

УДК 130.2+172.1+321.01

Philosophical Anthropology and the Problem of Entirety of the State

Pavel V. Klachkov*

*Department of Expertise and Analytics
of the Governour of the Krasnoyarsk Territory
110 pr. Mira, Krasnoyarsk, 660009 Russia*

Received 31.03.2012, received in revised form 06.04.2012, accepted 12.05.2012

Full development of the problem of Entirety of the State and variability of its parts requires synthesis of knowledge obtained from philosophy, philosophical anthropology, cultural studies, political science, theory of state and law, sociology, psychology and other sciences. This comprehensive study is only possible within the framework of philosophical anthropology. The category of "entirety" has got significant development in the works of some thinkers (especially Russian) reflecting a combination, a degree of coherence of unity and diversity, integration and autonomy of the components that provide self-preservation and progressive development of social and cultural systems (including states). The entirety of the state is associated with both rational (the division and cooperation of citizens' labour, the need to ensure life safety and activity), as well as with cultural, symbolic and even playful factors.

Keywords: collective behaviour, entirety of the state, philosophical anthropology, soft power, synergetic.

According to S.S. Khoruzhy the decisive role in the whole dynamics of the society belongs to the "processes occurring at the anthropological level ... Of course, this statement is not a self-evident truth, it expresses a certain position, which is openly different from well known sociocentric views ... The author argues without denying the fundamental role of social dynamics that "the latter is anthropological dynamics, which not only resolves itself in the social dynamics, but is an irreducible, deep and decisive level of dynamics of the whole multi-level society"¹. Recognizing the validity of the statement it should be noted that the anthropological manifestations and practices

are also subject to a determined management and education influence.

According to N.V. Abaev the culture of the psychic activity is the organic component of the metacultural entirety, which fulfills general antientropic functions for the whole cultural organism². The researcher assumes that in the Medieval China Confucianism and Chan Buddhism were persistently forming certain types of personality different from each other, involving the deepest layers of the mind³. V.F. Cheshko and V.I. Glazko also study the phenomenon of biopower, which forces certain standards of appearance, life style and even body-build upon

© Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved

* Corresponding author E-mail address: klachkov@mail.ru

modern people not acting by means of orders or enforcement, but using “mild” influence of such regulators as fashion, advertisement, cinema, recommendations of competent people, etc.⁴ According to the opinion of E.M. Spirova post modernism forms “a certain type of personality which, first of all, has a divided mind. Therefore, the carrier of such psychic structure perceives the world as a chaos, as a meaningless collage of hierarchically chaotic decentralized fragments”⁵.

In such circumstances socio-political unities are considered through the prism of socio-cultural factors providing self-perseverance and sustainable development. The leaders and elites in the evident and unevident way contribute to and construct some types of personalities, public consciousness and ways of behaviour, and at the same time move the other types to the periphery of the society. Herewith, three circumstances should be taken into consideration. Firstly, leaders and elites themselves do not appear at an empty place, they are formed by the medium, doctrines, traditions and practices. Secondly, public consciousness and, moreover, collective unconscious is nothing like a “clean board” on which one can put any symbols or texts. Thirdly, the humanitarian technologies providing introduction and distribution of socio-cultural values are even more important than in anthropology⁶. A carefully thought-out “mild” influence may be much more effective than the cruelest dictation. It is the case when a butterfly, which has sat in a certain place, can change the balance of a heavy construction of many tonnes (in a saving or a destructive way).

In the view of the above, it is philosophical anthropology that can most productively consider the issue of the national unity⁷ and the diversity of its parts, which is one of the core problems of philosophy, political science, theory of law and many other sciences. Since ancient times people have brought under deliberation the causes which

have impelled them to live in a politically organized society, as well as the factors that contribute to the maintenance, strengthening and development or, on the contrary, weakening, degradation and disintegration of the latter. The interest to these problems increases regularly during the periods of social and cultural disturbances, when the states, which have seemed unshakable, are on the verge of collapse, or even get past this point. When “buildings” get cracks, the thinkers discover “the supporting constructions”. It becomes obvious that the daily life of the state-organized society, which “was taken for granted”, is maintained by a complex system of institutions, traditions, values, ideas and images, which is based, in its turn, on the whole interweaving of social and cultural factors. As St. John Chrysostom said, “destroy the order of logs the house is built with, and the walls will break down on their own. Destroy the state power, and the whole human life will break up, the family, the city and the people will break up”⁸.

The interdisciplinary character of the problem also speaks in favour of the philosophical and anthropological approach. As M. Harris and O. Johnson point out, the originality of anthropology in comparison with other social sciences that it is holistic; it tries to understand the processes that affect all aspects of human thought and behaviour, as well as explain the latter⁹. It is no accident that anthropologists focus on the problem of the factors that ensure the integration of political communities¹⁰.

To characterize the necessary combination of the national unity and diversity of its constituent elements and interrelations the category of “entirety” should be implemented, which is already in use in philosophical anthropology.¹¹ Under entirety philosophers understand the generalized characteristic of objects with a complex internal structure. This concept expresses the integration and at the

same time, the autonomy and contraposition to the environment associated with their internal activities. It describes their qualitative features connected with their typical specific patterns of functioning and development¹². As noted by G.W.F. Hegel “the entire is not an abstract unity, but the unity of a different variety”¹³. A.F. Losev formulated it this way: “‘the entire’ is a dialectical synthesis of the ‘one’ and the ‘many’”¹⁴. The “controversy is life and life is the controversy waiting for synthesis”¹⁵.

In Greek philosophy the problem of entirety was considered in the framework of relation of the one to the many. Plato believed that the multiplicity of things in the world found its entirety only in an idea. Consideration of the infinite variety of individual things and properties without turning to the general principles only leads to the loss of the human thought¹⁶. To make thinking possible, the many should be understood in terms of uniting it in the one.

Science development in the Modern and the Contemporary ages is a change of several scientific pictures (cognitive models) of the world. According to V.G. Nemirovsky if G. Galileo and I. Kepler looked at the world as a book, Newton and P. Laplace as a clock, Charles Darwin and John Maxwell as a balance of chances and V.I. Vernadsky and E. Jantsch as a body, the scientists of the nearest future will perhaps look at the world as a garden¹⁷. Each of the above mentioned representations provides its own image of entirety as it is and the entirety of the state in particular. For example, the mechanistic approach presents the state mechanism in the form of a peculiar set of gears that need to be properly adjusted, and the statistical model focuses on the quantitative aspect of social processes. However, none of these approaches fully meets the needs of the modern practice.

Turning to the history of Russian philosophy it should be noted that the desire to achieve

holistic understanding of the world was typical for many Russian thinkers. Already in “The Life of Kirill” compiled at the end of the 9th century philosophy was defined as “knowledge of divine and human things as deep as close a human can get to God, thus teaching people to be in their lives in the image of Creator”¹⁸. Many Russian thinkers also considered the universe, including the social reality, equally integral. As O.A. Mitroshenkov points out, “a typical feature of the Russian philosophical worldview is the prejudice against individualism and commitment to a certain kind of spiritual solidarity that does not ignore personal freedom and individuality, but, on the contrary, is their solid basis”¹⁹. A.S. Khomyakov sought to create a “cathedral”, a “church” concept of cognition, to justify the unity of faith and mind²⁰. Other early Slavophiles had similar views. V.S. Solov’vov also considered it important to rely on the “entire knowledge”, which was a universal synthesis of philosophy, science and religion, not abstract, but capable to navigate the human in life. This idea led the philosopher to the concept of the “entire life”, which referred to the life and true communication with the Absolute. All specific forms and elements of life and knowledge should become necessary organs of the unified “integrated life”; they will get their positive value only after the dialogue of the people’s will and mind with the Eternal things of existence²¹. The central idea of V.S. Solov’vov’s philosophy has naturally become the “entirety”, i.e. the inner organic unity of the existence as a universe, interpenetration of its elements while maintaining their individuality²². The worldview of L.P. Karsavin had also been developing in this context. This philosopher considered the world as a hierarchical unity of symphonic personalities of a various order (from the humanity and peoples to a family and an individual)²³.

As A.A. Takho-Godi emphasizes, for A.F. Losev, who considered V.S. Solov’vov to be

his first teacher, the world was not only space, but also the universe, all parts of which bore a stamp of entirety on them. All-unity in Losev's conception manifested in the denial of the opposition between idealism and materialism²⁴. For P.A. Florensky it was the entirety, in which he saw the meaning of dialectics. In his view, the latter does not have and can not have separate definitions and proofs, but there is still "a growing ball of contemplation, which gets deeper into the essence of the subject under study"²⁵. N.O. Lossky believed that "initially there is the whole, and the elements are able to exist and occur ONLY IN THE SYSTEM OF THE WHOLE...plurality does not form the whole, and vice versa, it is generated from the integral whole"²⁶.

Far from the ideas of V.S. Solov'yov, I.A. Il'yin was greatly influenced by the philosophy of G.W.F. Hegel. He criticized the widespread view that the latter was reduced to abstract panlogism. He argued that the German philosopher recognized the self-identity of the world, which did not fit a purely logical process. It was about the understanding of life as formation of organic wholes: such as body, society, language, etc.²⁷

Russian thinker S.L. Frank identified two fundamentally different philosophical approaches: "universalistic" and "singularistic". The followers of the first approach believe that the society is a constellation of elements, the relationship between which does not create a new quality different from the amount of qualities of its constituent parts. The followers of the second approach understand the social medium as a system unity with integral properties of the whole, which are absent in the parts forming it²⁸.

S.L. Frank himself stated that "the society is ... a truly holistic reality, and not a derivative union of individuals, and moreover, it is the only reality in which we are specifically given a human"²⁹. When speaking of the laws of social

development, the thinker said: "there is no severest pressure that can replace a spontaneous source of the forces flowing out of the depths of the human spirit. The most severe military and state discipline can only regulate and direct the social unity, but not create it: it is created by free will"³⁰.

As N.P. Koptseva indicates, "the ideal of holistic consciousness that can be implemented only by the integral man is the most significant contribution of the national philosophy to the world philosophical process"³¹. Reflecting on the category of "entirety" in the social aspect, the author concludes: "The person is directly and integrally incorporated into the community as the integrity of a larger order. Beyond this incorporation the very existence of the individual is not complete and not holistic. Both the individual and the society are complementary, they are parts of each other giving each other the meaning of existence. At the same time, both theoretically and practically, the two integrities, the society and the individual, can and should be considered as separate entities with their own characteristics and special laws of entirety modeling: how atomic beings are transformed into the society, what is the basis of entirety, what is its content and perhaps what is its purpose"³². N.P. Koptseva also indicates that special attention should be paid to the archetypal roots of historically specific integrity typical for a particular society and conscious modeling of the latter³³.

Russian thinker A.A. Bogdanov has tried to create a universal organizational science: tectology. It was superior to both the theory of systems and cybernetics. He wrote that "conservation" (the word is taken in quotes by the author – P. Klachkov) of systems "is never absolute, but always only approximate; ... it is the result of dynamic equilibrium of the system with its environment, i.e. it is formed by two flows of activities: assimilation, absorption and

digestion of outside activities and dissimulation, indigestion of activities, their loss and transition into the environment”³⁴. According to the thinker these two sets regulate the development of the system, which is “going through contradiction, while the parts of the whole have a separate character”³⁵. Such an increase must be balanced by establishment of additional interrelations (links) between divergent parts³⁶. Hence, in particular, the integration of social communities, the complexity of their structure must be accompanied by the creation of additional interrelations. It is no accident that the thinker emphasizes that a skilled manager “always tries to combine people in such a way that they complement each other in the interest of the business ... i.e. directly causing the desired splitting of the additional links apart”³⁷. However, “any differentiation is beneficial only up to some point”³⁸. Getting at this point the system risks to lose the integrity. Still, preservation of the system requires, according to the author, not the denial of development, but timely creation of the required additional links.

In the framework of the system analysis the integrity is determined by D.M. Mekhontseva as “the unity of ruling and ruled parts of the system provided by the information, energy and transport (spatial-temporal, cause-and-effect) links necessary to achieve its main and functional objectives”³⁹. V.V. and V.D. Morozovs analyzing the dialectics of the concepts of the system and development, came to the conclusion that the entirety and summativity are dialectical opposites that exist in the indissoluble unity⁴⁰.

V.A. Kartashov emphasizes that the primary cause of the system formation is always some kind of necessity. The specific expression of the latter is the objective formulated on the basis of the experience and defining the system. However, M. Heidegger, who believed the system to be impossible neither in the Antiquity, nor in the

Middle Ages, noted: “Where the world becomes a system, the system comes to domination, and not only in thinking. But where the system is regulating everything, there is always a possibility of its degeneration into an empty formalism of artificially well-set patched systemacity. It is achieved when the initial energy of the project runs out”⁴¹.

A.G. Spirkin identifies three types of entirety: 1) disorganized (summative), which is a mere accumulation of random items, 2) organized, i.e. belonging to one or another level of order, characterized by irreducibility of the properties of the whole to the sum of the properties of its parts, and 3) organic as the highest type of the organized one, which is characterized by self-development and self-reproduction of its parts. The specifics of the organic entirety is that it occurs together with its parts (or rather, units)⁴². The state is referred, of course, to the third of these types.

There is another approach of distinguishing the three types of links (construction, functioning and development). It allows to identify the structural, the functional and the genetic types of entirety. The first is defined by an integrated structure of relations between the elements or parts of the whole, the second is defined by the correlation of various functions performed by different elements of the system, and the third – by the existence of the generating element or structure⁴³. Conservation and progressive development of the state require maintenance and strengthening of each of these types of integrity at the level of the challenges of our time.

Besides entirety there is a different word with a similar meaning. It is “unity”. V.I. Lenin stated: “Unity (coincidence, identity, equinox) of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, relative. The struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute, as is the development, the movement”⁴⁴.

Soviet thinker K.P. Buslov understood social cohesion as an economic, a political, a moral and a spiritual community of people developing in the process of merging of two forms of ownership, overcoming class differences, convergence of socialist nations, erasing of significant differences between the city and the country, mental and physical labour, the formation of a new spiritual and moral world of the human⁴⁵. He stated: “The whole system of socialism aims at the formation of social solidity as a set of many social phenomena that are alien in their nature to the class and national antagonisms”⁴⁶. In the same text the metaphors “cement”⁴⁷ and “alloy”⁴⁸ were used to describe social cohesion. Such imagery, which emphasizes the melting of social structures and processes into a frozen homogeneous mass, completely corresponded to the author’s position. He thought: “Not antagonisms, but social cohesion is the driving force in the development of society, the common source to overcome contradictions»⁴⁹. Thus, unity being separate (even contrary to the idea of V.I. Lenin) from the struggle of opposites, was declared to be the engine of progress, and contradictions were understood only as embarrassing social atavisms.

The scheme of social cohesion described by K.P. Buslov was not effective. An underlying activity of the “cemented” subjects generated cracks in a rigid, but fragile structure⁵⁰. As the lawyer N.N. Alekseev noted: “in our world only these things can exist, which are harmonious not in their appearance, but which include a dynamic system of the balance of opposing forces”⁵¹.

In our view, the category of entirety, as follows from the above said, best expresses the essential combination of unity and diversity (as the ancients said, “*E pluribus unum*”, one out of the many). Attempts to reach the first characteristics by eliminating the second in the today’s world are not only unpromising in the long-term perspective, but are just impossible to

fulfill. Total “nationalization” is ineffective for the reason that the forces of the civil society in certain cases can be in a more “favourable mood in relation to the state” than the bureaucratic body corroded by corruption, the most fertile ground for the subversive work of external forces⁵².

One of the “eternal” issues related to the topic of the state entirety is the issue of the origin of this social system. Let us confine ourselves to pointing at the fundamental difference between the two approaches. The supporters of the first one believe that the state has been created by a conscious social creativity, the adherents of another one prefer other factors (divine, natural or social factors that have been generated not by the consciousness, but just being).

Despite the fact that in the early stages of development of social knowledge the second of the above mentioned approaches was dominating, the Sophists believed that the state was created artificially⁵³. Later on T. Hobbes considered the state as the work of the human, the most important of all artificial bodies he creates⁵⁴. Without denying some scientific productivity of this approach, it should be noted that, as stressed by N.N. Alekseev, “alive real state is ... a mixture of an organic origin and an artificial, an instrumental origin”⁵⁵.

I.A. Isayev in his study of the political and legal status of solidarity says that the latter is always “to a certain extent an imaginary category”, not perfect and incomplete. At the same time “solidarity is inextricably linked with the authorities: the authorities form the unity and are themselves” generated by it. According to the scientist “the essence of solidarity, when the whole naturally prevails over its parts and cannot be described only as the sum”, is the social order (and the legal order as a derivative of the latter). This order is formed at the level of both national states and the “great spaces”, and the global world⁵⁶. Speaking of the “imaginary character”

of political and legal realities, we must remember that we speak not about groundless fantasies. In our view, social creativity achieves its goals only when it is based on, firstly, the objective political, social and economic realities, and secondly, on the beliefs and traditions rooted in the public consciousness, and, thirdly, on the archetypes hiding in the collective unconscious.

The problem of the state entirety is closely connected with the common interests of its citizens. Existence of the state puts a barrier to “the war of all against all”. In the words of J.W. Goethe: “the ruler is the one who gives us peace”⁵⁷. The point of view according to which the civil peace can only be set by “the great Leviathan called the state”⁵⁸, was thoroughly justified by the English philosopher T. Hobbes. Herewith, the philosopher made a number of controversial statements. In particular, it is difficult to agree with his view that maintaining the integrity of the state is incompatible with the right of individuals to distinguish good from evil⁵⁹. However, revolts and conflicts, which are usually accompanied by the collapse of the state, force us to accept the fact that public organization is really the main guarantor of maintaining the pacification space. The implementation of this function by the state is, of course, contributed by the concentration in its hands of the monopoly on the physical coercion, which was named by M. Weber the main feature of the social system⁶⁰.

According to S.A. Drobyshevsky, “the state acts as the organization of division and cooperation of labour and other human activities at a specific territory. And the quality of life of any participant of the considered social system is defined by the degree of perfection used by the specific person to implement his own needs by the efforts of other members of the federally organized society. Finally, the best situation for each individual in the state is the consumption of the products of labour and other results of

human behaviour, which are excellent in terms of consumer demands. Nevertheless, this position is not achieved even if one person in a politically organized society demonstrates imperfect forms of his own activity. After all, its negative effects are directly or indirectly experienced by his fellow citizens without exceptions”⁶¹. Unity of interests of the citizens is fulfilled in mutual services and obligations hidden behind a variety of forms of public activity.

J. Huizinga considers this issue from the other side. In his view, “the state is never just an institution for the benefit and interests ... In fact, in the pile-up of the power called the state, embodies a cultural impulse excited by the most diverse and mutually unrelated forces. The state then seeks justification in itself, for example, in the majesty of the clan or the superiority of the people. Trying to express its principle the state issues in various ways its fantastic nature up to the point of absurdity and self-destructing actions”⁶². It is no accident that “the court culture ... is especially susceptible to a playful form”⁶³. The playful origin can contribute to both strengthening and weakening of the state integrity.

It would be appropriate to mention Hegel’s point of view. He wrote: “The state is a spirit, which stands in the world and is consciously fulfilled in it ... Only being in the mind, knowing itself as an existing object the spirit is the state”⁶⁴. History shows that the state can not exist simply as a legal regulatory form, which has no cultural, symbolic and even spiritual content.

Understanding of the unity of original long-term interests of all the citizens of the state⁶⁵ can prevent physical degeneration of the people in those states where causing harm to one another among the people leads to such a result. The excess of deaths over births can be explained by misunderstanding of the state’s entirety by its citizens, lack of desire to survive by the entire political body. Here the

nature of corruption is rooted as well. In its turn, understanding of common interests can maintain a high moral and mental attitude in the society, which makes impossible frequent manifestations of the explicit corruption encouraging the care of the human descendents and older generation.

Both the states themselves and the knowledge of their entirety are continually changing under the influence of objective factors and purposeful activity of the ruling class and its opponents. Moreover, the integrity of the state can only exist at the expense of the dynamic balance of traditions and innovations, adaptation of fundamental constants to current challenges of the modern world⁶⁶.

An essential element of the study of the state integrity is investigation of the activities aimed at strengthening or destruction of this characteristic. It should be noted that both activities are carried out in the same socio-cultural fields: cultural, symbolic, informational and psychological. The study of the state entirety reveals both the key points that will be stricken by its opponents, and the resources that can be used to counteract the latter. On the contrary, the study of the technologies used by both internal and external opponents of the existing government, gives, however, the guidelines for a more intelligent and balanced public policy providing both self-preservation and sustainable development of the state.

“The complexity of today’s reality provides the creation of truly integrated concepts due to a complex synthesis of different views, ideas, theories and paradigms. A. Toffler characterized the activity of modern thinkers in such a way: “We are creating a new network of knowledge ... we connect one concept with another in their initial moments of development ... we build a hierarchy of reasoning ... we create new theories, hypotheses and descriptions basing on new

assumptions, new languages, new codes and new logical constructions”⁶⁷.

Contemporary socio-cultural reality has called for the investigation mechanisms of self-organization of complex, nonlinear processes. New research methods have appeared, among which the synergetic approach takes an important place. As noted by E.N. Knyazeva, the specificity of the latter “is the transition from the study of simple systems to complex ones, from closed to open, from linear to nonlinear, from consideration of equilibrium and processes near equilibrium to ... instability, to the study of what happens far from equilibrium”⁶⁸. Synergetics considers socio-cultural development as a non-linear process, where the periods of stable development are replaced by zones of bifurcation, where there is a number of alternatives. According to N.N. Moiseev, in times of crises the system “loses its memory”, and its subsequent evolution is determined only by the random factors acting at the moment of bifurcation⁶⁹. We can say that crises generate reconfiguration of the wholes.

As pointed out by I.A. Vasilenko, modern social science more actively applies not classical rigid, but other “soft” methods⁷⁰. The hermeneutic approach occupies a dignified place among them. It is understood both in the narrow sense of the interpretation techniques of written texts and in a wider context as the art of understanding the “other”. Understanding of integrity does not exist in the minds of citizens in isolation, but due to “non-thematic horizon” that offers some “prior knowledge”, and thus, the unity of meanings and interpretations. An important part of the state integrity belongs to the key texts, representations and images created by the culture and the educational system. At the same time, both the activities aimed at weakening and destruction of the state integrity, and the texts in which this activity is objectified, cannot be properly

interpreted without understanding the specific “life world”, which generates them⁷¹.

Based on the above it can be concluded that the full development of the problem of the state integrity and diversity of its constituent elements and interrelations between them requires a philosophical-anthropological and socio-

philosophical synthesis of the interdisciplinary knowledge on the basis of the category of “entirety”, which has got deep development in the works of a number of thinkers (especially Russian). The state entirety is dependent on rational, as well as cultural, symbolic and even a playful factors.

¹ S.S. Khoruzhy. *Sinergiinaya antropologiya* [Synergic Anthropology]. *Tomskie lektzii // Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. – Filosofiya. Sotsiologiya. Politologiya*. [Tomsk lectures // The bulletin of Tomsk State University. – Philosophy. Sociology. Political Science] 2009. – No. 2 (6). – P. 124.

² See: N.V. Abaev. *Ukazannye sochineniya* [Indicated materials]. P. 7.

³ See: *Ibid.*, P. 15.

⁴ See: *Ibid.*, pp. 21-23 and further.

⁵ E.M. Spirova. *Simvol kak ponyatie filosofskoi antropologii* [Symbol as a Notion of Philosophical Anthropology]. *Avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskanie uchyonoi stepeni doktora filosofskikh nauk* [Abstract of the Doctoral Thesis]. – Moscow, 2011. – P. 11.

⁶ See for more details: P.V. Klachkov. *Ponyatie gumanitarnykh tekhnologii v sisteme sotsialno-filosofskikh kategorii* [Technologies of the Humanities in the System of Social and Philosophical Categories] // *Sovremennye problemy nauki i obrazovaniya* [Modern Problems of Science and Education]. – 2012. – No. 3; available at: www.science-education.ru/103-6452

⁷ The concept of “state” has two basic meanings. The tradition dating back to Aristotle, Cicero and F. Aquinas understands political and territorial entity under this term. Second of the above named thinkers defined the state as “a union of many people connected with each other by an agreement in the terms of the law and a unity of interests”. A narrower interpretation identifies the state as the mechanism (unit) of the government, i.e. the controlling subsystem of an independent political society. Each of these approaches has strengths and weaknesses. The narrow approach focuses on the fact that the interests of the government and the civil society do not always coincide. The broad approach focuses on the role of the state as an organization of division and cooperation of labour and other human activities in the territory. In this article, the word “state” is used in its broad sense.

⁸ See: N.N. Alekseev. *Ideya gosudarstva* [The Idea of the State] – 2nd edition. – Saint Petersburg: Publishing house “Lan”, 2001. – P. 156.

⁹ See: Harris M., Johnson O. *Cultural Anthropology*. – Sixth Edition. – Allyn and Bacon, 2003. – P. 2.

¹⁰ See: *Ibid.* P. 5.

¹¹ For example, E.M. Spirova understands integrity as “a horizon associated with the analysis of human physicality, soul and spirit” (Spirova E.M. Indicated materials. P. 38). The problem of integrity in her work is treated “not as a simple collection of all the features that reflect “the specifically human” that is typical for many Russian investigations. Integrity is understood not in the form of a comprehensive approach, but as successive opening of the depths of the human existence”. (*Ibid.*, P. 10).

¹² See: *Filosofskii entsiklopedicheski slovar* [Philosophic Encyclopedic Dictionary] / Edited by L.F. Ilychev, P.N. Fedoseev, S.M. Kovalev, V.G. Panov. – Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1983. – P. 763.

¹³ Cited from: B.S. Ebzeev. *Gosudarstvennoe edinstvo i tselostnost Rossiiskoi federatsii (konstitutsionno-pravovye problemy)* [State Unity and Integrity of the Russian Federation (constitutional and legal problems)] / B.S. Ebzeev, S.L. Krasnoyarsky, I.V. Levakin, V.I. Radchenko; editor-in-chief B.S. Ebzeev – Moscow: CJSC “Publishing house ‘Ekonomika’”, 2005. P. 26.

¹⁴ A.F. Losev. *Filosofiya imeni* [Philosophy of the Name] – Moscow: Publishing house of the Moscow State University, 1990. – P. 22.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* C. 23.

¹⁶ Plato. *Philebus*. // Plato. *Essays*. V. 3. Part 1. – Moscow, 1971. – P. 19.

¹⁷ V.G. Nemirovsky. *Posneklassicheskie podkhody k analizu sotsialnykh izmenenii* [Postnonclassical Approaches to the Analysis of Social Changes] // V.G. Nemirovsky. *Tainue obshchestva i zagovorshchiki* [Secret Societies and Conspirators]. – Saint Petersburg, 2007. – P. 217.

¹⁸ Cited from: *Istoriya russkoi filosofii* [History of Russian Philosophy]: text book / edited by M.A. Maslin. – 2nd edition – Moscow: KDU, 2008, – P. 9. In Russian philosophical studies there was another approach. In particular, Avvakum in the 17th century said: “Do not look for the rhetoric and philosophy and eloquence, but live the subsequent with the true common verb. Thus, a rhetorician and a philosopher are not Christians!” (Cited from: *ibid.* P. 11). However, as emphasized by historians, this antiphilosophic tradition was neither the only one nor the dominant. (See: *ibid.*, P. 12).

¹⁹ *Filosofiya* [Philosophy]: Text book / edited by O.A. Mitroshenkov. – P. 148.

²⁰ See: *Ibid.* P. 149.

²¹ See: *Ibid.* P. 163-170.

²² See: *Istoriya russkoi filosofii* [History of Russian Philosophy]: text book / edited by M.A. Maslin. – pp. 339-343.

²³ See: *Ibid.* P. 510-512.

²⁴ See: *Ibid.* – P. 528.

- ²⁵ Cited from: N.P. Koptseva. *Vvedenie v aletologiyu* [Introduction into Aletology]: Monograph / Krasnoyarsk State University – Krasnoyarsk, 2002 – P. 143.
- ²⁶ Cited from: Ibid. P. 149.
- ²⁷ See: *Istoriya russkoi filosofii* [History of Russian Philosophy]. P. 499.
- ²⁸ See: K. Kh. Momdzhyan. *Vvedenie v sotsialnuyu filosofiyu* [Introduction into Social Philosophy]. Text book. – Moscow: Higher School, KD “Universitet”, 1997. – pp. 281-296.
- ²⁹ Cited from: R. Redlich. *Solidarnost i svoboda* [Solidarity and Freedom] – Frankfurt on the Main: Posev, 1984. – P. 88.
- ³⁰ Cited from: Ibid. pp. 102-103.
- ³¹ N.P. Koptseva. *Problema istiny v filosofskom poznanii* [The Problem of the Truth in the Philosophical Cognition] Abstract from the doctoral thesis. – Irkutsk, 2000 // available at: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/problema-istiny-v-filosofskom-poznanii>
- ³² See: Ibid.
- ³³ See: Ibid.
- ³⁴ A.A. Bogdanov. *Tektologiya (Vseobshchaya organizatsionnaya nauka)* [Tectology (General Organizational Science)]: In 2 books: Book 2/ Editor-in-chief L.I. Abalkin / Economic Division of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Institute of Economics of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. – Moscow: Ekonomika, 1989. – P. 13.
- ³⁵ See: Ibid.
- ³⁶ See: Ibid. P. 14.
- ³⁷ See: Ibid. P. 22.
- ³⁸ See: Ibid. P. 28.
- ³⁹ See: *Kontseptual'no-teoreticheskie osnovy pravovogo regulirovaniya i primeneniya mer bezopasnosti* [Conceptual and theoretical basis of the legal regulation and implementation of safety measures]: Monograph / under scientific edition of N.V. Shchedrin; Siberian Federal University – Krasnoyarsk: SibFU, 2010 – P. 13.
- ⁴⁰ See: Ibid. P. 31.
- ⁴¹ M. Heidegger. Being and Time. P. 77.
- ⁴² See: A.G. Spirkin. Indicated materials. pp. 273-275.
- ⁴³ See: B.S. Ebzeev. Indicated materials. pp. 35-36. According to Goethe, the truly united can be only something that comes from a common generating principle and can be thought about as born from it. See: I.A. Vasilenko. *Politicheskaya filosofiya* [Political Philosophy]: Text book – 2nd edition, with additions. – Moscow: INFRA_M, 2009. – P. 281.
- ⁴⁴ Cited from: M.M. Rozental'. *Vazhneishii zakon revolyutsionnoi dialektiki* [The Most Important Law of the Revolutionary Dialectics] // available at: <http://nounivers.narod.ru/bibl/conf8.htm#endnote11> Criticizing this approach B.P. Vysheslavtsev argued: “dialectics has two principles: war and peace, antagonism and harmony, inter-eating and inter-feeding of the opposites. Herewith, the second principle of peace and harmony outweighs, it gives meaning, value and existence to everything: war exists for the sake of peace, and not peace for the sake of war; peace can be without war, but war cannot be without peace”. (B.P. Vysheslavtsev. *Filosofskaya nishcheta marksizma* [Philosophical Poverty of Marxism] // available at: <http://philosophy.ru/library/vushes/mark.html>).
- ⁴⁵ See: K.P. Buslov. *Sotsial'noe edinstvo, protivorechiya, otvetstvennost* [Social Unity, Contradictions, Responsibility] – Minsk: Nauka i tekhnika, 1972. – P. 5.
- ⁴⁶ See: Ibid.
- ⁴⁷ “Social ownership for tools and means of production, absence of class antagonism, social, political and ideological unity, peoples’ friendship and socialist public spirit cement the society into one whole”. Ibid. pp. 7-8.
- ⁴⁸ See: Ibid. P. 27.
- ⁴⁹ See: Ibid. P. 103.
- ⁵⁰ According to A.A. Menshchikov, the traditional disadvantage of Russian government machinery is its rigidity, i.e. combination of supertension and fragility. According to the expert’s point of view the state should learn more flexible, but at the same time effective management techniques. See: *Sotsial'naya politika dlya Rossii: obsuzhdenie stat'i V.V. Putina* [Social Policy for Russia: Discussion of V.V. Putin’s Article] available at // <http://expertclub.info/content/zasedanie-no322-15022012-socialnaya-politika-dlya-rossii-obsuzhdenie-stati-vv-putina>
- ⁵¹ N.N. Alekseev. *Ideya gosudarstva* [Idea of the State] – 2nd edition – Saint Petersburg, Publishing house “Lan’ ”, 2001. – P. 29.
- ⁵² As A.E. Gapich and D.A. Lushnikov mention, “typical intergrowth of the business society and the bureaucratic apparatus, own business structures and assets owned by the government officers make them defenseless for external blackmail in case of business located outside the state or dependence on external sources”. A.E. Gapich, D.A. Lushnikov. *Tekhnologii tsvetnykh revolyutsii* [Technologies of Colour Revolutions] – Moscow: RIOR, 2010. – P. 24.
- ⁵³ See: B.N. Chicherin. *Politicheskie mysliteli drevnego i novogo mira* [Political Thinkers of the Ancient and the Modern World] – Saint Petersburg: Publishing house “Lan’ ”, Saint Petersburg University of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, 1999. – P. 25.
- ⁵⁴ See: *Kulturologiya* [Culture Studies]. P. 283.
- ⁵⁵ N.N. Alekseev. *Ideya gosudarstva* [Idea of the State] – 2nd edition – Saint Petersburg, Publishing house “Lan’ ”, 2001. – P. 313.
- ⁵⁶ See: I.A. Isaev. *Solidarnost kak voobrazhaemoe politiko-pravovoe sostoyanie* [Solidarity as Imaginary Political and Legal State]: Monograph. – Moscow: Prospekt, 2009. – P. 4.
- ⁵⁷ Cited from: I.A. Isaev. Indicated materials. P. 64.
- ⁵⁸ Cited from: L.S. Mamut. *Etatizm i anarkhizm kak tipy politicheskogo soznaniya (domarksistskii period)* [Etatism and Anarchism as Types of Political Mind (Pre-Marxism Period)] – Moscow: Nauka, 1989. – P. 138.

- ⁵⁹ See: Ibid. P. 145.
- ⁶⁰ According to M. Weber “The state is a human community within a certain territory” which successfully claims for “monopoly ... of assault”. Cited from: S.A. Drobyshevsky. *Istoriya politicheskikh i pravovykh uchenii: osnovnye klassicheskie idei* [History of Political and Legal studies: Main Classical Ideas]: Textbook / S.A. Вкцинырумылно – Moscow: Norma, 2007. – P. 305.
- ⁶¹ S.A. Drobyshevsky. *Istoriya politicheskikh i pravovykh uchenii: osnovnye klassicheskie idei* [History of Political and Legal studies: Main Classical Ideas]. P. 12. K.Kh. Momddzhyan also notes that “the condition for people’s existence, satisfaction of their life-supporting needs is the cooperation and coordination of mutual efforts”. K. Kh. Momoddzhyan. Indicated materials. P. 228.
- ⁶² J. Huizinga. Homo ludens. In the Shadow of Tomorrow: Translation from Dutch / General editing and afterword by G.M. Tavrizyan. – Moscow: Publishing house “Progress”, “Progress-Akademiya”, 1992. – P. 198.
- ⁶³ Ibid. P. 176.
- ⁶⁴ Cited from: P.P. Gaidenko. *Tragediya estetizma. Opyt kharakteristiki mirosozertsaniya Serena Kirkegora* [Tragedy of Estheticism. Experience of Characterizing the World Perception of Søren Kierkegaard]. – Moscow: Publishing house “Iskusstvo”, 1970. – P. 21.
- ⁶⁵ This approach is actively developed by S.A. Drobyshevsky in particular. See: S.A. Drobyshevsky. *Istoriya politicheskikh i pravovykh uchenii: osnovnye klassicheskie idei* [History of Political and Legal studies: Main Classical Ideas]. Pp. 14-19.
- ⁶⁶ According to A. Giddens “The tradition does not oppose to changes, but generates a context of specific time and space features, in relation to which the changes get a significant form”. Cited from: I.A. Vasilenko. *Politicheskaya filosofiya* [Political Philosophy]: Text book – 2nd edition, with additions. – Moscow: INFRA_M, 2009. – P. 215.
- ⁶⁷ A. Toffler. *Metamorfozy vlasti: Znanie, bogatstvo i sila na poroge XXI veka* [Powershift: Knowledge, Wealth and Violence at the Edge of the 21st Century] (translated from English) / Alvin Toffler. – Moscow: AST: AST MOSKVA, 2009. – P. 114.
- ⁶⁸ Cited from: A.P. Khuskivadze. *Slozhnye sistemy, sinergetika i teoriya tselostnosti* [Complex Systems, Synergetics and Theory of Integrity] available at // <http://www.synergetic.ru/science/slozhnye-sistemy-sinergetika-i-teoria-celostnosti.html>
- ⁶⁹ See: I.A. Vasilenko. *Politicheskaya filosofiya* [Political Philosophy]: Text book – 2nd edition, with additions. – Moscow: INFRA_M, 2009. – pp. 245-246.
- ⁷⁰ See: I.A. Vasilenko. Indicated materials. P. 243.
- ⁷¹ See: *Filosofskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar* [Philosophic Encyclopedic Dictionary]. pp. 111-112.

Философская антропология и проблема целостности государства

П.В. Клачков

*Экспертно-аналитическое управление
Губернатора Красноярского края
Россия 660009, Красноярск, пр. Мира, 110*

Полноценная разработка проблемы единства государства и многообразия его частей требует синтеза знаний, полученных философией, философской антропологией, культурологией, политологией, теорией государства и права, социологией, психологией и иными науками. Такое комплексное исследование возможно лишь в рамках философской антропологии. Категория «целостность», получившая глубокую разработку в трудах ряда мыслителей (в особенности отечественных), отражает сочетание, степень согласованности единства и многообразия, интеграции и автономии составных частей, обуславливающее самосохранение и прогрессивное развитие социокультурных систем (в том числе и государств). Целостность государства обусловлена как рациональными (разделение и кооперации труда граждан, необходимость обеспечения безопасности жизни и деятельности), так и культурными, символическими и даже игровыми факторами.

Ключевые слова: коллективное поведение, «мягкая сила», синергетика, философская антропология, целостность государства.
