

FROM SOCIAL CONTRADICTION TO SOCIAL COMPETITION AS THE BASIC LEGAL REGIME (MODE) OF STATEHOOD (Part II)

Alexander V. Butakov

Dostoevsky Omsk State University, Omsk, Russia

Article info

Received –

2022 June 21

Accepted –

2023 January 20

Available online –

2023 December 20

Keywords

Contradictory social contradiction, contrarian social contradiction, antagonistic social contradiction, social competition, domination, basic legal regime (mode) of statehood

The subject of the article is social competition as the basic legal regime (mode) of statehood as a systemic channel that determines the functioning of property as a goal and the state as a means.

The aim of the article is to confirm or refute hypothesis that the resolution of social contradictions is a kind of legal regime for the realization of property as the fundamental purpose of the existence of the state.

According to the author's methodology of normative structuralism, the assignment to each mode of property organization of a specific function (social development function, social compromise (convergence) function, social security function) generated the corresponding potential for the emergence and existence of social contradictions, where the state as an artificial (reasonable) sufficiency had to direct the energy of the said contradictions into the normative-legal channel and thus ensure the existence of social competition.

The main results. The restriction and leveling of social competition and the transition to domination as the basic legal regime (mode) of statehood destroys the natural mechanism for resolving social contradictions and transfers this mechanism to the plane of directive political and ideological expediency. As a result, the power of the structural organization of the state is transformed into a goal of its existence, and property only into a means of realizing this goal. There is a disavowal of property as a fundamental goal of the existence of the state; the escalation of its imperialization begins, triggering the destruction of social competition as the basic legal regime (mode) of statehood. There is a danger of an existential rupture between the three most important social institutions of human civilization: property, competition, and the state.

Society, constituting the creation of the state as artificial (reasonable) sufficiency, through the functioning of the structural organization of power has fixed the fundamental purpose of existence - property in the form of an integral structural platform of the main ways of its organization (private (individualized), mixed (corporate), general (collective)), assigning to each of them the execution of the corresponding social function.

Conclusions. Society, realizing the existence of a social contradiction, purposefully forms appropriate ways (rules) to overcome them to ensure its progressive development. The essence of the legal regime as the existence of the resolution of this social contradiction can be defined by the concept of "competition".

3. Competition. General conceptual characteristics

The universal value of the existence of a social contradiction lies in the fact that if it were not for the genetic potential of human development, the life of our civilization would probably be something like a multiplication table. Social competition in these conditions would represent something that was not born, but already dead. This dependence can be formulated more simply: if there is a social contradiction, then there is human development in the form of competition; if there is no social contradiction, then there is no human development, then competition as a form of life activity is unnecessary.

In this situation, a brief historical digression into the study of the social phenomenon characterized as "competition" is simply necessary. It is appropriate to conduct it in three main directions: competition is a global phenomenon; competition is a universal economic category; competition is a legal phenomenon.

To begin with, the founder of the methodology of dialectical contradiction, G.V.F. Hegel, did not use the concept of "competition" in his doctrine, but at the same time he applied the conceptual formula "struggle for recognition" similar in content [1, pp. 241-242].

In the globality of the characteristic of the struggle for recognition of G.V.F. Hegel, which can be considered as a certain identity of the concept of "competition", the main thing is manifested: through this state, there is a transfer from the natural nature of man to the creation of his reasonable (artificial) habitat, covering the entire civilizational parameter from the "life – death" of the individual to the emergence of civil society in various forms of artificial rationing (state, law, law, Constitution, etc.).

Any social norm, any social rule is an artificial product of competition, which at the same time is itself an artificial mode of perception and resolution of social contradiction. Competition is a mode of reasonable (artificial) human activity aimed ultimately at overcoming the state of "war of all against all" by creating appropriate artificial forms of existence of civil society, and above all the state and law, where a reasonable standard of understanding of freedom determines the parameter of socially recognized social justice [2; 3; 4].

The dual nature of social competition consists in the fact that it is the product of reasonable (artificial) activity and at the same time is an artificial mode of creating the same social norm. Such artificiality of the nature of competition began to reproduce it as a universal legal regime for resolving social contradictions. If it is easier to define, then competition is an artificial tool for the formation of the state and law, through which an artificial parameter of the existence of competition is established. Therefore, competition is a universal regime of reasonable (artificial) existence of human civilization based on the reproduction of a reasonable (artificial) rule of law in its various forms of existence. This is where the globality of the conceptual characteristics of social competition is manifested, of which G.V.F. Hegel was a prominent representative. In general, there is competition – there is a human civilization, there is no competition – there is no human civilization.

The second main direction of the conceptual characterization of social competition is its definition as a universal economic category. I will try to demonstrate this position on F. A. Hayek's research on this topic.

F. A. Hayek's position is based on the well-known Sombart-Schumpeter combination of competition as a creative process of destroying the old with the new (see in more detail: [6; 7]), and despite the broad conceptual content, this definition was mainly used in economic theory.

F. A. Hayek in his famous essay "The Meaning of competition" formulated a number of provisions that reveal the essence of the phenomenon under study: competition "creates a process of unity and consistency of the economic system"; competition is a continuous dynamic process; competition is an information process of forming an opinion about the best and cheapest; competition is a process consisting of continuous changes, which, as a rule, put the theory at a dead end, i.e. there is a creative destruction of the old by the new [8, pp. 20-27].

F. A. Hayek, developing the ideas of K. Marx and J. Schumpeter on competition as a universal (systemic) economic category, formulated the most important theoretical position on the socio-economic determination of social development in the conditions of the XX century. At the same time, it should be noted that F.A. Hayek was a staunch critic of the Soviet model of socialist construction (see, for example: [9; 10]).

The third main area of consideration of the conceptual characteristics of social competition is the study of its content as a legal phenomenon. In legal encyclopedic publications, its definition is either absent [11], or it is reduced to the competitiveness of economic entities in the commodity market [13], the legal institution regulating it [14, p. 211].

That is, in Russian legal science, the concept of "competition" is used mainly as a highly specialized instrument of economic activity of subjects in the relevant commodity market. This is confirmed by Federal Law No. 135-FZ dated July 26, 2006 "On Protection of Competition". Let's pay attention to its name. If we take into account that the main content of the concept of "competition" enshrined in the law is the fight against, as it were, its unfair implementation, then what kind of competition does the federal legislator protect? If in modern Russia its GDP by about 70-75%, and in some areas even higher, is formed with the participation of state property, then what kind of competition can we talk about? (see for details: [15, pp. 339-340]).

Between economic entities with a state form of ownership? Between an economic entity with a state form of ownership and an economic entity with a private (individualized) form of ownership? It is not difficult to guess who will win in this "competition" as in an economic rivalry and which of them will first of all be persecuted for unfair competition.

As a result of the undeveloped legal doctrine of competition in modern Russia from the position of ownership as the fundamental goal of the existence of the state, it is still largely implemented on the ideological basis of the Soviet past.

We return to the consideration of the proposed three main directions of the general conceptual characteristics of competition: competition as a global phenomenon; competition as a universal economic category; competition as a legal phenomenon.

Competition in the civilizational differentiation of instinct and reason represents a certain boundary – a Rubicon, from which begins a kind of construction of an artificial human habitat as a reasonable reality.

Competition as a globality appears simultaneously in two guises. First, competition is an artificial way of ensuring the vital activity of the state by creating an abstract social norm. The second is to bring this abstract social norm into a functional (working) state. That is, competition as a kind of objectified process is an artificial (reasonable) way of building the same artificial (reasonable) activity of the state, through which the same artificial (reasonable) abstract social norm is created, while simultaneously combining the corresponding artificial (reasonable) mode of bringing this abstract social norm into a functional (working) state, and therefore, the entire artificial (intelligent) human habitat.

If we paraphrase the famous statement of G. V. F. Hegel: "Everything reasonable is valid, and everything real is reasonable," then in my interpretation it sounds like "everything reasonable is artificial, and everything artificial is reasonable."

In this logical certainty, competition is a product of artificial (reasonable) and at the same time the same means of bringing this artificial (reasonable) into a functional (working) state, the same artificial (reasonable). To put it briefly, competition is a hybrid of the method and mode of ensuring and bringing all artificial (reasonable) vital activity of the state into a working functional state; this is the social purpose of competition as a global phenomenon.

If, in a general conceptual characteristic, competition as a global phenomenon is a reflection of the entire holistic spectrum of the existence of an artificial (reasonable) human civilization, then the perception of it (competition) as a universal economic category is, in a certain sense, the corresponding result of the existence of generation of production and reproduction of social contradictions caused by the creation of consumer value, i.e. a specific source of satisfaction of material and other human needs. It is in the economic sphere that, during the production, exchange, distribution and consumption of added value, spontaneous generation of uncontrollable energy of social contradictions occurs, which, through the constitution of competition (an artificial reasonable regulator), is transformed into a controlled one.

Competition transforms the spontaneous energy of social contradiction into artificial (reasonable) energy necessary to ensure social development. The effectiveness of such a transformational transition is determined by the parameters of ensuring proportional sufficiency between spontaneity and artificial rationality, allowing for the existence of the maximum possible degree of satisfaction of individual interest and its optimal ratio with group and collective interest. If a corresponding disproportion occurs between spontaneity and artificial rationality, then competition as an economic phenomenon, while ensuring an optimal ratio of individual interest with group and collective in social terms, simply "dies". This is where the importance of competition as a universal economic category manifests itself, determining the progressive algorithm of social development or the absence thereof.

Along with the characteristic of universality, competition as an economic category has three more important aspects of existence: 1) first of all, the social "production" of direct productive force in the person of the direct producer, his competitiveness in the labor market; 2) the formation of a social expression of choice, as F. A. Hayek wrote, between "the best and the cheapest", determining the strategic vector of development of social production; 3) the dynamism of competition, determining the need for permanent clarification of the current social norms.

The next parameter in the general conceptual characterization of social competition is its hypostasis as a legal phenomenon.

The issue of considering competition as a legal phenomenon appears to be complex and extremely complex for its objective and subjective reasons. Back in the XIX century. Rudolf Lering, in his works "The Struggle for Law" and "The Goal in Law", formulated a certain idea that law is a product of competition, and competition is a product of law (see in more detail: [16; 17]). The very setting of R. Using the conceptual certainty of the goal in law as "punishment of the violator" and "encouragement of the performer", he constructs an appropriate legal channel, only in which the existence of such a phenomenon as competition can exist. Hence the numerous attempts in the practice of legislative regulation to fix various conceptual legal formulas, for example: "unfair competition"; "imperfect competition"; "support for competition", etc. In my opinion, this can be considered as a legal incident, but no more. Competition can only be legal. Any interpretation of this fact by the legislator reflects only his desire to lead this process in the interests of a certain nomenclature bureaucracy, and this is called protectionism.

At a minimum, it is necessary to legislatively define what competition is, ensuring its existence by the functioning of an appropriate intersectoral legal institution. As a maximum, it is necessary to procedurally limit the power of the nomenclature bureaucracy on this topic, beyond which it can only go in a special legislative order.

The process of monopolization in the main ways of organizing property acts in a certain sense as a civilizational threat to the existence of social competition. But about this in the section "Competition and property".

Another legal phenomenon in the conceptual characterization of competition: law constitutes the complex nature of social competition, regulating its actions in all spheres of life of the state and society. That is, social competition as a diverse phenomenon can be economic, political, social, cultural, legal, etc. in the context of interpersonal to intergroup and inter-collective.

The existence of an inversely proportional relationship between competition and law generates a certain proportional sufficiency or, conversely, a disproportion, which at the same time has the characteristic of a legal fact. For example, the higher the social competition, the higher the legitimacy of the right recognized by society as socially just; at the same time, the lower the social competition, the lower the legitimacy of the right, and therefore the lower the level of recognition by society as socially just.

The desire of the nomenclature bureaucracy not to take into account in its practical activities the existence of this inversely proportional dependence objectively leads to the social degradation of its regime. A strategic issue in the legal provision of the functioning of social competition is the problem of matching the transition of social competition, which has developed in the economic sphere of activity, to the political sphere in the parameters of a certain proportional sufficiency. In other words, if there is one quality of social competition in the system of economic relations, and another in the political one, then this right acquires the property of illegitimate.

It is necessary to take into account the exceptional role of social competition in ensuring the existence of such civilizational forms as law and the state. If the goal in law is to "punish the violator" and "reward the perpetrator," then property is the fundamental purpose of the existence of the state. Here, the exclusivity of social competition is manifested in the fact that it ensures the formation of a regime of artificial (reasonable) vital activity of the state as legal and socially just recognized by society.

Thus, social competition, after being recognized by society as fair, acquires the position of a legal regime for the formation of artificial (reasonable) vital activity of the state and, in fact, law as a social regulator. This ensures the consolidation of the dual-purpose unity of the state and law into a common goal - the existence of an artificial (reasonable) human civilization.

It can be stated that the general conceptual characteristic of competition in these areas is implemented unevenly and unequally in the conditions of the late XX – early XXI century. Interpersonal, intergroup, and inter-collective competition, conditioned by the action of relevant social contradictions, gradually begins to change its natural nature of functioning.

4. Competition and ownership

Property is a universal legal source of satisfaction of material and other human needs, formed in practice in the realization of his target interest. Compared with the multiplicity of human needs and interests, the possibility of satisfying them is incomparably less. This discrepancy generates the emergence of an indefinite mass of social contradictions; society, in order to convert their energy into development potential, proceeds to create an artificial (reasonable) environment for its existence.

The state and law as forms of artificial (reasonable) activity are designed to normalize the process of satisfying the material and other needs of a person and a citizen in the mode of functioning of social competition. Property as a source of satisfaction of material and other needs of a person and a citizen turns into the fundamental goal of the normalized existence of the state, in the legal space of which social competition as a mode of activity brings it into a functional (working) state. This mode (method) of the life of the state is determined in its functioning to realize its fundamental purpose of existence – property. Property, which is an integral structural platform of the main ways of its organization: private (individualized); mixed (corporate); general (collective), directly affects the formation of this regime (method) of the vital activity of the state (see, for example: [18]). Social competition as a mode (method) of the vital activity of the state in the process of civilizational construction of an artificial (reasonable) habitat acted as a kind of mechanism for distinguishing ownership of its main methods of organization according to the target criterion of their implementation of relevant social functions, the implementation of which creates conditions for the consolidation of the operation of this regime. The fact is that social competition, if we draw a parallel with a medical drug, constructs a social positive in a certain proportion, and a social negative in another.

Social competition, predetermining the differentiation of the main ways of organizing property, caused them to split according to the difference in the potential of existence in each of them itself.

For example, the highest potential for the existence of social competition presupposes the action of a private (individualized) a method of organizing property in which the production and reproduction of an indefinite mass of social contradictions is accumulated. If we leave one way of organizing property in civilization – private (individualized), then, figuratively speaking, it will tear it apart, since it will not be able to ensure a balance within social competition as a mode (method) of the state's vital activity.

In other words, the private (individualized) way of organizing property, in order to ensure the balance of actions of this regime, requires the existence of its opposite – the general (collective) a method of organizing property, the effect of which will be purposefully aimed at limiting and leveling social competition in every possible way. This is allowed at one pole by means of a private (individualized) the method of organizing property to generate the highest potential of social competition, and on the other – with the help of a common (collective) There is no way to limit and level it in every possible way, which does not exclude their sufficiency in the implementation of relevant social functions – the functions of social development and the functions of social security.

The emergence of a mixed (corporate) method of organizing property was crucially determined by the desire of society to form a certain guarantee of the existence of a balanced regime of social competition, giving it a structured quality sufficient to generate the function of social compromise (convergence).

Competition as a way of carrying out artificial (reasonable) vital activity of the state by splitting property into the main ways of its organization: private (individualized); mixed (corporate); general (collective) – creates a potential regime to ensure the proportional sufficiency of relevant social functions (social development, social compromise (convergence), social security). This makes it possible to successfully realize both the fundamental purpose of the existence of the state – property, and to balance a certain proportionality of the implementation of these social functions. Thus, competition as a way of life of the state provides the opportunity to search for an optimal mode of existence.

Competition as a certain tuning fork in the hands of the state helps it to design the parameters of the permissible splitting of the existence of the main ways of organizing property, depending on which of the social functions in real time acquires strategic importance compared to others.

If it is vital for the state to define as a strategic prerogative of its existence the full realization of the function of social development, then it will create a regime for the most favored private (individualized)

the method of organizing property opens a kind of valve for the appropriate stimulation of social competition in a legally permissible parameter.

If, in the event of mass disasters, catastrophes, pandemics, wars, etc., the state uses property as a powerful mobilization resource to overcome these social hardships, then it creates the most favored nation regime for the general (collective) the method of organizing property with its social security function, by law limiting and leveling the existence of social competition in certain parameters.

If, as a strategic prerogative, the state needs to simultaneously create conditions for both social development and social security, then it creates a most-favored-nation regime for mixed (corporate) a method of organizing property with its function of social compromise (convergence), stimulating the emergence of a balance of proportional sufficiency between the above-mentioned social functions by limiting the high-pole and low-pole state of existence of social competition, at the same time, it is sufficient for its (the state's) sustainable development and social stability.

As already noted, the elimination of any method of organizing property with its social function leads to the destruction of the competition regime as a balanced way of life of the state in ensuring sustainable development and social stability. Despite the fact that social competition, by its mode of existence, creates a potential opportunity for splitting property into the main ways of its organization and assumes a proportional sufficiency of the interaction of their social functions, it (competition) is still secondary to property as the fundamental goal of the state.

Only property as a source of satisfaction of material and other needs and interests of man and citizen generates the existence of social competition, and this manifests its social priority. Violation of this social dominance inevitably leads to the destruction of property as an integral structural phenomenon, and social competition as the appropriate regime (method) of the state's vital activity, which determines the onset of its degradation.

Property and competition, in general, represent an inseparable integral circle of the

existence of human civilization; at the same time, the first is a source of satisfaction of the material and other needs of man and citizen, and the second is a kind of civilizational locomotive in ensuring this satisfaction.

The inversely proportional civilizational dependence between property and social competition is especially vividly demonstrated in the process of achieving the first monopoly state. In practice, this dependence is clearly manifested in the following: the higher the level of monopolization of property, the lower the level of existence of social competition; the higher the level of social competition, the lower the potency of the possibility of monopolization of property. This is a general rule. A special rule is that each method of organizing property is private (individualized); mixed (corporate); general (collective) – generates its own potential and the level of existence of social competition. From the highest – private (individualized) The method is to the lowest – general (collective), where social competition is purposefully limited and leveled.

In the process of monopolization of the main ways of organizing property, the transformation of the corresponding social functions takes place, each of which begins to acquire a negative significance. Any monopoly entering the state of rent begins, first of all, to destroy the natural mechanism of the genetic transformation of social contradiction into competition as a certain artificial (reasonable) human habitat.

As a result, the monopolization of property – the fundamental purpose of the existence of the state – destroys the integrity of a single structural platform of the main ways of its organization and, accordingly, degeneration of every social function occurs. The function of social development is beginning to take on the importance of opposing this development. The function of social compromise (convergence) loses the quality of its existence. The social security function, due to the degradation of the functions of social development and compromise (convergence), in principle begins to lose the ability to carry out its objectively set purpose. At the same time, the process of monopolization of property in any of the main ways of its organization begins to destroy, first of all, the regime of social competition

as a way of life of the state.

The main thing here is that in the process of monopolization of property, the natural human interest begins to collapse. Monopolization destroys the regime of social competition, thus alienating a person from property as a source of satisfaction of his material and other personal needs. As a result, property, as the fundamental purpose of the existence of the state and the main source of satisfaction of material and other personal needs, begins to lose the meaning and meaning of its existence for a person.

Monopolization of property, most naturally destroying the regime of social competition as a way of life of the state, produces a metamorphosis, i.e. a radical change in its social nature. Monopoly as a catalyst begins to stimulate the alienation of man from property, the alienation of man from labor, the alienation of man from power. The further destruction of the regime of social competition as a way of life of the state through its restriction and leveling gradually turns humanity into a standardized association of sociobiorobots (see [19]).

5. Conclusion

Social competition with this approach provided a solution to the following strategic problems for society.

Firstly, to control and regulate the activities of the state as an artificial (reasonable) sufficiency, and therefore to determine the configuration of the existing structural organization of power.

Secondly, to coordinate the activities of the state as an artificial (reasonable) sufficiency in determining the appropriate proportions in the implementation of a particular social function.

Thirdly, to formulate for the state as an artificial (reasonable) sufficiency the parameter of perception of its activities through the implementation of a policy of social justice.

Fourth, to overcome the state of "war of all against all" in human civilization through the state as an institution of artificial (reasonable) sufficiency (see in more detail: [20; 21]).

Consequently, the withdrawal of the state from social competition as the basic legal regime (method) of its life activity determines the

occurrence of the following negative consequences for the existence of the above-mentioned social institutions.

Firstly, property is being destroyed as an integral structural platform of the main ways of its organization, since domination as the basic legal regime (method) of life inevitably creates a situation of dysfunction both between the main ways of its organization and their respective social functions. Property, as the fundamental purpose of the existence of the state, loses its purpose and social meaning.

Secondly, the state is being destroyed as an institution of artificial reasonable sufficiency in the person of the corresponding structural organization of power, which, through the formed bureaucratic oligarchy, turns it into the goal of the existence of a corporate dictatorship.

Thirdly, the destruction of social competition, i.e. its restriction and leveling through the constitution of domination as the basic legal regime (method) of the state's vital activity, simultaneously destroys property as its fundamental purpose of existence and the state itself as an institution of artificial reasonable sufficiency.

All this determines the inevitability of the onset of social degradation for this statehood.

REFERENCES

1. Hegel G.W.F. *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*, in 3 volumes. Moscow, Mysl' Publ., 1977. Vol. 3: Philosophy of spirit. 470 p. (In Russ.).
2. Hobbes T. *Leviathan*, in: Hobbes T. *Selected works*, in 2 volumes. Moscow, Mysl' Publ., 1964, vol. 2, pp. 3–590. (In Russ.).
3. Locke J. *Two treatises on government*, in: Locke J. *Works*, in 3 volumes, Moscow, Mysl' Publ., 1988, vol. 3, pp. 135–406. (In Russ.).
4. Montesquieu Ch.L. *About the spirit of laws*. Moscow, Mysl' Publ., 1999. 674 p. (In Russ.).
5. Mill J.S. *Fundamentals of Political Economy*, in 3 volumes. Moscow, Progress Publ., 1981. Vol. 3. 450 p. (In Russ.).
6. Sombart W. *War and capitalism*, in: Zombart V. *Collected works*, in 3 volumes. St. Petersburg, Vladimir Dal' Publ., 2008, vol. 3: Research on the history of the development of modern capitalism, pp. 237–476. (In Russ.).
7. Schumpeter J. *Theory of economic development. Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. Moscow, Eksmo Publ., 2007. 861 p. (In Russ.).
8. Hayek F.A. The meaning of competition. *Sovremennaya konkurentsia*, 2009, no. 3, pp. 18–27. (In Russ.).
9. Hayek F.A. *Pernicious arrogance. The mistakes of socialism*. Moscow, Novosti Publ., Catallaxy Publ., 1992. 304 p. (In Russ.).
10. Hayek F.A. *The Political Order of a Free People*. London, Overseas Publications Interchange Ltd Publ., 1990. 309 p. (In Russ.).
11. Topornin B.N. (ed.). *Legal encyclopedia*. Moscow, Yurist Publ., 2001. 1270 p. (In Russ.).
12. Balashenko S.A. (ed.). *Belorussian legal encyclopedia*, in 4 volumes. Minsk, State Institute of Management and Social Technologies of the Belarusian State University Publ., 2009. Vol. 2. 584 p. (In Russ.).
13. Sukharev A.Ya., Krutskikh V.E. (ed.). *Big legal dictionary*, 2nd ed. Moscow, INFRA-M Publ., 2003. 703 p. (In Russ.).
14. Marchenko M.N. *Globalization and the Main Trends in the Development of National and Supranational State Legal Systems in the XXI Century*. Moscow, Prospekt Publ., 2019. 296 p. (In Russ.).
15. Butakov A.V. *To the study of the recent history of Russian statehood: Property and the state. Universal and singular*. Omsk, 2018. 414 p. (In Russ.).
16. Jhering R. *Fight for the right*, in: Jhering R. *Selected works*, in 2 volumes, St. Petersburg, Yuridicheskii tsentr – Press Publ., 2006, vol. 1, pp. 13–86. (In Russ.).
17. Jhering R. *Purpose in law*, in: Jhering R. *Selected works*, in 2 volumes, St. Petersburg, Yuridicheskii tsentr – Press Publ., 2006, vol. 1, pp. 87–436. (In Russ.).
18. Engels F. *The Communists and Karl Heinzen*, in: Marx K., Engels. F. *Works*, in 50 volumes, 2nd ed., Moscow, Gospolitizdat Publ., 1955, vol. 4, pp. 268–285. (In Russ.).
19. Yanitskii O.N. Globalization and hybridization: towards a new social order. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya = Sociological Research*, 2019, no. 8, pp. 8–18. (In Russ.).
20. Vlasenko N.A. *The modern Russian state, Essays*. Moscow, Norma Publ., 2022. 152 p. (In Russ.).
21. Baburin S.N. *Integration constitutionalism*. Moscow, INFRA-M Publ., 2020. 264 p. (In Russ.).

INFORMATION ABOUT AUTHOR

Alexander V. Butakov – Doctor of Law, Professor, Honoured Lawyer of the Russian Federation; Professor, Department of Theory and History of State and Law

Dostoevsky Omsk State University

55a, Mira pr., Omsk, 644077, Russia

E-mail: anvikulowa@yandex.kz

RSCI SPIN-code: 9843-0789; AuthorID: 683256

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION

Butakov A.V. From social contradiction to social competition as the basic legal regime (mode) of statehood (Part II). *Pravoprimerenie = Law Enforcement Review*, 2023, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 5–14. DOI: 10.52468/2542-1514.2023.7(4).5-14. (In Russ.).