

Political Institute of the State in the context of the historical and typological analysis

Instituto político del Estado en el contexto del análisis histórico y tipológico

Valentin Ya. Lyubashits¹

Southern Federal University - Russia

kafedra_tgp@mail.ru

Nikolay V. Razuvaev²

Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Service - Russia

niko.m_2002@mail.ru

Irina E. Abramova³

Rostov State Medical University - Russia

abramova-achii@mail.ru

Natalya V. Fedorova⁴

Don State Technical University - Russia

fnavl@mail.ru

Benedyk Y. S.⁵

Yaroslav Mudry National Law University - Ukraine

ss.shestopal@yandex.ru

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to problems of structuring state created history taking into account a variety of social, political, forms, various speeds of political genesis. Problems of allocation of development stages of the political organizations (statehood) taking into account uncertainty of the general units of the analysis, terms, and concepts of rather various paradigms of structuring and periodization of history are considered. It is shown that the decisive force causing the transformation of all other public sectors is growth, distribution, and deduction of a dominant position of the most effective in the conditions of this period of a political regime.

Keywords: historical, typological analysis, potestarny structures, historicism, Kondratyev's paradigm.

RESUMEN

El artículo está dedicado a los problemas de estructuración de la historia creada por el estado teniendo en cuenta una variedad de formas sociales, políticas, diversas velocidades de génesis política. Se consideran los problemas de asignación de etapas de desarrollo de las organizaciones políticas (estadidad) teniendo en cuenta la incertidumbre de las unidades generales del análisis, los términos y los conceptos de varios paradigmas de estructuración y periodización de la historia. Se muestra que la fuerza decisiva que causa la transformación de todos los demás sectores públicos es el crecimiento, la distribución y la deducción de una posición dominante de los más efectivos en las condiciones de este período de un régimen político.

Palabras clave: análisis histórico, tipológico, estructuras de potestarny, historicismo, paradigma de Kondratyev.

1Corresponding author. Doctor of jurisprudence, professor, Head of the department of the theory and history of state and law, Southern Federal University

2 Doctor of jurisprudence, associate professor, head of the department of the civil and labor law, Northwest institute of management of the Russian academy of national economy and public service

3 Doctor of political sciences, professor, Manager of department of History Rostov state medical university

4 Candidate of historical sciences, associate professor, Don State Technical University

5 PhD, Assistant of the Department of International Law, Yaroslav Mudry National Law University, Kharkiv, Ukraine

Recibido: 04/07/2019 Aceptado: 17/09/2019

1. INTRODUCTION

Today many ways of the description of evolutionary typology of the state organization are offered, there are alternative versions. And business even not in forming of the tough evolutionary scheme and in the admission of some variability which after all is set by certain logic of education and development of political institutes.

The problem of historical typology of the state certainly deserves the detailed analysis and our further researches will be devoted to it. Let's consider some ideas and the approaches which are put forward by modern scientists here, having concentrated on the main eras and stages of historical process, in relation to its so important aspect as history of the state and other potestary structures.

2. HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF TECHNIQUES AND MODELS

Consideration of the historical past in terms of chronology and stadial development has more than centuries-old tradition. Still Plato in "Laws" began discussion of a variety of political institutes with the lowest steps of the social organization.

2.1 "Process", "phases" or "stages".

The theory of stages or phases does not remain unnoticed by critics, the brightest of whom are K. Popper and R. Nisbet (Popper, 1993).

Johan Gudsblom in work about which the speech will go below, noted that the tradition of creation of phase models (from Plato and Aristotle to Marx and Spencer) sparks criticism for the following reasons: first, they lack historical concreteness, so, and checkability; secondly, they mix fact and standard statements; thirdly, they proceed from a concept of inevitability and teleology. The last decades were added to them two more points: fourthly, they are not able to explain transition from one stage to another and, fifthly, they actively open experience of Western Europe and North America, i.e. are "Europe-centered" (Goudsblom, 1996).

It is possible to agree with Y.Gudsblom's opinion on what stadial models have along with advantages and certain shortcomings. At the exit, owing to small empirical representation, they can be not verified. Creation of the general schemes of social evolution was carried out quite often at the expense of chronological accuracy.

Lack of initial spatial limitation is among advantages. One of the essential metamorphoses which happened in recent years to stadial models is a pre-stress from "phases" and "stages" on "processes". It allowed removing claims of critics of the theory of stages in points of insolvency in an explanation of transitional states between stages and "Eurocentrism".

The concept "process" began to form a basis for development of a concept of "phases" or "stages". "Process" is considered as the sequence of changes which assume transformation something from one phase in another. That is each "stage" or "phase" is transition in progress. It consists of small processes and is, eventually, a part of big processes. At the same time process does not exclude distinction of stages in social development.

2.2 Formational and stadial approach

One of theoretical predecessors of modern tipology of structuring history is formational and stadial approach. This approach - one of serious attempts to create the comprehensive natural-historical theory. Her authors were K. Marx and F. Engels.

Direct material vital circumstances were recognized as the only and unconditional reality. The main postulate is expressed in a formula: "the way of production of material life causes social, political and spiritual processes of life in general" (Marx & Engels, 1981).

Primacy and certainty of production of goods of life leads to creation of a certain dependence of a political superstructure on economic basis: "In social production of the life people enter in certain, necessary, from their will not the dependent relations - relations of production which correspond to a certain step of development of their material productive forces. Set of these relations of production makes economic structure of society, real basis on which the legal and political superstructure towers and to which there correspond certain forms of public consciousness" (Marx & Engels, 1981). Thereby it is emphasized that the state, policy, political institutes are caused by economy. Despite separate signs that it is capable to make the return impact on economy the Marxism isolates the main thing: intrinsic dependence of political institutes on economy is observed, the logic of development of the state forms is defined by dynamics of productive forces, way of production and relations of production.

"Productive forces ... form fundamentals of all history" (Marx & Engels, 1981). This history includes three consecutive steps of world development: primary, or archaic; secondary, or economic, and tertiary, or communistic (Marx & Engels, 1981). The Marxist idea about steps of development of productive forces became key in conceptualization of a concept of a public formation which was expressed in typological fixing and registration as stages of world development. The Marxism assumes accurate distinction of the formations connected with type of productive forces, the interformational and intraformational stages connected with ways of production, and also smaller stages not only connected with types of relations of production, but also including also aspects of the organization of work, the production technology, distribution, etc. (Lyubashits, 1993; Lyubashits, 2016; Lyubashits, 2017; Adriana & Holanda, 2016; Ali et al, 2017).

2.3 Theory of cycles

Marx and Engels's numerous followers, owing to any circumstances, including the wrong translation of Marx in Lenin work "That it "friends of the people" and how they are at war against social democrats", the expression "an era of an economic public formation" which turned into "eras in the history of economic formations of society" promoted emergence of a so-called five-stage. The Marxist interpretation of a political genesis was extremely hardy and found reflection in numerous neo- and post-Marxist researches. Formational stadial the concept of cycles of N. D. Kondratyev is genetically close to approach of Marxism. Socioeconomic structures, stages and development stages of human society are easily implanted into cyclic fundamentals of history.

The structure of kondratyevsky cycles (duration of a cycle makes 40-60 years) consists of two parts or waves: upward wave and wave bearish. The upward wave is the period of long prevalence of a high economic environment in world economy. The bearish wave is the period of long prevalence of a low economic environment.

Long waves of Kondratyev allow considering not only cycles of a world environment, but also manifestation of the technological, economic, political, social shifts happening within such wave or a cycle.

One of experts in the field of kondratyevsky waves G. van Rhum designated a thematic row from social life which can be investigated in this paradigm: social stratification, social mobility, revolutions and reformism, development and distribution of various ideologies - from liberalism to fascism, changes in religious views, democratic changes, etc. (Room van C., 1984).

Within a kondratyevsky paradigm waves of the most various frequency - are considered from 3-5 to 1000 years; (Pashinsky, 1994; Bytyak, et al, 2017; Mamychev et al, 2016), for certain regions temporary distances of their action (André Gounder Franck, Barry Gills, George William Modelski) are allocated; political dynamics is described (Umov & Lapkin, 1992). André Gounder Franck in collaborations with Barry Gills reveal kondratyevsky cycles of rise and recession during era of the Middle Ages and Antiquity that definitely structures world history, establishing the extent of world system in five thousand years against vallerstaynovsky five hundred years of the European system (Mordovtsev et al, 2017; Mordovtsev et al, 2017; Mordovtsev et al, 2017).

Driving force of development of world system is the accumulation of the surplus value or the capital connected with change of hegemony and various combinations of the market and the power.

Frank and Gills besides an economic environment consider rises and expansions of empires, establishment of communications between them, activation of exchange or disintegration of empires and worldsystem communications.

Other expert in the field of social evolution of the analysis of world systems and long geopolitical cycles J. Modelski in own way structures the scheme of world history. Evolution is divided into four main stages: variation, cooperation, selection and reinforcement. Transitions from one stage (era) to another are explained by exhaustion of innovative impulses which dominated during a former era, and preparation of new products of innovations.

So, innovative transition from the first era (for 3200 - 1200 BC) to the second (1200 BC - 1000 AD) was connected with formation of multiple cultures and was characterized by distribution of city-states, small number of large empires, etc.

Rather original approach to a periodization of historical development of society was shown by Johan Gudsblom in the work "History of mankind and long-term social processes: to synthesis of chronology and phazeology" (Goudsblom, 1996; Martyshin, 2003). In its research strategy main "catalysts" are allocated (control over fire; an agrarization and industrialization) as some kind of ecological transformations which become dominating at this or that stage of development. Then four consecutive stages are built:

1. A stage, when there is no society with control over fire, either agriculture, or the machine industry, or X (X are understood as conditional human achievement - statehood, writing, religious institutes, etc.).
2. The stage when some societies exercise control over fire, but any have neither agriculture, nor the machine industry, nor X.
3. The stage when, at least, in some societies there is a control over fire and agriculture, but in one is not present either the machine industry, or X.
4. A stage when, at least, in some societies there is a control over fire, agriculture and the machine industry, but one has X.

If we X fill with such epoch-making innovation as "the state (in the sequence from less developed and simple to more difficult and developed types of the political organization), then we will receive effective tools for comparison and coordinating of the most various periodization.

The simple four-stage criterion is entered. For example, for transition from communal autonomy to the state we will take such innovation, (X): 1) one social community has no this achievement; 2) the chiefdom is available for one social community; 3) the chiefdom is available for some social communities; 4) the chiefdom is available for all social communities.

This life cycle of stages with the advent of the fifth step when some social community is not required such form of public organization as a chiefdom any more comes to the end. It is replaced with other innovation: a specific form of the political organization - the traditional state. The traditional state enters own life cycle. Other types of the state forms can undergo such expansion.

3. MAIN PART. TYPOLOGY AS METHOD

At the review of various stadial attempts of structuring models it is impossible to ignore the large phenomenon of domestic science - the book of the orientalist I. M. Dyakonov of "A way of history" (1994). The author offered the stadial model of history including eight phases: primitive, primitive-communal, early antiquity, imperial antiquity, Middle Ages, stable and absolutist post-Middle Ages, capitalist and post-capitalist.

The scientist in the periodization makes a start from basic Marxist positions and it notes: "From the point of view of causativity the theory of social and economic formations planned by Marx more than hundred years ago (in 1859) and in the deformed look formulated by Stalin in 1938 has advantage. According to this theory, productive forces, i.e. technology in combination with her producers as public category, develop until the relations of production existing in society match the need of their development" (Dyakonov, 1994). Considers deacons that at the end of the XX century the Marxist theory of historical process reflecting realities of the 19th century "became hopelessly outdated". He tries to consider new factors, namely: technological level and condition of social and psychological processes. That new relations of production were established, it is necessary, in his opinion, "introduction of essentially new technologies, in particular production technologies of weapon" (Dyakonov, 1994).

Transition from one type of managing to another and - from one system of the social attitudes towards another has to be followed further by change of social values. Independent significance is attached to a role of military equipment and military science in general. It is important from the point of view of belonging of the military organization to political structure in general.

Thus, technological level and a condition of social and psychological processes is criterion of "change of the principle of the social relations" or character of a state system. These factors cause change of rises and declines both within this or that phase, and between them.

Only in the third dyakonovsky phase (early antiquity) the control system of society is institutionalized, receives the constant conventional structure, enforcement machinery, and turns into the state.

Phase transition to communal antiquity crowned a chiefdom (the second phase of communal primitiveness). The state educations typologically belong to communal antiquity (the third phase).

During each separate period of history societies of different phases of development, and within one phase - different societies coexist. It demonstrates that during each separate period of history societies of different phases of development coexist, but within a uniform phase different societies have approximately equal opportunities (equal share) and efficiency of the political legal regimes. M. V. Ilyin wrote about similar gaps and disagreements between generations of the political systems creating difficulties in interaction of chronopolitical occurring at different times, but calendar modern political systems (Ilyin, 1999).

It is interesting that the worldsystem typology, offered by Hristofer Chase-Dunn and Thomas Hall (Chase-Dunn & Hall 2001) in the aspect interesting us in many respects is conformable Dyakonov's periodization. By comparison of two approaches it is detectable that the third dyakonovsky phase (early antiquity) corresponds to primary state worldsystem where Mesopotamia, Egypt, the valley of Indus, the valley of Ganges, China, pre-Columbus Mexico and Peru enter. The fourth phase - a phase of imperial antiquity - to primary empires to which the autonomous states united as a result of a gain (Akkad, Egypt of an ancient kingdom, Magadkh, Zhou, Teotihuacan, Uari), and partly multicenter, consisting of empires, to the states and peripheral regions (The Middle East, India, China, a mezoempire of Peru).

The fifth phase, medieval, partially covers multicenter imperial worldsystem and commercialized, founded on the state in which important aspects of marketability are developed. Let's note that as criterion of worldsystem distinction "the way of accumulation" is taken. Also the 6, 7 and 8 phases are corresponded.

For Chase-Dunn and Hall in the analysis of historical development the problem of emergence and development of a chiefdom (chiefdom) and the state from less hierarchical structures founded on relationship of societies was extremely important. They made an attempt to designate in a periodization importance of intersocietal processes and structures (worldsystem) in a grid of coordinates "a kernel - a periodization".

Essential aspect of conceptualization worldsystem - identification of consequences of various types of interactions on a long distance, for local societal structures. It is interesting what the key indicator allowing to carry out domination of a kernel where the equipment of the power is most developed is, as well as for Dyakonov, the specialized military organization, the back and supply, strategy and arms, and also the organizational equipment for management of the remote provinces and withdrawal of a tribute and taxes (Chase-Dunn & Hall, 2001; Ali et al., 2017).

On an own question: "what similarity and distinction between the sequence of processes of political centralization and decentralization in different worldsystem types?" authors answer with the formulation of a hypothesis. It consists that, first, when in the centralized empires the equipment of the power was improved, peripheral regions lagged behind in

the development, and, secondly, peripheral regions acquire much quicker social and technological features of regions of a kernel as soon as trade on a long distance becomes more intensive and based on the commodity relation (Chase-Dunn & Hall, 2001).

Thus, Chase-Dunn and Hall specify conditions and the nature of influence of societies, leaders (kernel) on other societies (peripheries) within a worldsystem.

The uniting moment of the considered typology is consent concerning coexistence of the state educations and development stages during the same historical period of time. At the same time formation of the states represents an accurate watershed in development of society. The state is the politically structured society with specialized institutes, including military and bureaucratic, performing functions of management and control.

State registered society differs from society of the previous stage - a difficult chiefdom (chiefdom) - degree of development of the specialized control functions which are not based on relationship.

The concept of "political evolution" is taken from works of the Dutch researcher, famous specialist in problems of an evolutionism H.J. M. Klassen. Klassen on the basis of a multiple line evolutionism tried to explain cyclic development and those cases when at different stages of evolution similar political structures appear again. Evolution is carried out as process of structural reorganization in time. Emergence of this or that form, structure which qualitatively differ from the previous form (Claessen et al, 1985; Claessen & Oosten, 1996). He noted that the similar political organizations (the state or chiefdom) unexpectedly appear in the most different regions of the world and in various evolutionary streams.

In search of the solution of this paradox Klassen addresses Julian X's idea. The steward who long before him tried to explain appearance of patrilocal group in a number of the societies which are not connected among themselves. The Steward explained emergence of not similar socio-political structures with presence of similar cultural forms at these groups. The thought of Klassen and his coauthor Osten that for maintenance of the law and an order, preservations of territorial integrity of the country, etc. are required such organizational structures which are quickly enough forced to find effective and functionally successful solutions attracts attention. Here the reasonable functional argument moves forward (Claessen et al, 1985; Claessen & Oosten, 1996). Each political organization passes severe tests for efficiency and owing to this circumstance there are few functionally suitable institutes. Klassen considers that evolutionary changes are result of complex interaction of a number of factors, namely: economic, ideological, demographic and sociopolitical.

The structure, the periodization offered by the Novosibirsk researcher N. S. Rozov considerably does not differ from the academic tradition of studying of a political genesis, but is rather innovative and requires to itself due consideration. Rozov sets a task of improvement and restructuring a conceptual framework in an explanation and understanding of history. On the basis of the enough extensive philosophical and methodological researches (Rozov, 1992; Rozov, 1995; Rozov, 1999), (Development and approbation of a method of theoretical history, 2001) it formulates set of requirements to a periodization of history and according to a political genesis: the principle of a substantiality (the periodization has to correspond to the main characteristics determining by the qualities setting specifics and stability of various parts of historical and political reality and also with the strongest factors (the reasons, driving forces, patterns) of historical change in these parts directly; the principle of temporary comparability (division of the periods of history on the basis of conceptually homogeneous and comparable criteria); the principle of spatial comparability (the accounting of a real-life variety of historical forms, obvious distinction in the speed of historical changes); the principle of comparability of paradigms (the conceptual structure of a periodization has to be comparable to key categories of the most developed and productive macro historical paradigms); principle of flexible traditionalism.

Across Rozov, the substantial criterion of a periodization consists in change of the main types of variety of the modes. The social mode, for example, includes regular military, political, economic, moral and legal and other interactions. Character of an era is set by the strongest dominating modes, and it in an obvious or implicit look is present at many attempts of structuring history of mankind, starting with Hegel and Marx. The author understands as the dominating modes "their higher efficiency in the wide limits which developed at present conditions, and this efficiency is shown in steady distribution through replacement and assimilation of the competing modes" (Rozov, 2001). Rozov enters the concept "type attractor" which is defined in structural terms as the regime complex steady within a certain variety of conditions.

In the conceptual design offered by the Pink major link the scheme of change of domination of the new modes and regime complexes is (types - attractors). Criteria of allocation of factors of domination are set by communication of growth of value of a political regime upon transition of society and state from one phase in another.

Let's note that noticeable impact on allocation of factors of domination was exerted by works of the American political anthropologist R. Karneyro who for identification of the political leader marked out 14 categories. From them the category "political organization" serves as the defining criterion of efficiency of the modes.

So, relying on the ideas of stages of political evolution of the Steward, Klassen, Karneyro's development, the general structure of history of Gellner, I. M. Dyakonov and others, Rozov offers the ideally typical scheme including six phases of development of society from which four are state issued. The third phase - "society of early statehood"; the 4th - "society of mature statehood"; the 5th - "society of through statehood" and the 6th - "sensitive society" (the developed capitalism with liberal and corporate and state versions). Here the main state educations on this or that phase of development of society are fixed. The level of political evolution (a factor of universal value) is inherent in each type attractor or a regime

complex. Development of political structures and institutes defines other factors of domination which are grouped in factors of geopolitical, geocultural and geoeconomic domination.

For this research allocation of factors of domination, or indicative criteria which are correlated with the ideas of a number of scientists of phases and development of societies, of essence of transitions considered above from one phases to others, and also about the domination reasons is represented to the most urgent.

In the ideal and typical construction society, across Rozov, represents set of human groups with unity of structures of the power, moral and/or legal rules, and unity of an order of exchange and distribution, unity of language or languages of social interaction (Rozov, 2001).

But such criteria answer the developed statehood form, in particular, to the national state. Considering that aspect that the basic modes are political and legal and economic, we can define the state registered society as set of human groups with unity of structures of the power, rules of law and the general unity of an order, exchange and distribution.

Whatever different ways formation of statehood at people of the world went, we will find everywhere the installed system of the power (political regime) which regulates rules of interaction between people (the legal and moral regime), an order of exchange of material benefits and services and their distributions (economic regime). Common language (the cultural mode) is necessary for communication and social interaction.

And the first statehood on the earth which arose in the Ancient East (in Egypt, Babylon), differing in the special regularities caused by specifics Egyptian, Babylon and others modern it civilizations (History of political and legal doctrines. Ancient world., 2001), (History of political and legal doctrines, 2003) and to the Antique states of Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome - an example of the statehood which arose, developed, reached civilization height and reached a deadlock within this culture - Ancient Greek and ancient Roman, and only it inherent lines, and to all other state forms the unity of the basic social and cultural modes is inherent in the feudal states which are characterized by the. If the unity of the basic modes is broken off - it is possible to speak about similar society in terms of "the falling states" or "the failed states" (failing states). Modern experts counted forty one states which can be referred to category of the falling or failed states. The vector of development of all these states shows their swift social, economic, political and intellectual degradation. Quite often the board just leads to extinction of the own people (Rwanda, Somalia other). One of parameters of similar educations - inability of the leaders of these countries to provide elementary human rights in the territories.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Problems of structuring state issued history are exclusively difficult, first of all, because of existence of a huge variety of social, political, state forms, various speed of a political genesis. Allocation of development stages of the political organizations (statehood) is complicated by uncertainty of the general units of the analysis, terms and concepts of rather various paradigms of structuring and a periodization of history.

The analysis of evolution of society through changes of combinations of distinguishable structural signs in which this society differs from previous is carried out in the real work taking into account the separate ideas of concepts of structuring history of the Steward, Klassen, Karneyro's developments, structure of history of Gellner, the general conceptual approach of Rozov. Though conceptual schemes of the called authors do not propose the final decisions of problems of a periodization of the historical and state process, but represent an important step on the way of knowledge of communication of internal structures (social processes and regularities) and external structures (division into time historical spans). It is obvious that consideration and classification of the political organizations (state) in many respects reflect values of qualifiers.

Consideration of various points of view on structuring state issued history showed importance of a question of basic criterion of distinction of the periods. Fixation of transition of society to another demands allocation of the main criterion or a factor from one phase of the state development - the level of political development which, in our opinion, is universal on the value.

The essence of any historical period disclosing a change source, the decisive force causing transformation of all other public sectors is growth, distribution and deduction of a dominant position of the most effective in the conditions of this period of a political regime.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Adriana, J., & Holanda, M. (2016). Brasilia's Database Administrators. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering & Management*, 1(3), 149-157. <https://doi.org/10.20897/lectito.201630>
- Ali, Y., Nusair, M. M., Alani, F., Khan, F. R., & Al Badi, L. (2017). Employment in the Private Sector in Oman: Sector-Based Approach for Localization. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, eISSN, 2395-6518.
- Bytyak, Y. P., Yakovyuk, I. V., Tragniuk, O., Komarova, T. V., & Shestopal, S. S. (2017). The State Sovereignty and Sovereign Rights: Correlation Problem. *Man in India*, 97(23), 577-588.
- Chase-Dunn K., Hall T., (2001). One, two, many world systems. *World Time*. Issue 2. Novosibirsk.
- Claessen, H.J.M., Oosten, J.G. (1996). Ideology and the formation of early states. Leiden.
- Claessen, HJ.M., Velde, P. van de. Smith, M.E. (1985). Development and decline; The evolution of sociopolitical organization. South Hadley (MA).
- Goudsblom, J. (1996). Human History and Long-Term Social Processes: Toward a Synthesis of Chronology and Phaseology. Goudsblom J., Jones E.L, Mennell S. *The Course of Human History. Economic Growth, Social Process and Civilization*. M.E. Sharpe, N.Y.; L., P.20.
- Ilyin, M. V., (1999). Choice of Russia: myth, destiny, culture. *Via Regia*. No. 1-2.
- Lyubashits, V. Y. (1993). General theory of the state. P1. Origin, essence and nature of the state. Rostov-on-Don,
- Lyubashits, V., (2017). Sociocultural measurement of institutional and functional characteristics of public-power interactions// Lyubashits V., Mamychev A., Uvarova G., Artyukhin O. *Man in India*. T. 97. No. 23. Page 461-470.
- Lyubashits, V.Y., Mamychev, A.Y., Shalyapin, S.O., Filippova, M.K. (2016). Prognostic problems of the public and power organization of the Russian society: Archetypes and sociocultural basis of functioning and development. *International Review of Management and Marketing* 6 (6). P.85-89.
- Mamychev, A. Yu., Kachurova, S.V., Shestopal, S.S. (2016). Socio-cultural (archetypal) basis of transformation of public power organizations: forms and directions. *Baltic Humanitarian Journal*, T5, No. 4 (17), 375-380.
- Martyshin, O. V. (2003). History of political and legal doctrines / Under the editorship of O. V. Martyshin. M.
- Marx, K., Engels, F. (1981). *Compositions*. M, 1955-1981. T.13.
- Mordovtsev, A. Yu., Mamychev, A. Yu., Shestopal, S.S. (2017). Russian statehood as a particular civilizational and legal mentality type. *Baltic Humanitarian Journal*. 2017. T. 6. No. 4(21)
- Mordovtsev, A., Zhinkin, S., Mamychev, A., Yakovyuk, I., Shestopal, S. (2017). Legal Mentality in National Cultural Space: Characteristics of the ERA of Change (Church Schism of the 17th Century). *Man in India*, 97(23), 295-309.
- Mordovtsev, A.Y., Mamychev A. Yu., Shestopal S.S., (2017). Essential content of Russian legal mentality. *Azimuth of Scientific Research: Economics and Administration*. 2017. T. 6. No. 4(21)
- Pashinsky, V. M., (1994). Recurrence in the history of Russia (a look from a position of social ecology) *The Policy*. No. 4.
- Popper, K. (1993). Poverty of history science. M.
- Room van, C., (1984). Historians and Long Waves. *Long Waves in the World Economy*. L., R.237-244.
- Rozov, N. S., (1992). Structure of civilizations and tendencies of world development. Novosibirsk.
- Rozov, N. S., (1995). Possibility of theoretical history: answer to Karl Popper's call. *Philosophy Questions*. 1995. No. 12. Page 55-69;
- Rozov, N. S., (1999). Structure of social ontology: on the way to synthesis of macrohistorical paradigms. *Questions of philosophy*. 1999. No. 2. Page 3-22;
- Rozov, N. S., (2001). Development and approbation of a method of theoretical history. Scientific editor N. S. Rozov. Novosibirsk, 2001; etc.
- Rozov, N. S., (2001). On the way to reasonable periodization of world history. *Structures of history//world Time*. Issue 2. Novosibirsk, 2001. Page 247.
- Umov, V. I., Lapkin V. V. (1992). Kondratyevsky cycles and Russia: forecast of reforms. *Policy*. No. 4.