

*Paper prepared for the Euroacademia International Conference  
Identities and Identifications: Politicized Uses of Collective Identities*

*Zagreb, 18 – 20 April 2013*

*This paper is a draft  
Please do not cite*

# Cosmopolitanism and World Culture as the Psychological Expressions of Supra-National Identities

By Valerie Lazarenko,  
Kyiv National Taras Shevchenko University

*This contribution is a part of the monograph "Cosmopolitanism and World Culture: History, Psychology, Development" by Valerie Lazarenko (Lambert Academic Publishing, 2012, ISBN-13: 978-3659202346).*

*Since the ancient times the processes of uniting and consideration, followed by global experience sharing, have been creating a so-called «cultural sphere» of our planet. This general category comes from a meaning of culture, so it includes everything that humans overbuild on the nature in a couple with all the intercultural bonds and opportunities for cultural sharing. Generally to the cultural sphere could be added only that cultures, that are known to the majority of others, and existing of the cross-cultural bonds between is also the compulsory thing. And the process of cultures» connecting to the unified web is the process of forming the supra-national identities.*

*The conception of archetypes can be a psychological explanation of general existing of cosmopolitanism as a notion. Jung identifies collective or transpersonal unconsciousness as a nucleus for all the psychological material that is not transferred through the personal experience. Components of this structure appear in the apportionment of people, who belong to different cultures and epochs.*

*This basic structure does not depend on any time and culture, so that it is equal for children all over the world. In spite of we all have different ways of growth and became the unique individuals, collective unconsciousness is common for all the people, so that is a great unifying power, something that help people to identify themselves independently from nation or culture.*

*The collective unconsciousness is displayed mostly through the archetypes that are also common for all the cultures.*

*So finally we can claim that cosmopolitan tendencies are determined by the structure of our psyche and throughout this are the congenital aspirations of people all over the world and the basis for supra-national identities to form.*

## Part 1. Introduction

Cosmopolitanism is a conception of world outlook that proclaims ideas of world citizenship and domination of interests of the whole world on interests of particular nation. Unlike conceptions of patriotism or nationalism, that appreciates self-actualization and self-development of certain nation as the highest value for society, cosmopolitanism means replacing these options with similar idea towards the whole Earth.

The word «cosmopolitanism» is coming from Greek and means kosmopolitês («citizen of the world»). But here comes another, more philosophical meaning of this word. Cosmos in Greek system of Logos is not just «the world»; it is rather «universal order». So the «cosmopolitan» will be not just a citizen of the world, but a citizen of such world that is ordered and regularized from above, with corresponding supra-national identity.

The conception of cosmopolitanism can also be considered as a discursive practice which might be interpreted as a historical marker that provides us with an opportunity of observing the dynamics of a society. The feature of such societies is that they are continuously changing their frames and outlines, and as following - their self-perception in every destination or strategy, both expanding onto others or compressing and excluding these others. But the communities do not only change their borders as a result of consciousness self-identification. So it is properly to use the notion «marker» in a such context, because the discourses on cosmopolitanism can be considered as a historical syndrome, a signal of some changes in the borders as well as prolonged changes in self-perception and society status.

Wherever the discourse on cosmopolitanism appears nowadays, it needs the historical and cultural explanation, which elucidates its function in the society. Cosmopolitanism as a group of discursive practices may be an instrument for conversion the borders of the ordered community of people, but cosmopolitanism always is an indicator for such transformations.

However, cosmopolitanism is not the only one marker of such kind. There is a separated category of the concepts that are located between history, political and social sciences and can be hardly distinguished. In this context can be revised such notions as internationalism, transnationalism, multiculturalism, globalism, etc., which are not identic to cosmopolitanism, but can sometimes be used as synonyms and have the same meaning. They are signaling about the

changings in lineaments of the ordered «cosmic polices» and sometimes help the society to rationalize such modifications. What is the main difference between cosmopolitanism and other «-isms» of such kind is that:

- cosmopolitanism does not erase, but absorb the differences (unlike universalism does);
- cosmopolitanism does not treat the nation and national state as a one possible incarnation of for differences between peoples and cultures (unlike internationalism does);
- cosmopolitanism is not an out-axiological descriptive model (unlike transnationalism is);
- ideally cosmopolitanism is an assessment tool and a way of proclamation of «otherness» through interplay with elements (unlike multiculturalism, which is an isolationistic conception of parallel lines);

The contrast with transnationalism is the most significant, because this notion has been evolving since the 1970-es, when was formulated by American political scientists, into an approach that carefully removes any ontological appeals to understanding of human nature. Transnationalism is also opposed to cosmopolitanism because the second one has always proceeded from the views on human nature's commonality and a possibility to apprehend it although it seems impervious to cognition. And such understanding of commonality of human nature became an agent for cosmopolitan project within the development of it. [1]

Since the ancient times the processes of uniting and consideration, followed by global experience sharing, have been creating a so-called «cultural sphere» of our planet. This general category comes from a meaning of culture, so it includes everything that humans overbuild on the nature in a couple with all the intercultural bonds and opportunities for cultural sharing. Generally to the cultural sphere could be added only that cultures, that are known to the majority of others, and existing of the cross-cultural bonds between is also the compulsory thing. So that, here will be presented the conception of development of cosmopolitanism views in different cultures, that were consolidating together in a such an important process as creating the word culture, in which will be included all the quintessential points of every culture, that joined «cultural sphere» in some period of time. And the process of cultures» connecting to the unified web is the process of forming the supra-national identities. [2]

## Part 2. The Collective Unconsciousness

One of the most significant, difficult and controversial theoretician of psychology was a prominent Swiss scientist Karl Gustav Jung, whose works can also be reviewed in a context of cosmopolitanism.

The idea of collective unconsciousness was the most outstanding idea of Jung, and so that widely discussed in all levels and branches of psychology, including the cosmopolitanism psychology. Jung identifies collective or transpersonal unconsciousness as a nucleus for all the psychological material that is not transferred through the personal experience. Components of this structure appear in the apportionment of people, who belong to different cultures and epochs. Some psychologists, like Skinner and other behaviorists, undoubtedly claimed that each person is born as a tabula rasa, so their psychical evolution is possible only throughout their personal experience. However, Jung postulates that the psyche of each child already inherits the structure, which would further determine all the channels of future evolution and ways of interaction with the environment.

This basic structure does not depend on any time and culture, so that it is equal for children all over the world. In spite of we all have different ways of growth and became the unique individuals, collective unconsciousness is common for all the people, so that is a great unifying power. «The collective unconsciousness is more like an atmosphere, in which we are living, than something we can find inside us. It is just an unknown value» [3]

As it comes from Jung's theory, we all have a congenital psychical heritage as well as biological one. Both of are the very important determinants of our behavior.

*«As the human body looks like the whole organ museum, each one with a long period of it's own evolution, that the psyche, on our opinion, is organized such in a way. It can be a product without history not more than a body, in which it does exist».*  
[4]

The collective unconsciousness, which is a result of our experience, common for all the people, includes also the material that was available for the majority of our ancestors of human and animal origin. So that, it is a massive source of our most exciting and unusual ideas and experiences.

## Part 3. Archetypes Theory

The archetype as a notion can hardly be understandable and explained, but it expresses the idea of a cosmopolitan «cultural sphere» even more than the collective unconsciousness idea does. The archetypes are inherited patterns of reaction to world in some specific ways. Archetypes are the basic images that resemble us the most important ideas and energies of the collective unconsciousness.

*«Basic means «the first» or «the initial»; so that, the first image does refer to the most early stadia of the evolution of psyche. Human does inherit these images from the past of his ancestors that includes all his human ancestors as well as pre-humans and animals».[3]*

Jung has postulated the conception of archetypes, grounding on the stories of his patients. Some of Jung's patients were describing dreams and fantasies, which included surprising ideas and images that could not have their origin in the past of these particular patients. Jung suggested that in the collective unconsciousness is present some level of imagery. But the most important and efficient for cosmopolitanism studies is discovered by Jung strict bond between the content of patients» dreams and mythical and religious topics, presented in different cultures all over the world.

According to Jung's conception, the archetypes are structure-forming components inside the unconsciousness. The whole archetypal images are being made up from such «bricks», and these images are dominating in existing of personal fantasies as well as in mythologies of different cultures. Existence of archetypes means «being ready for producing equal or similar mythological ideas more and more times» (1917). [5] Such ideas have a tendency to appear as the main patterns – repeating situations and images.

Archetypal situations are the most interesting expressions of global «cultural sphere», because they are equally important for the representatives of all of the worlds» cultures. Situations like retrieval of something by a Hero, voyage through the night sea or battle for emancipation from Mother are present worldwide in all the mythological and religious motives.

Classical examples of archetypal situations that are present in almost every culture are following:

- Quest (Holy Grail, Ahab);
- Initiation (Huck Finn);
- Fall (Paradise Lost);
- Death and Rebirth (Christ, Hercules).

Among the general archetypes we can also distinguish some main archetypal dyads of contrast symbols, which are also wide-spread among different cultures. The main are:

- Life and death;
- Black and white;
- Male and female;
- Good and bad;
- Dark and light (Day and night);
- Sun and Moon;
- Sea and Land;
- Desert and Water.

Archetypal figures are as important as the archetypal situations. To this category can be concerned, for example:

- Child of Divine origin (Christ, Buddha, all ancient Heroes);
- Old Sage (Merlin, Gandalf, Dumbledore);
- Hero (Arthur, Theseus, Bilbo);
- Scapegoat ("The Lottery");
- Outcast (Cain, Ancient Mariner);
- Devil Figure (Lucifer, Darth Vader, Hades, UquPacha);
- Salvatore (Christ, Noah, Prometheus, Harry Potter);
- Earth mother (Mother Nature, Gaea, Pachakamaqua, Mama Alpa);
- Temptress (Sirens, Delilah);
- Platonic Ideal (Dante»s Beatrice, Athena);
- Unfaithful Wife (Anna Karenina, Aphrodite);
- Trickster (Loki, Hermes, Ulysses, Mephistopheles, Nasreddin, Kokopelli);

The last archetype is one of the most interesting, because it has one of the most interesting transformations in world culture. Starting as an image of some irresponsible but not evil god, in late folklore of the majority of cultures trickster's image has changed.

He started to come as a smart naughty human or another creature, who is trying to resist problems and dangers of the world with help of different tricks, stratagems and cunning. In a huge number of fairy-tales of different peoples the ruler finds out some test for choose a future husband for his daughter. Brave heroes, princes and knights cannot withstand these tests. But then appears poor peasant, who is able to avoid all the dangerous things with help of his imagination and smartness, and also can beat the evil without fighting. So that, the least appropriate candidate passes all the tests and gains the main prize. This story not only can be found in folklore of every peoples, but also has some new editions in modern culture. Examples of such «simple heroes» can be even Bucks Bunny and Little Tramp by Charlie Chaplin.

Each one among the variety of the archetypes can be connected with a huge diversity of related symbols. For example, the archetype of Mother includes not only the real mother of every person, but also all the figures of maternal origin and figures of the disciples. In real it is not a one particular archetype, it is a group, a storage of its. And this group includes women in general as well as mystic female figures like Venus or Virgin Mother, and supporting and upbringing symbols like the Church or the Paradise. Archetype of Mother consists from both positive and negative feelings, such as thrilling, dominating or strangling mother. The last one during the Middle Ages in Europe was personified into a Witch archetype.

*«It is efficient to insist that archetypes are not only the names or psychological notions. They are the part of the whole life – images, which are deeply bonded by the bridge of emotions with the real-life individual» [4].*

Each one of the most important features of a person is an archetype. The most efficient among them are: ego, person, shadow, anima (male), animus (women) and self.

In general, the archetypes also have had their own cultural evolution, and so that now they have the up-to-date form. For example, such archetypal situation as combating evil in form of a dragon now can be seen in conflicts with relatives of a spouse.

Archetypes themselves are the form without defined meaning, and they are need for psychological material being organized and directed in some route. They look like almost as dried river channels, because their forms determine the characteristics of rivers that flowed here some time ago. Archetypes are also the carrying agents of the energy of collective unconsciousness. And all the human creativity has the archetypal origin.

Archetypal forms are the infrastructure of a psyche. Archetypal patterns are similar to patterns organized in a crystalloid structure. As well as there are no two equal snowflakes, even though all of them have the same crystalloid structure, the content of psyche and individual experience of each person is unique and cannot be repeated. However, the general patterns, to which these experiences are joined, are determined by the universal parameters and ground-basing principles that are surprisingly the same as the archetypes. «Archetypes of the unconsciousness are the display of organs and powers. Archetypes are determined biologically». [6]

## **Part 4. The Efficiency of Hero Archetype**

Having archetypes is efficient for the world outlook of every peoples and every culture. But all of the archetypal symbols, images and stories are constructions; they are not real. All the societies have similar hero stories not because they coincidentally made them up on their own, but because heroes express a deep psychological aspect of human existence. They can be seen as a metaphor for the human search of self-knowledge. In other words, the hero shows us the path to our own consciousness and the collective unconsciousness through his actions.

Jung called the process of forming a consciousness "individuation," which means the process by which we reconcile the conscious/unconscious aspects of the psyche. [7] Thus, when the hero slays a monster, he is not literally killing it in the real world, but facing an aspect of the unconscious, such as lust or rage, in order to control that side of his being. The hero stories can be thought of as road maps to successful assimilation of the conscious, rational mind with the unconscious, animal mind.

The images of the hero conquering death or returning from a successful battle provide us with the restricted conscious mind with new raw material into which to expand, thereby forcing the consumers of the hero stories to expand their conscious image of themselves.[7] The hero stories are both a record of primitive encounters with the unconscious and a prompt for individuals to enter into the struggle for higher consciousness. Functioning in this way, heroes give men and women hope for such things as life after death, reprieve from suffering, and a sense that order rules their lives.

Heracles illustrates the hero's reconciliation of the conscious/unconscious mind with one of his Labors.

Heracles kills all but one head of the Hydra, which he places under a rock. Hercules dips his arrows in the poisonous blood of the Hydra. Later, Hercules kills a centaur suspected of seducing his wife with the same arrows. Before the centaur dies, he gives Heracles» wife some of his own now tainted blood, telling her to use it on Heracles if she ever suspects infidelity. She eventually dips a vest in the blood and sends it to Heracles, who puts it on and suffers such a terrible burning sensation that he kills himself rather than live with the pain.

What's the lesson? Repression of unconscious forces, namely desire, will eventually invite disaster upon the psyche. The unslain head of the Hydra, whose blood eventually causes Heracles» unbearable agony, represents a repressed force in the unconscious.

Archetypal stories about Heroes are presented almost in each culture in mythological or even literature forms. The most well-known examples of images of Heroes combating evil are:

- Anglo-Saxon «Beowulf» and «Widsith», «Waldere»;
- Armenian «David of Sassoun»;
- Bashkirian«Ulan-Batyr»;
- Babylonian «Epos about Athrachaesis»
- Byzantine «DigenesAkritas»;
- Chinese «ShuDzin»;
- East-Slavonic bylines and «The Tale of Igor»s Campaign»;
- Estonian «Kallevipoeeg»;
- Finnish «The Kallevala»;
- French «The Song about Roland»;
- Greek «Iliad», «Odyssey», «Theogonia», «Argonautica»;
- Georgian «The Knight in the Panther»s Skin»;
- German «Song about the Nibelungs»;
- Jewish «Old Testament»;
- Indian «Ramayana» and «Mahabharata»;
- Irish sagas of Ulster cycle;
- Italian «Oneida»;
- Kalmyk «Jangar»;
- Kyrgyz «Manas»;
- Persian «Shah-Name»;
- Quiche Indians»«PopolWuj»;
- Scandinavian «The Poetic Edda», «The Prose Edda», «Heimskringla»;
- Sumerian Epos about Gilgamesh;
- Spanish «The Song about my Sid»;
- Uzbek «Alpamysh»;
- Yakut «Olongo» and many others.

But what happens when, as Nietzsche said, "Dead are all the gods"? Is modern, scientific man unable to experience myths and heroes as the ancients, as a guide and symbol? Are we so attuned to the scientific dissection of the myths that we fail to see the spiritual aspects of them? Is the hero nothing more than a remnant of the aggressive energy projected by a society to justify its dominance over less war-like societies?

It is worth to recognize the decline of the relevance of religion and mythology in the life of modern man, and that the bridge between conscious and unconscious is severed with no more heroes to serve as guides for reconciliation. With no connection to the collective unconscious we all share, the modern ideals of nationhood and lethargic religions (propagated by hero images, among other things) as the new dragons to be slain, calling for the new, self-sacrificing heroes to step forward and bring about an annihilation of the extreme egoism of individuality that the loss of myth has brought about. [8]

But generally archetypal heroes are a small part of a cultural mythology. They have been useful for thousands of years to the people for whom they serve as an idealized human, a sort of "super" person, capable of dealing with problems that surpass normal humans and their abilities. In this sense, heroes are part of the perceptual system of a culture through which unfamiliar situations, originating both within the culture and outside it, are interpreted and fitted into old symbolic molds. In helping to pattern the relationships among basic beliefs, values, and behaviors that organize social interaction, heroes produce common social understanding of new social conditions. [9]

In a sentence, heroes contribute to the society's necessary business of reproducing itself and its values. For most of history, religion has been the main force of reproducing the dominant society's traits by using mythical figures to illustrate moral and societal principles that help form a common social conception of such things as death and gender roles.

An excellent example of a modern hero performing this social conditioning is Luke Skywalker in the Star Wars. Luke affirms our belief in the power of mankind over technology's "evil" invasion of our world. Computers were beginning to become fairly common in the late 1970's, and many people had anxieties about their dominance in society; hence, the hero is refashioned into a triumph of human spirit over technology's evil plans.

The hero is both an expression and a tool of the hegemony of a lived system of meanings and values - constitutive and constituting - which as they are experienced as practices appear as reciprocally confirming. It thus constitutes a sense of reality for most people in the society, a sense of absolute because experienced reality beyond which it is very difficult for most members of the society to move, in most areas of their lives. It is, that is to say, in the strongest sense a «culture», but a culture which has also to be seen as the lived dominance and subordination of particular classes.

Riane Eisler, quoted by Penelope Prentice in her essay calling for women to reclaim their power in society as peacekeepers, says:

*"Ours is a species that quite literally lives by stories and images, by the myths - be they religious or secular - that tell us what is «sacred,» «natural,» and «true.» And for a long time our conscious minds have been fettered by stories and images that serve to maintain a dominator system... The all too familiar archetype of the hero as killer (all the way from Odysseus to Rambo) inculcates the minds of both men and women with the notion that domination and conquest - whether of women, other men, other nations, or nature - ... The powerful archetype of woman as evil seductress (from Circe in the Odyssey to Glen Close's role in Fatal Attraction) serves to further justify men's domination over women and the Feminine." [10]*

Every successful society must have means by which it indoctrinates its members into the society's system of values and morals. One of the darker aspects of the hero is the role he plays in disseminating these values. If to have a look at the heroes mentioned above in previous part of this work, it is worth to admit that all of them to some extent can be called warriors, fighting evil and even killing their opponents to solve their problems. They reflect the violent history of their respective societies in conquering other groups. The hero reflects the appearance and values of the dominant societal group and justifies the society's crimes against others by showing the hero's strength and violence resulting in the hero's people gaining independence, usurping power, or obtaining any of a number of other results favorable to the dominant group, usually at the expense of marginalized groups. Obviously, this reinforces violence as the only means of gaining power; in fact, for persons living in a nation with violent heroes, it's hard to imagine any other way. And, unfortunately, being militarily dominant has historically been very effective in maintaining dominance for privileged groups.

In today's global village, which can also be considered as an example of cosmopolitan society, however, the hero's aggression and nationalistic or ethnic symbolism are detrimental to cooperation among and within nations. Breen and Corcoran say:

*"We can see that other societies are culturally-constructed but we feel that our world is not at all the result of a historical process. As innocent myth-consumers, we read our myths as facts instead of culturally-constructed images". [9]*

The hero justifies the actions of a nation - but only if one is part of the group the hero represents.

Another aspect of the hero that is potentially dangerous is the misapplication of his story in modern media. In Campbell's examination of the hero's life, he outlines three steps of the hero: separation-initiation-return. Campbell emphasizes the hero not only conquers the problem, but returns to society to "bestow boons on his fellow people." Ken Burke points out that in modern American cinema, the fixation on the conquering or initiation aspect of the hero has hidden the full life of the hero - that of maturation into leadership and wisdom - from viewers of modern myth. Ancient heroes would often return after their journeys to marry and lead a mature life, imparting their hard-won wisdom to their people. Burke says the lack of portrayal of this part of the hero's life in modern media leads to an "arrested adolescence" that "constantly avoids social responsibility and marital commitment". The result is an incomplete individuation process, with members of a society caught in a dangerous, "self-destructive individualism," unable or unwilling to reconcile the worlds of personal ego and community that Campbell believes the heroes were trying to show could be done. The necessity of heroes, Campbell felt, was to "pull together all these tendencies to separation, to pull them together into some intention."

*«The term «archetype» sometimes is misused as signature of some mythological images and main topics... Archetype indeed is a tendency for forming the conception of the main topic - conception that in details can be changed without losing of the main pattern» (Jung, 1964, p.67).[4]*

In conclusion I would like to say that the conception of Karl Gustav Jung can be a psychological explanation of general existing of cosmopolitanism as a notion. The collective unconsciousness is universal for all the times, peoples and cultures, and so that is a source for uniting identity tendencies among the representatives of different nations.

The collective unconsciousness is displayed mostly through the archetypes that are also common for all the cultures. Every personality consists from five main archetypes: self, person, ego, shadow, and anima or animus. But apart from these dominating archetypes hundreds of others are existing in our collective unconsciousness. Archetypical images can be seen in all the cultural and historical periods. The evidences of this are common topics, situations and stories in myths, legends and folklore in all the peoples, not depending of their geographical and ethnographical locations.

So finally we can claim that cosmopolitan tendencies are determined by the structure of our psyche and throughout this are the congenital aspirations of people all over the world and the basis for supra-national identities to form.

### **About the Author**

*Valerie Lazarenko was born and lives in Kiev, Ukraine. Studies psychology and communication science. Makes researches in the crossroad of branches like intercultural psychology, history of arts and cosmopolitanism studies. Attends Conferences, seminars, trainings and workshops related to these topics.*

*In 2012 has published a monograph "Cosmopolitanism and World Culture: History, Psychology, Development".*

*Contacts: [valerie.lazarenko@gmail.com](mailto:valerie.lazarenko@gmail.com)*

### **References**

1. GalinTihanov, *Cosmopolitanism: Legitimation, Opposition and Domains of Articulation // Language, Ideology, and the Human: New Interventions* / Ed. by S. Bahun and D. Radunovic. (Aldershot: Ashgate).
2. Valerie Lazarenko, *Cosmopolitanism and World Culture: History, Psychology, Development* (Berlin: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2012)
3. Karl Gustav Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, 2nd edition of *Collected Works*, Vol.9, Part 1, (Princeton, N.J.: Bollingen, 1981), 39 – 81.
4. Jung, C. G., & Franz, M.-L. *Man and His Symbols*. (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964), 67-95.
5. Karl Gustav Jung, *Psychology and Religion: The Terry Lectures*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938), 69 – 76.
6. Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1990), 51-58.
7. Robert Davies, James Farrell, and Steven Matthews, *The Dream World of Film: A Jungian Perspective on Cinematic Communication*, from *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*. 46 (1982): 326-343.
8. Joseph Campbell, *The Hero's Journey: Joseph Campbell on His Life and Work*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1990).
9. Myles Breen, Farrel Corcoran, *The Myth in the Discourse*, from Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association, (Milwaukee, April 15-17, 1982).
10. Penelope Prentice, *Tell Me a Story I'll Never Forget or Deconstructing Traditional Narrative Plot/Myths to Challenge the Ethics of Conflict*, from 23<sup>rd</sup> Annual Meeting of the College English Association, (Pittsburgh, 27-29 March, 1992).