, in the field of such studies categories, concepts and ideological and conceptual innovations of natural and technical sciences are involved. An example of the latter are such concepts and categories as convergence (mixing, convergence, approximation of materials, substances, etc.), used in the political and legal system of knowledge to describe transitional, mixed political systems; or ideological and conceptual innovations of Synergetics, organically included in the system of humanitarian research. Another example is the formation of a philosophical system based on the mathematical justification of the social and political by Alain Badiou (Badiou, 2016, "*Philosophy, and the Event ...*").

The post-disciplinary field of research includes all elements, relationships, links, contexts, socio-cultural artifacts, etc., that are involved in the thinking activity and communicative interaction of people. For example, Stewart Hall characterizes the complexity of this approach, although somewhat "engaged": "Cultural studies deals with all practices, institutions, and systems of classification through which certain values, beliefs, abilities, routine life practices and habitual forms of behavior are instilled in the population" (Hall, 1992).

In this regard, important in the sociocultural study are the various forms of connections and interrelations, as well as their changes and transformations. It seems to us that the protracted period of postmodernist defragmentation, the "exposure" of any public records, actualizes the problems of the community, the issues of joint coexistence and the restoration of the stable foundations for the latter. In general, we adhere to the position according to which the sociocultural is lived and is constantly being created, it is not a frozen construct, but a dynamic whole that grasps intuitively as a holistic experience and is reproduced in the practical thought-activity of people.

Here we can agree with Bruno Latour, that social is not so much a static object as a dynamic area of interactions, it is "a kind of process of restructuring the ties and reassembling" the entire socio-cultural integrity, group unity into a particular concrete historical stage. To think socially, from his point of view, means not to impose certain structures and theoretical schemes on social thinkers (Latour, 2014), but to grasp the process of positive movement. "Positiveness" here means a positive orientation toward the formation, reproduction, restructuring, and re-creation of sociocultural communities and differs from negative postmodern and neo-anarchic research programs focused on defragmentation, decay, debunking of sociocultural unity, their destruction in favor of a free and unstructured set (Mamychev, 2014).

From Latour's point of view, contemporary researchers "are trying to play legislators" imposing their theoretical schemes and forms of comprehension on social agents. In turn, it is really important to have an ability to see and the ability to analyze the process itself by adopting, restructuring, reassembling social communities. To trace the process of how people, with the help of which elements, things, traditions form and maintain stable links and relationships, restructure the latter, define group boundaries, principles of identification, etc.: "In the majority of cases,", notes B. Latour, "We use the word "social" to refer to what has already been collected and acts as a whole, not being too interested in the nature of what is collected, bound and packed together" (Latour, 2014).

While there are differences, and they seem inevitable to us, there will be forms and ways of their consolidation and expression. Differences are constitutive by their nature, they are the basis for the formation of ways of understanding reality, socio-cultural phenomena, the structural and hierarchical structure of groups and societies, etc. Differences have always existed as an initial, basic element of cognition and social construction. Of course, in postmodernity, the difference loses its constitutive positive effect, becomes a difference for the sake of difference, an instrument for defragmenting traditional systems, an element that undermines any unity and integrity (Deleuze, 1998).

This "fight against difference" has formed a negative projection of all humanitarian research in the twentieth century and today is being questioned. It is just in this respect that A. Badiou notes that "differences are what are there. People and nations necessarily differ. The problem is how to produce the identity. This is a very important point. We say goodbye to the period of the cult of difference, which, in general, was quite negative. A genuine great policy is aimed, rather, at producing unity from a different material (emphasis added – auth.)" (Badiou, 2016, "*Mysterious Relation…*").

3. Program provisions of archetypal research. So, the sociocultural is lived and is going on, when stopping the very stable community itself disappears. Maintaining and continuing sociocultural integrity, rather than imitating it, requires tremendous work and effort from the whole generation. The continuation of the tradition of sociocultural integrity does not put emphasis on collectivity to the detriment of the creative energy of individuality. This is a common communitarian process, the content of which is given precisely by the social interaction of people, and not by the subordination of the individual to social forces.

It is in action, in interaction, that "sociocultural integrity" comes to life and "reproduces", and not in general hegemonic structures that impose a certain unity on creative uniqueness. Therefore, the socio-cultural for us is, above all, the process developing on an archetypal basis, rather than a static structure inherited from the once formed archaic structures. In principle, there is nothing fundamentally new in this approach, it fits into the modern orientation of sociocultural studies of various phenomena. For example, the authors of the recently published monograph note that "law does not exist without and in the absence of a person who is socialized in the corresponding legal culture. The postclassical socio-cultural anthropology of law asserts constructiveness, i.e. creation of human activity, and not a given right, and its reproducibility by human practices" (Isaev & Chestnov, 2015).

Let us note that by the archetypal bases we mean certain and stable "axial elements", general orientations and formal models involved in concrete historical practices of continuation (reproduction), restructuring and living of sociocultural integrity. In this regard, we can talk about a concrete being-culture, or as noted by K.V. Chistov, about "a gradual advance through a variational combination of the old with the new" (Chistov, 1986).

In its turn, we describe the specific in this process through the notion of "sociocultural archetypes," which, metaphorically speaking, represent "material", "specific blocks" for assembling a new political, legal, socio-economic space that put to order social interaction in concrete historical conditions, in the context of active and latent challenges and threats. If we take the instrumental aspect, it can be noted that through the juxtaposition, imitation and creative use of sociocultural canons, the successive development of sociocultural integrity is carried out.

The problem of restructuring, re-assembly is conditioned by creative and innovative moments arising in the development of the sociocultural and in particular, for example, the public-power organization. At the same time, the extreme, radical version of the transformation (as a process more general than specific processes - modernism and conservatism) of a sociocultural

organization is, in our view, the concept of a crisis that can both lead to the destruction of the sociocultural as a holistic and stable evolutionary phenomenon, and offer new formats and directions of its transformation.

Indeed, the strongest impressions that "imprint" on persistent ideas and/or fundamentally change the process of sociocultural transformation are associated with a radical loss of "social order, the death of norms and" differences "that set cultural categories ... the collapse of institutions blurs or collapses hierarchical and functional differences, giving to all the look both monotonous and monstrous" (Girard, 2010). For example, from the history of state-legal transformation, we know that the period of scrapping sociocultural integrity leads to the collapse of the political and legal organization. However, then, as it has been repeatedly confirmed by the historical experience of socio-cultural transformation, the archetypal bases "launch" the processes of restructuring the ideological and semantic basis, the reorganization or reassembly of publicly-authoritative space at the expense of new ideological foundations and procedures of truth.

It is important to emphasize that the formation of new ideological and semantic foundations of a public-power organization, its development and institutionalization is realized not from scratch but under the influence of sociocultural archetypes. Formation and adoption of these grounds are the choice of both the specific thinkers themselves, and, if again expressed metaphorically, the history itself. This is a choice/acceptance, in its essence, historical arbitrariness, which in its time was fundamentally described by P. Bourdieu. As is well known, the French sociologist wrote a lot about the interrelationship between the sociocultural context ("habitus"), the creative activity of the thinker (actions and interaction of actors) and the processes of institutionalization, which are all mutually interrelated (Bourdieu, 1993).

In particular, he wrote that this triad lies at the foundation of any social institution and only in the course of time the society in the process of its development through the mechanism of social amnesia represents the acting institutional and regulatory order as a matter of course, and individual institutions as natural and universal: "Being realized in social structures and in the mental structures adapted to them, the established institution makes us forget that it is the result of a long series of actions on institutionalization, and it appears with all its external signs of naturalness." (Bourdieu, 2013).

CONCLUSION

The process of acceptance/selection of ideological and semantic grounds and the formation, in accordance with it, of a publicly-authoritative organization

of society (mental and institutional-normative structures, a certain system of categories, principles of thinking, evaluation, social status, hierarchies, etc.) should be complemented with another element - the archetypal forms and schemes that ensure the focus of this process. As noted above, this direction is associated with the preservation of humanity in humans, the possibility of a social community as such, its reproduction is realized on the basis of stable - common (archetypal) and specific (sociocultural) forms and models.

It is important for us that this process of "eternal return" or "one-type creation" is archetypically unchanged, but this immutability belongs to the order of the action itself (re-creation of the community, its structuring, ordering, value-normative design, etc.), and not to the action of deterministic regularities, i.e. the manifestation of the same archaic material in the new socio-cultural conditions.

In turn, the concrete historical acceptance/choice of the ideological and semantic basis is then proclaimed a natural/universal foundation, which entails the establishment of differences in the quality of constitutive elements and the activation of the rationing processes, which subsequently legitimize a particular publicly-authoritative organization, a certain hierarchical structure, conservative mechanisms for its conservation and phased development. In this respect, the elements of structure and standardization set the concrete historical political and legal reality.

Acknowledgement

References

Badiou, A. (2016). *Mysterious Relation of Philosophy and Politics*. Moscow: Institute for General Humanitarian Research.

Badiou, A. (2016). *Philosophy, and the Event. Conversations with a brief introduction to the philosophy of Alain Badiou*. Moscow: Institute for General Humanitarian Research.

Baudrillard, J. (2000). *Symbolic Exchange, and Death*. Moscow: Dobrosvet.

Berger, N. & Lukman, T. (1995). *Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge*. Moscow: Medium.

Baranov P.P., Mamychev A.Y., Ovchinnikov A.I. (2016). *Management of the conservative political platform of the transformation public-power organization in Eurasia*. International Review of Management and Marketing. No. 6 (S6). P. 241-246

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology of Politics*. Moscow: Socio-Logos.

Bourdieu, P. (2013). *Sociology of Social Space*. St. Petersburg: Aleteya.

Chestnov, I.L. (2012). *Postclassical Theory of Law. Monograph*. St. Petersburg: Alef-Press.

Chistov, K.V. (1986). *Folk Traditions, and Folklore*. Moscow: Science.

Deleuze, J. (1998). *Differences and Repetitions*. St. Petersburg: LLP TK Petropolis.

Deleuze, J. & Guattari, F. (2007). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Ekaterenburg: U-Faktoriya.

Demetradze, M. (2014). *Sociocultural Anthropology. Research of social, cultural, legal, political and economic processes*. Palmarium Academic Publishing.

Derrida, J. (2000). *About grammatology*. Moscow: Ad Marginem.

Dronov, V.T. (2016). Consent as a Civilization Archetype of Russian Society. *Sociological research, 9*, pp. 157-160.

Feyerabend, P. (1986). *Selected Works on the Methodology of Science*. Moscow: Progress.

Foucault, M. (1994). *Words and Things. Archaeology of the Humanities*. St. Petersburg: A-cad.

Garfinkel, H. (2002). *Ethnomethodology's Program: Working out Durkheim's Aphorism*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Girard, R. (2010). *The Scapegoat*. Saint Petersburg: Publishing house of Ivan Limbakh.

Girard, R. (2016). *Things Hidden from the Creation of the World*. Moscow: BBI Publishing house.

Gostev, A.A. (2015). *The Influence of the Orthodox Christian Tradition on the Russian Mentality as a Problem of Historical Psychology*. Moscow: Institute of Psychology RAS.

Hall, S. (1992). *Cultural Studies, and Theoretical Legacies*. London; N.Y.: Routledge.

Hoffman, I. (2003). *Analysis of Frames: Essay on the Organization of Everyday Experience*. Moscow: Institute of Sociology, Russian Academy of Sciences.

Irkhin, Yu.V. (2012). Methodology, and methods of modern political analysis: approaches and problems. *Problem analysis and public-management design, 6* (26), pp. 71-80.

Isaev, N.A. & Chestnov, I.L. (2015). *Socio-cultural Anthropology of Law. Collective monograph*. St. Petersburg: Alef-Press.

Kerimov, D.A. (2003). *Methodology of Law: Subject, Functions, Problems of Philosophy of Law*. Moscow: SGA.

Kiyashchenko, L.P. & Stepin, V.S. (2009). *Post-Classics: Philosophy, Science, Culture: Collective monograph*. St. Petersburg: Mir.

Knyazeva, E.N. (2011). Transdisciplinary Research Strategies. *Bulletin of TSPU, 10* (112), pp. 193-201.

Koltsova, V.A. (2015). *Russian Mentality as a Subject of Socio-Psychological Research*. Moscow: Institute of Psychology RAS.

Kurennoy, V. (2012). Research and Political Program of Cultural Studies. *Logos, 1* (85), pp. 14-79.

Latour, B. (2014). *The Reassembly of the Social: An Introduction to the Actor-Network Theory*. Moscow: Higher School of Economics.

Lyubashits V., Mamychev A., Mamycheva D.,Vronskaya M. (2016) *The northern caucasus in the 21st century: Sociocultural and political-economic viability of Russia's state sovereignty*. Central Asia and the Caucasus. Vol. 17. Issue 3. p. 14-22

Lyubashits V.Y., Mamychev A.Y., Vronskaya M.V., Timofeeva A.A. (2016) *Socio-economic and Public-power Aspects of the State and Society Relations in Modernizing Russia*. International Review of Management and Marketing. No. 6 (S6). P. 116-120.

Mamychev, A.Yu. (2014). State Power in the 21st Century: Modern Projects of Political Modeling. *State Power and Local Self-Government, 1*. pp. 3-9.

Mamychev A., Mamycheva D., Krupnitskaya V., Timofeeva A. (2016*) Political transformation of public-power organization and the color revolution technology in the Eurasian space*. Central Asia and the Caucasus. Vol. 17. Issue 3. p. 22-30.

Mamychev A.Y., Lyubashits V.Y., Shalyapin S.O., Filippova, M.K. (2016) *Prognostic problems of the public and power organization of the Russian society: Archetypes and sociocultural basis of functioning and development*. International Review of Management and Marketing. No. 6 (S6). P. 85-89.

Mordovcev A., Mamychev A., Mordovceva T. (2016) *Democratic Transit in the South Caucasian countries.* Central Asia and the Caucasus. 2016. Vol. 17. Issue 3. p. 7-14.

Monina, N.P. (2011). *Russian Cultural Archetype. Factors of Formation and Philosophical Dominants.* Omsk: Omsk State University.

Ovchinnikov, A.I. (2013). *Legal Thinking: Theoretical and Methodological Analysis*. Rostov-on-Don: Rostov State University.

Rozin, V.M. (2000). *Legal Thinking (Formation, Socio-Cultural Context, Development Prospects)*. Almaty: VSHP "Adilet".