

Published by the decision of the Scientific Council  
of Khachatur Abovian  
Armenian State Pedagogical University



Department of Philosophy and Logic  
named after Academician Georg Brutian



# W I S D O M

2(22), 2022



*WISDOM is covered in Clarivate Analytics' Emerging Sources  
Citation Index service*

YEREVAN – 2022

## THE PROBLEM OF STATE UNDERSTANDING AND PARADIGM BASES OF ITS TYPES

### Abstract

It is essential to develop an adequate specificity of the historical time reference point of scientific knowledge for the theory of the state, its strengthening by creating, introducing as a subject of study such a category as “state understanding”, designed to become a system-forming element of state studies, a place of application of forces associated with ontological, epistemological, methodological and typological research.

This category of state studies is identified, determined and justified as part of the analysis. Types of state understanding (theological-static, anthropocentric-mechanistic, positivistic-historical, systemological-alternativeist) are formulated and substantively disclosed as semantic models of state cognition, including theoretical construction, subject and method corresponding to individual types of scientific concepts characteristic of a particular stage of human civilization development. The basis of their evolutionary dynamics is established in the form of a paradigm shift of scientific rationality. The idea of a legal study of the state, its genesis, development, and essential functional characteristics are being actualized at present, post-non-classical stage of the development of science utilizing synergetic methodology, taking into account its subject adaptation. The foundations of a new derivative of the specifics of the modern systemological-alternativeist type, the synergetic concept of state understanding, are determined.

*Keywords:* state understanding, paradigm, methodology, typology, synergistic concept.

### Introduction

Analysis of the state of modern civilization allows us to conclude that there is a total problem associated with the actualization, optimization and functionalization of the idea of statehood, which has been an essential organizational tool for the development of humanity for several thousand years.

So, modern science is faced with a large-scale task connected with the search for effective means of knowledge and understanding of the essential foundations of the increasingly complex and accelerating processes of the public-state level, creating a universal doctrine ensuring the predictability and controllability of these processes.

In this regard, it is essential to develop an ad-

equately specific of the historical time reference point of scientific knowledge for the theory of the state, its strengthening by creating, introducing as a subject of study such a category as “state understanding”, designed to become a system-forming element of state science, a place of application of forces associated with ontological, epistemological, methodological and typological research.

So, we would like to define the concept of state understanding that interests us as follows. State understanding is a set of conceptual views on the essence of the state, the causes and ways of its emergence and development, the form of organization, structure and functioning of state power, its role in the life of society, its connection with the law, which is determined by the type of scientific rationality that has developed in

legal and political theory.

It is important to note that the problem of state understanding is inextricably linked to the question of the concept of the state itself, which, being the cornerstone of legal science, is open and relevant to this day. The complexity of this issue, the polyvariance of its solution in different historical eras by individual thinkers, is due to the complexity of knowledge and description of the phenomena of public, political and state power, which, being organizational phenomena of social reality, are multidimensional and dynamic.

Taking into account the scientific heritage and thousands of years of historical experience, in the context of the idea of state understanding, we will try to fundamentalize the theory of the state, establish the principles and vector of its development in conjunction with the nature of the evolutionary transformations of the systemic relations between the state and society, thereby revealing the guidelines and possibilities of modern science.

The substantive basis of state understanding is revealed in a special typology designed to classify individual types of state understanding as semantic models of state cognition, including theoretical construction, subject and method of the related concepts.

Substantiating this, it is possible to identify the following types of state understanding:

1. Theological-static;
2. Anthropocentric-mechanistic;
3. Positivist-historical ;
4. Systemological-alternativeist.

The name of each specified type reflects a variant of the cumulative concept of the state as a civilizational phenomenon based on the synthesis of ideological and practical attitudes characteristic of a particular stage in the development of society and science - the ideological paradigm of scientific rationality (classical, non-classical, post-non-classical), reflecting the original conceptual scheme, model problems and their solutions, research methods, dominant during a spe-

cific historical period in a scientific community.

(Starting to analyze, we indeed take into account the fact of a certain methodological lag, due to considerable conservatism, of the socio-humanitarian sciences (primarily legal science) from the natural sciences).

#### Theological-static Type of State Understanding

Conscious of the fact of the state form of organization of society, the formation of views and ideological attitudes regarding the nature and purpose of the state, in a period of time longer than the period of the history of science (political and legal science), it is necessary to pay attention to the area(s) of the history of the development of civilization, which is peculiar non-scientific (pre-scientific, near-scientific) rationality, and correlate the fruits of her knowledge of the surrounding reality with a certain type of state understanding.

So, it is customary to single out such relict forms of knowledge as mythological, religious, ethical, as non-scientific knowledge.

From the time of the most ancient civilizations up to the 16<sup>th</sup> century A.D., the dominant role in the description and interpretation of state-legal phenomena has been played by religious and ethical teachings, which scholastically explain the nature of the state and law, directly or indirectly synthesize the ideological basis of the inviolability of the existing state system as an inert form of organization of society. Here, the state is represented by God's given human coexistence led by the choice of God and, by virtue of this, sovereign ruler. Theoretical thought is aimed at idealization, revealing an exceptional standard of political organization in society. The possibility of comprehending the root causes of the state form is questioned as much as the possibility of comprehending the divine plan. The status of the human person, determined by descent, is formed on the basis of the principle of predetermination, humility and modesty, which

ideology is ideally defined by the immutable canons of behaviour under the auspices of the restriction of sinning.

It seems that this type of rationality can be correlated with the theological-static type of state understanding, the characteristic features of which will be the following:

1. the period of genesis - 2nd millennium B.C. – 16th century A.D.;
2. the determinant type of rationality – unscientific, quasi-scientific, proto-scientific:
  - a) reflection of knowledge – super-object;
  - b) object of knowledge – given-perceived, whole-static, idealized; unidirectional structural hierarchy, unable to be comprehended in full;
  - c) subject of knowledge is limited, self-limited by virtue of custom, tradition, faith, quasirational, fatalistic; logically adjusted to the object;
  - d) method of knowledge – scholastic;
3. relevant political and legal conceptual positions:
  - a) Zarathustra – the state is an embodiment of the heavenly kingdom, where the monarch, as a protege and servant of the one God, is a protector of citizens from evil and a source of virtue;
  - b) Confucius – the state is a large traditional family based on class inequality (dependence of the “younger ones” on the “older ones”), united under the authority of the emperor (“son of heaven”), called upon to rule on the basis of virtue;
  - c) Plato – the state is a class organization which is a manifestation of the aspirations of the human soul, originating in the realm of ideas beyond the heaven, must be governed by the wise men involved in the eternal good;
  - d) Aurelius Augustine – the state is a consequence of the sinful nature of man, a faith-based means of human survival in the world of mortals, an intermediate stage before entering the city of God;

- e) Thomas Aquinas – the state is like the world created and governed by God, established, managed and personified by the monarch organization, based on the law of God in the name of the common good.

Thus, in the context of the stated type of rationality, the understanding of the state can be expressed in the form of an unconditional, given, closed system of the political organization of society, having a unidirectional structural hierarchy with an exceptionally significant functionality of individual elements.

Throughout human history, many generations of scientists, lawyers and philosophers have been studying the prospects for the existence and development of the state. Depending on the level of development of human culture, ideas about society and the state, the principles of their functioning and development changed, and new conceptual structures emerged.

#### Anthropocentric-Mechanistic Type of State Understanding

Following the declared logic of presentation, we turn to the so-called “classical” type of scientific rationality and its inherent specificity of state understanding.

Thus, classical science, the science of the Renaissance and Enlightenment, is “genetically” associated with the heritage of ancient natural philosophy and ethics (in the context of interest to us, primarily with the teachings of Aristotle, Polybius and Cicero), having a long period of development, revealed to the world its own dogmatic arsenal of knowledge about nature and man.

The conceptual image of the mechanical system was dominant in the science of the 16-18th centuries and even the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The world seemed to be arranged like a clock, which the “creator” once wound up, and then they go according to objective laws. The philosophy of mechanism was intensively developed, which, in essence, determined the categorical

apparatus for describing small systems. As a simple mechanical system, not only physical but also biological and social objects were considered.

So, T. Hobbes described the state as a mechanism, the gears of which serve the citizens of the state. The world is a set of elements subject to the laws of mechanical movement. He also reduces the spiritual life of animals and man to movements and efforts. They are complex mechanisms entirely determined by external influences. He denied the objective nature of the qualitative diversity of nature, considering it only a product of human perceptions, which are based on mechanical differences of things.

P. A. Holbach (1963) substantiates the laws of classical mechanics, and elevates them to the rank of universal philosophical laws. With their help, he tries to know all the phenomena of the world, including psychic phenomena, social life, etc.

Characteristically, the categories of classical science here are automatically transferred to the description of social processes. Of course, any analogies have their limits, but at the same time, they allow us to clarify a lot and find new ways of understanding them.

Objectivity and subjectivity of scientific knowledge in classical science is achieved only when everything that relates to the subject and the processes of his cognitive activity is removed from the description and explanation. The ideal was to build an objective picture of nature. Special attention was paid to the search for obvious, evident, “derived from experience” essential principles, on the basis of which it is possible to build theories explaining and predicting experimental facts. The man was understood as a force of opposing nature, invading its processes, transforming objects of nature into the necessary objective forms.

If we find some subjective moments in the process and results of cognition, this cannot but indicate that the subject has ceased to be reduced to an a priori unit, that he has transformed no less

than the subject of study, and that we are no longer dealing with the classical paradigm of science, but with something else. Therefore, if a scientist, a philosopher wants to remain within the framework of the classical paradigm of science, he should not accept the position associated with the subjectivization of the object of study and, accordingly, of scientific knowledge. If a step towards this methodological model is made, then little remains of the classical science of modern times since this step is fraught with very serious consequences associated with an understanding of truth, objectivity, causality, historicity, etc. (Markova, 2003).

Nature was viewed as a huge conservative deterministic system in which causal relationships can be predicted or traced to any point in time, both in the past and in the future, if the initial conditions are precisely known. It is a simple resource of human activity, a kind of working material, allowing the unlimited possibility of human intervention, alteration and transformation in the interests of man, who, as it were, opposes natural processes, regulating and controlling them (Lektorsky, 2001).

Thus, the anthropocentric worldview, in contrast to the monotheistic, scholastic, creates favorable conditions for scientific research, which, however, was destined to exhaust itself in the search for the laws of nature and social reality.

The world seemed to be rigidly connected by cause-and-effect relationships. For causal chains, the course of development can be infinitely calculated into the past and the future. Development is retraceable and predictable. The present is determined by the past, and the future is determined by the present and the past.

As A. Koyre wrote about classical science, Modern science has destroyed the boundaries that separated the sky from the Earth, united and unified the Universe. But at the same time, A. Koyre writes, that it has replaced for us the qualitative world of sensory perceptions, the world in which there is a place for everything except the man himself. “It is true,” A. Koyre (1968) con-

tinues, “that these worlds every day, and even with time more and more, are interconnected by the practice. And yet in the realm of theory, they are divided by an abyss” (p. 103).

The classical approach to the management of complex social systems was based on a linear idea of their functioning. According to this view, the result of external control action is an unambiguous and linear, predictable consequence of the applied efforts, which corresponds to the “control action – the desired result” scheme. However, it turns out that many efforts are in vain or even harmful if they counter their own tendencies in the self-development of complex social systems (Budanov, 2006).

So, let us objectively relate and connect the above-described classical type of scientific rationality with the previously announced anthropocentric-mechanistic type of state understanding. As characteristic features of this type of state understanding, we highlight the following:

1. the period of genesis - the 16-mid – 17<sup>th</sup> centuries;
2. the determinant type of scientific rationality – the classical:
  - a) reflection of scientific knowledge – the object;
  - b) object of knowledge is rationally arranged, mechanically ordered and linearly developing according to the causal laws in force in it; a separate phenomenon, a simple static (cyclically closed) system that exists “by itself”, which is a mechanical set of its elements;
  - c) subject of knowledge is eliminated by virtue of natural equivalence; a carrier of pure abstract knowledge, distanced from the object of knowledge;
  - d) method of knowledge – ontological;
3. relevant political and legal conceptual positions:
  - a) Aristotle (*it is indicated regardless of the declared period due to the most important role of the teachings of Aristotle as a methodological basis for the humanities of Modern times*) – state – determined by order of government, a form of political communication of people, consisting of many elements.
  - b) N. Machiavelli – the state is a political state of society; determined by the cynical relations of power and subordinate organization;
  - c) J. Bodin – the state is an exercised by the supreme (sovereign - indivisible) power management of multiple owners, households and their common property;
  - d) H. Grotius – the state is a defined by the social nature of man, a perfect union of free people concluded for the sake of observance of the law and the common good;
  - e) T. Hobbes – the state is an artificially created by equal people, through self-restriction of their own freedom to ensure peace and well-being, mechanism with absolute sovereignty;
  - f) J. Locke – the state is a set of people in order to ensure freedom, equality and protection of property, established the form of collectivity, empowered to issue laws and ensure their implementation through special bodies for the common good;
  - g) Ch. Montesquieu – the state is a designed to ensure the regime of the legality of organization of management (a product of the historical development of society), characterized by order of formation and the level of functional autonomy of the authorities, which has a specific form of government due to the quality of the “spirit” of a particular nation predetermined by geographical factors;
  - h) J.-J. Rousseau – the state is a created by the general will of the people, primary source and carrier of sovereign power, political organism designed to ensure civil rights and freedoms;
  - i) T. Paine – the state is an organization created on the basis of a social contract with an approved people possessing supreme

- power, a form of government;
- j) I. Kant – the state a contractual, subject to legal laws, the association of people (individual subjects of moral consciousness) designed to ensure civil liberties by harmonizing the constitution with the principles of law (“categorical imperative”);
- k) G. Hegel – the state is the highest goal of the individual, a means of imperious harmonization of civil society (ensuring freedom, security, property), ideological and political national unity functioning in the regime of legality.

Thus, in the context of the stated type of rationality, the understanding of the state can be expressed in the form of a property produced by rational thinking, mechanically ordered, linearly developing, the rigidly determined system of political organization of society, which is equal to the sum of properties of its elements (institutions) existing by themselves.

#### Positivist-Historical Type of State Understanding

Next, moving along a given vector of argumentation for the evolution of state understanding, let us turn to the analysis of the following – the non-classical stage of development of scientific rationality.

Since the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the “linear” paradigm of ascending social development (progress), taking into account the objectification of the research of the real historical process, had begun to raise certain doubts, which later led to its consistent criticism.

The changes that occurred in various areas of scientific knowledge - in physics (creation of the theory of relativity and quantum mechanics), in cosmology (concept of a non-stationary universe), in chemistry (quantum chemistry), in biology (synthetic theory of evolution), the emergence of cybernetics and systems theory played a crucial role in the formation and development of non-classical science.

The categorical apparatus of classical science has ceased to satisfy the methodological requirements associated with the effective study, as it turned out, of complex, self-regulating natural and social systems. It became customary to differentiate these systems into relatively autonomous subsystems, in which, at their own level, stochastic (randomly chosen) interaction of elements takes place. Integrity, as the quality of the state of the system, has become determined on the basis of the presence in it of a special control unit and direct and inverse connections between the complete system and its subsystems. Within this framework, complex systems are seen to be homeostatic (self-balancing) phenomena. It is assumed that they have a “functioning program” that determines the control commands and adjusts the behaviour of the system based on feedback.

In complex self-regulating systems (as opposed to simple ones), the interrelation of parts and the whole acquires new content. The whole is no longer exhausted by the properties of the parts; a new systemic quality of the whole arises. The part inside the whole, and outside it has different properties.

Causality in self-regulating systems does not have a fatal connection with “Laplace’s determinism”; it is mainly associated with “probabilistic” and “target” conditions of existence. The first characterizes the behaviour of the system, taking into account the stochastic nature of the interactions in the subsystems, and the second - the action of the self-regulation program as a goal ensuring the reproduction of the system.

In the studies of complex self-regulating systems, new meanings arise, which are expressed in their spatial-temporal descriptions; the genesis of these processes is bound to develop such areas of scientific thought as cybernetics, information theory and systems theory.

Through the theoretical-methodological principles developed within the framework of non-classical science, a different image of natural science and social science was formed, in which the

ideas of pluralism dominate another (rather than classical) type of scientific rationality.

In contrast to classical epistemology, the truth can be interpreted not as a reproduction of an object in knowledge but as a characteristic of the method of cognitive activity with it. Since there can be many such methods, pluralism of truths is possible, and, therefore, a monopoly on one truth is excluded.

Non-classical science does not detract from the great achievements of classical science. The logical and historical significance of classical scientific rationality and the existence of certain invariants of the evolution of science are recognized. As in the case of classical science, a true understanding of science as such was achieved; when the science of each historical era is not cancelled by subsequent development, it coexists with all previous and subsequent scientific activities.

However, projects and constructions of historical development, built, in particular, by the political and legal thought of classical science, lose their dominant status, which requires new approaches. These approaches are connected with the concepts of non-classical science in the field of research on the socio-historical evolution, formation and development of society and the state.

So, in particular, G. Spencer considers social evolution (the evolution of the state as a social organism) as an automatic, unavoidable process. "The process of social development as a whole is so predetermined," he wrote, "that its successive stages cannot be indicated in advance; therefore, no doctrine and no policy can accelerate it above the known rate, which is limited by the rate of organic changes in man, but it is quite possible to upset and slow down or disrupt the course of this process... Growth and development processes can be, and very often stop, or get upset, but cannot be improved artificially" (Spencer, 1896, p. 291).

According to A. Comte, as well as other sociologists-positivists, social development is subject

to the same laws that govern the development of all-natural systems. "The main character of positive philosophy," wrote A. Comte (1912), "is expressed in recognition of all phenomena subordinate to the unchanging natural laws, the discovery and reduction of the number of which to a minimum is the goal of all our research, and it seems to us that the search for the so-called causes, both primary and final, is inaccessible and meaningless" (p. 6).

The formational approach developed by K. Marx and F. Engels is associated with the recognition of the following position: the history of mankind has unity in the sense that it obeys the same laws that have been in force throughout history. K. Marx argued that the understanding of the real history of mankind begins from the moment it discovered its dialectical materialistic laws. In accordance with these laws, the world community of people goes through the historical path of progressive development and goes through certain stages in this development called formations. However, N. V. Ustryalov (1998) gave in his work "The Problem of Progress" convincing criticism of this progressive approach to the ideological attitude concerning the pre-determination of the development of human civilization. There, he poses two fundamental questions about the historical progress in society: what is the progress and is the progress a historical reality?

The progress, according to N. V. Ustryalov, is not in an unbroken linear "rise" but in increasing beingness in a growing wealth of motives. At the same time, it is not at all necessary that the subsequent motive, by all means, be "more perfect" than the previous one. But it always adds "something" to what has been before. Only in this conditional understanding can the idea of "general", "absolute" progress be assimilated: it postulates a common connection, in the actual reality of which disparate empirical facts are interpreted as moments of becoming a higher unity" (Ustryalov, 1998).

In the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century N. Ya.



Danilevsky, exploring the features of the formation and development of the Russian and Western European cultures as socio-historical types of evolution, in his work “Russia and Europe” (1991), introduced the concept of “cultural and historical type”. Cultural and historical types, according to N.Ya. Danilevsky, like living organisms, are in a continuous struggle with each other and with the external environment, and also as biological species pass through certain stages: maturity - decrepitude - inevitable death. Cultural and historical types evolve from the ethnographic state to the state and from it to civilization.

We find the most developed non-classical concept of human history in the works of A. Toynbee, which he called the “theory of the cycle of local civilizations”. World history, according to A. Toynbee, is a collection of histories of individual, unique and relatively closed civilizations. The basic principle of A. Toynbee’s concept is the explicitly expressed idea of multi-variant and alternative human history, which transforms the political and cultural outlook doctrinally, demonstrating the emergence of a new approach to the study of state-social development, anticipates the development of a post-non-classical science methodology.

Next, focusing on the substantive correlation of the indicated features of a non-classical scientific approach with the previously announced positivist-historical type of state understanding, let us single out the characteristic features of the latter:

1. the period of genesis – 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 19<sup>th</sup> – mid-20<sup>th</sup> centuries;
2. the defining type of scientific rationality – non-classical:
  - a) reflection of scientific knowledge – means–object;
  - b) object of knowledge – relative to the research activity (the type of scientific description), changeable, dependent on the conditions of existence, involved in a network of interrelated events; a complex of

- phenomena, an element of the world of complex self-regulating systems;
  - c) subject of knowledge - included in the object of knowledge, involved in the process of obtaining knowledge as an experimenter and interpreter;
  - d) method of knowledge – epistemological;
3. relevant political and legal conceptual positions:
    - a) A. Comte - the state is social cooperation of people and social groups endowed with functional rights and duties necessary to achieve a common goal, having political power, the quality of which evolves (progresses) over time through the moral and economic improvement of social relations;
    - b) G. Jellinek – the state is a normative ratio of the wills of the ruling and subordinate based on the psychological acceptability of domination of power, the recognition of the legitimacy of the functionally satisfying power;
    - c) G. Spencer – the state is a product of the evolution of a social organism, determined by its interaction with the environment, historically undergoing functionally determined transformations;
    - d) Karl Marx – the state is based on the economic structure of society (industrial relations that do not depend on the will of people, which correspond to forms of public consciousness), form of organization of political power of the economically dominant class, historically evolving, able to respond to a crisis of basic relations with revolutionary changes;
    - e) N. Danilevsky – the state is defined by the cultural-historical type of human society, cyclical in its development, political form of existence of the people;
    - f) O. Spengler – the state is a condition of the historical movement of the people, as a national-cultural community, the form of which is changeable and definable only in a specific period of time;

g) A. Toynbee – the state is a local civilization (cultural-spiritual) phenomenon, taking into account possible alternative development, going through pre-established stages of life.

Thus, in the context of the above type of rationality, the understanding of the state can be expressed as depending on the conditions of existence, a complex (multidimensional) evolving system of political organization of society based on the principles of cooperation and predetermined by historical and temporal factors.

#### Systemological-Alternativeist Type of State Understanding

Having defined the methodological problem of the state of understanding, having considered a part of its types (theological-static, anthropocentric-mechanistic and positivistic-historical), following the declared logic of the statement, we shall address the analysis of the following modern, post-non-classical type of scientific rationality.

It is necessary to say that modern civilization is faced with many global problems. In addition, as the analysis shows, at present, the development of the world community has entered the mode in which unpredictability and alternative-ness has become crucial for further evolution.

For the highly condensed, eventful historical time, the time of rapid qualitative change, large-scale technological innovations, social, national crises and conflicts, global shifts and upheavals accompanying the formation of a multipolar world - this is a whole new era, which E. Laszlo called the “era of bifurcation”. Instability, variability, and bifurcation (alternative development) – the most stable characteristics of modernity. There is an intensive transformation of social institutions, a change in the entire socio-cultural environment of a person and in parallel with his views on the meaning and purpose of being.

At present, the transition of the majority of

fundamental scientific disciplines to the study of a new type of objects - self-organizing and self-developing systems has been completed. The results of the study of complex systems capable of self-organization led to a radical transformation of mechanistic ideas about nature and society.

The development of the theory of self-organization and the ideas of synergetics is connected with the philosophical understanding of the results of natural science research of irreversible, open thermodynamic processes and the worldview and methodological principles of mastering and comprehending the world that is unfolding (Chernavsky, 2002; Haken, 1980; Knyazeva & Kurdyumov, 1992; Kochesokov, 2010; Prigogine & Stengers, 1989; Ruzavin, 1995).

So, sociosynergetics, its conceptual foundations (principles of self-organization of complex systems: homeostasis, hierarchy, openness, non-linearity, randomness, instability, emergence, irreversibility, universality, etc.) open up new opportunities in the study of problems of social development, demonstrate non-trivial interdisciplinary scientific results, methodologically applicable in the process of researching socio-political systems, state organization.

The synergetic worldview setting and the corresponding methodology of social cognition lead to the formation of a theoretical model of socio-political development that understands society and the state as evolving integrity, which is characterized by determinism and randomness, stability and instability, organization and disorganization, mutual transitions of dynamic chaos and dynamic stability at the micro and macro levels.

Here, time, as a measure of historical development, is a conventional unit of the systemic transformation of energy.

In turn, the will of an individual is seen as the primary source of energy of state-legal matter - the primary element - a particle of the “quantum field” of social relations. Summing up (actualizing) the energy of individual wills (in full accordance with the law of conservation of energy)

has a synergistic (self-organizing) effect on matter, manifested in its system-structural ordering and transformation - state-legal formation and reform. Further and further, fixing informationally, one (achieved) system of relations, becoming an object of reflexive-volitional processes that generate the movement of matter, is replaced by another, demonstrating, thereby, the global principle of development.

Thus, the knowledge of the process of state formation involves the study of not only the conditions for the formation of the most ancient systems of the state-like organization of society - the primary examples of organizational culture, fixed by the memory of generations in the form of a "genome" responsible for the form of collective coexistence but also the study of the general laws of the emergence of all that have ever existed in the past and present states.

With regard to the problem of state genesis, it is heuristic to use the idea of self-preservation (dynamic stability) as a system-forming factor, which reflects the essence that determines the mechanisms and patterns of emergence, the formation of a system (system genesis). The considered mechanism (correlated with the principle of the hierarchy of the Universe) underlies the state organization of society, both at the dawn of mankind and in the modern period, and is the essence of its systemic development.

The state here appears to be a universal self-organizing political system, a product of social evolution that has arisen (produced) as an institution that is able to ensure self-preservation for a certain contingent of people - carriers of the will of attractive goal-setting, and developing in the form of a speculative-organizational form of systemic stability, periodically undergoing adaptive-situational transformations.

Further, it is worth saying that the patterns of development of the state system can be grouped into two main structure-forming trends, corresponding to the processes of the birth of a new socio-political order and the processes of maintaining this order, corresponding to two different

types of behaviour of social systems (the basis of the typology of states): the first – open, dynamic, far from equilibrium, generating a complicated structure; the second is self-isolating, oriented towards static, close to equilibrium, generating a simplified structure.

These two basic psychodynamic trends are due to different types of reactions of socio-political systems to external and internal system trends and ways of processing these trends (adaptation to them). The change in these forms of behaviour of social systems at different stages of their evolutionary development demonstrates a hidden pulsating mechanism of the wave development of society in the context of the corresponding state system, which is characterized by the cyclical processes of emergence (spontaneous generation), relatively stable existence (preservation) and decay (restructuring).

Power, as a category, is understood as a systemic phenomenon, considered as a property of a social system, as a will-producing activity order; it is embodied in the structuring of relations between people, coordination and direction of their actions in a single channel of the resulting, goal-setting volitional vector (attractor), which, forming system of values, determines the order of the hierarchical correlation of elements depending on their functional purpose, and the functional value itself is determined depending on the place occupied in this system.

State power is the basis of the processes of evolution of socio-cultural reality, evidence of their irreversibility. It is she who sets the vector of the historical development of society, which is based on the genesis of the mechanism of power. The process of self-organization in society goes through the accumulation, selection and transformation of information and its structuring. On the basis of this process, the emergence of new structures is carried out, i.e. organization of disciplinary spaces pre-establishing a certain order of thinking and behaviour. Power, thus, is associated with the internal self-organization of the system. The result of the exchange of activity,

information, and energy is a differentiated and hierarchically organized structure of state-public relations, as well as the produced order of relations through which, whatever its specific appearance (democracy, monarchy, oligarchy, tyranny, etc.), human society is constituted as an association of united individuals.

In a synergistic context, public administration is seen as a process of self-organization originating in a multitude of micro-level formations of the social space. Spontaneously arising in the process of overcoming a crisis situation or at the moment of choosing an alternative development, order parameters coordinate private and general interests in a particular community and acquire the meaning of arranging (organizing) or guiding and regulating (managing) movement, which, in turn, determines the nature of the connection, the type activities of the components of the state system, the next and next organizational levels, optimizing the process of solving basic state tasks. Social changes make adjustments to the structural and qualitative characteristics of the subjects and objects of management while not opposing but synergizing the subject-object relations. The purpose of management is not to maintain a static order that has taken place but to maintain self-organization, manifested by the ongoing process of state formation, i.e. dynamic organization.

Thus, the systemic state crisis is considered not only as of the apogee of disorganization but at the same time as the emergence of a new organization struggling with the emerging disorganization, in the unity of the meanings of the destructive and constructive movement. This concept of management takes into account the alternativeness of social evolution and the peculiarities of behaviour in the critical range of system parameters that impose significant restrictions on external control actions. Speaking about the problem of strategies and tactics of public administration and its relation to crisis (transitional) states and processes, it is emphasized that there can be no such external influences that could "impose" a mode of behaviour that is not

characteristic of the potential structure of the state system.

In turn, the synergetic approach to the analysis of the mechanism of legal regulation, and its action, is carried out in the context of a theoretical setting that involves taking into account the understanding of the relationship between the categories: society, power and law, through their correspondence to the correlation of fundamental concepts: matter, energy and information, where matter (society) is the carrier of movement, energy (power) is the amount of movement, information (right) is the quality of movement.

The description of the quality of the connection between the state and the law, in which the law is represented by the condition of the coherence of wills, a function (non-linear function) of the system of the state organization of society, can be mathematically expressed by the following formula:  $y = f(x)$  ( $y$  - state regulation;  $f$  - law;  $x$  - public relations), where by  $f$  we mean the rule according to which a given value of  $x$  is associated with a certain value of  $y$ ;  $f$  is the symbol of some transformation that  $x$  must be subjected to in order to obtain  $y$ .

The dynamic nature of the links between the elements of the mechanism of legal regulation is the factor that determines the self-improvement of both the links themselves and the mechanism itself as a whole, which, acting as a synthesizing component of the co-evolution of a person, society and the state, confirms the provisions of synergetics that the processes of self-organization the essence is always the result of the interaction of microsystems, manifested at the macrolevel.

It should be noted that man, as a rational subject, is not an epiphenomenon of natural processes but their complex product - the embodiment and carrier of the concentrated experience of metagalactic co-evolution, and the state-like organization of human society, the transition of its state (transformation and development), is a structural element and result (continuation) of the immanent process of evolution of the Universe.

Thus, universal evolution, in relation to the

systemic form of organization of the state, is presented as a sequence of regularly changing qualities of the matter of political relations in society, serving as its content. In the process of this evolution, each subsequent quality of the indicated matter is born in the depths of the previous one and passes through certain phases in its development. Any state system already at the moment of its inception bears the rudiments, those qualitative characteristics that subsequently serve as the cause of its collapse (degradation, self-destruction). The transitional period, prepared by the phase of the crisis, is a moment of self-development - the replacement of an outdated form of development with a new one, more functionally corresponding to the moment in time, capable of ensuring the viability of the social system here and now.

The state as a system moves to a new stage of development, choosing one of the options that are close to this choice. However, the latter does not represent the “best” variant of the possible and cannot take into account the further development prospects, and it is carried out mainly due to internal processes. The selection system is constantly evolving; the selection rules become more complex, multiply and evolve themselves, which naturally causes uncertainty in the vector of system development.

The transition status of the state is such a form of self-fulfilment of social being, which serves as a means of actualizing a potential political structure and represents a change from one type of orderliness and balance to another type of social stability in the process of choosing one of the alternatives leading to morphogenesis, there is a space for deploying potential being, constructing or recreating organizational forms that ensure the viability of the social system.

It seems relevant that as an ideological guideline, it is necessary to have an alternative modeling method that is capable of speculatively reproducing a meaningful, developing, evolving Universe that preserves free will for a person as a condition for the immanence of the formation

and transformation of state-political matter. So, for the possibility of constructing the causal fabric of reality, it is necessary to allow a plurality of causes and consequences of events, where the minimum possibility is the creative triad for any event. Here, events form grid nodes (there are two inputs and one output in a node, or two outputs and one input), along which you can move ambiguously and come to the same result in different ways, or vice versa. This generates many scenarios for the development of events, pluralism of opinions and diversity of our world, its ambiguous future and possible past.

So, correlating the above-described post-non-classical type of scientific rationality with the previously declared systemological-alternativeist type of state understanding, let us pay attention to the characteristic features of the latter:

1. the period of genesis – the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 20<sup>th</sup> – the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> centuries (the present time);
2. the defining type of scientific rationality – post-non-classical:
  - a) reflection of scientific knowledge – subject–means–object;
  - b) object of knowledge – relative to the subjective (value-willed) features of understanding, an open, complex, non-linear, self-organizing system; interdisciplinary, represents a single systemic picture of reality;
  - c) subject of knowledge – indivisible with the object of knowledge, the condition for the evolution of scientific knowledge, the condition of the anthropic principle, the bearer of social goal-setting;
  - d) method of knowledge – methodological;
3. relevant political and legal concepts – are currently in their infancy (in particular, a synergistic concept, the elements of which will be presented below).

In general, according to the paradigmatic provisions outlined above, the concept of a state is assumed to be as follows: the state is a non-entropic phenomenon of social reality, a self-orga-

nizing system of political relations aimed at ensuring the viability and sustainability of the goal-oriented development of a spatially defined social community characterized by the non-linear (alternative) evolutionary dynamics of its functional structure and form due to external and internal order parameters which are interconnected with the volitional attitudes of individuals and their groups by means of subject-objective reflection of consciousness.

Thus, in the context of the stated type of rationality, the understanding of the state can be expressed in the form of a complex, open, non-linear, dynamic system(s) of the political organization of society based on the principles of global evolutionism, the laws of self-organizing development, including the law of synergetics of the entire elementary composition, where a separate subject acts as the primary goal of systemic content and form.

#### Conclusion

In conclusion, we would like to emphasize once again the importance of the formulation and development of the theoretical basis of state science, including by drawing the attention of science to the category of state understanding, which can become a fertile basis for developing an approach adequate to the realities of modern civilization, an approach to the place and role of the state in the life of man and society, an approach to the principles of its development (co-development (self-development)) and functioning, with a further exit to the level of strategic recommendations on the practice of political-legal optimization.

Summing up, we would like to focus on the designated problem of state understanding and its actualization in the modern world. As part of the analysis, this category of public studies has been identified, defined and justified. Types of state understanding (theological-static, anthropocentric-mechanistic, positivist-historical, systemological-alternativeist) are formulated and

meaningfully disclosed as semantic models of state cognition, including theoretical construction, subject and method corresponding to various types of scientific concepts. The basis of their evolutionary dynamics has been established in the form of a change in the paradigms of scientific rationality. The idea of research of the state, its genesis, development, and essential functional characteristics are actualized at present, post-non-classical stage of science development by means of synergetic methodology, taking into account its subject adaptation, the fundamentals of a new derivative of the specificity of the modern systemological-alternativeist type - the synergetic concept of state understanding are defined.

#### References

- Budanov, V. G. (2006). *O metodologii sinergetiki* (On the methodology of synergetics, in Russian). *Voprosy filosofii (Problems of Philosophy, in Russian)*, 5, 87-99.
- Chernavsky, D. S. (2002). *O metodologicheskikh aspektakh sinergetiki* (On the methodological aspects of synergetics, in Russian). Moscow: Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Comte, O. (1912). *Kurs pozitivnoj filosofii* (Course of positive philosophy, in Russian). *Rodonachal'niki pozitivizma (Ancestors of Positivism, in Russian)*, 4, 6-15.
- Danilevsky, N. Ya. (1991). *Rossiya i Evropa* (Russia and Europe, in Russian). Moscow: Book Publication.
- Haken, H. (1980). *Sinergetika* (Synergetics, in Russian). Moscow: World Publication.
- Holbach, P. A. (1963). *Izbrannyye proizvedeniya: V 2-h t* (Selected works: in 2 volumes, in Russian). Moscow: The Science.
- Knyazeva, E. N., & Kurdyumov, S. P. (1992). *Sinergetika kak novoe mirovidenie:*

- dialog s Prigozhinym* (Synergetics as a new world view: A dialogue with Prigogine, in Russian). *Voprosy filosofii* (Problems of Philosophy, in Russian), 12, 4-12.
- Kochesokov, Z. Kh. (2010). *Diskurs sovremennoy etapy sotsialnoy evolyutsii v post-neklassicheskoy paradigme nauki* (Discourse of the modern stage of social evolution in the post-non-classical paradigm of science, in Russian). Nalchik: Kabardino-Balkarian State University Publication.
- Koyre, A. (1968). *The significance of the Newtonian synthesis*. Bassala: The Rise of modern Science.
- Lektorsky, V. A. (2001). *Epistemologiya klassicheskaya i neklassicheskaya* (Classical and non-classical epistemology, in Russian). Moscow: Institute of Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publication.
- Markova, L. A. (2003). *Ot matematicheskogo estestvoznaniya k nauke o haose* (From the mathematical natural science to the science of chaos, in Russian). *Voprosy filosofii* (Problems of Philosophy, in Russian), 7, 18-28.
- Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1989). *Poryadok iz haosa* (Order from Chaos, in Russian). Moscow: Progress Publication.
- Ruzavin, G. I. (1995). *Samoorganizatsiya i organizatsiya v razvitiy obshchestva* (Self-organization and organization in the development of society, in Russian). *Voprosy filosofii* (Problems of Philosophy, in Russian), 8, 227-233.
- Spencer, G. (1896). *Sotsiologiya kak predmet izucheniya* (Sociology as a subject of study, in Russian). Moscow: Lan Publication.
- Ustryalov, N. V. (1998). *Problema progressa* (The problem of progress, in Russian). Moscow: Yurlitizdat Publication.