



## HERMENEUTICAL<sup>1</sup> PRINCIPLES OF BIOETHICS DEFINITION

Yana TRINEVA,

PhD, Professor of Criminal Law Department of the National Academy of Prosecution of Ukraine,  
junior counselor of justice

### Аннотация

В данной статье рассматривается происхождение, эволюция и формирование определения биоэтики в научных мыслях разных эпох: от античности до современности. Для удобства каждый этап в тексте выделен. Прослеживается интерпретация термина «биоэтика» учеными разных стран, в том числе российско-украинскими учеными, учеными Западной Европы и США. Предлагается авторское определение биоэтики, основанное на определении, зафиксированном в международных нормативно-правовых актах.

**Ключевые слова:** биоэтика, принципы биоэтики, определение биоэтики, герменевтика, наука о выживании.

### Summary

This article explores the origin, evolution and formation of bioethics definition in the global scientific thought different epochs from Antiquity to ending with the present. For convenience, each step in the text highlighted. In article are present interpret the term «bioethics» scientists from different countries, including Russian-Ukrainian scientists, scholars of Western Europe and the USA. Demonstrated community views these scientists, which once again underlines the truth of their ideas. With reference to official regulatory legal acts proposed an author's bioethics definition.

**Key words:** bioethics, principles of bioethics, bioethics definition, hermeneutic, life of survival.

### The etymological origin definition of «bioethics»: Antiquity.

Today in the literature in various industries, has taken the term «bioethics». There appeared the same name, science, philosophy and discipline. However, the meaning of this term, many scientists realize on your own.

In this article, we will trace the history of this concept, the evolution of its nature, as reflected in the written sources, and true, in our opinion, the modern understanding of it.

Thus, the word «bioethics» is derived from two Greek words βίος – life and ἠθος – custom. If a Greek word which means «life» – more or less clear, with the other component (ethics) – is not so clear. The concept of ethics is etymologically derived from the ancient Greek word «etos», which at first (especially in «Iliad» of Homer) place of residence. Subsequently acquired a new meaning: custom, temperament, character [1]. To determine the science that studies the ethical rules Aristotle formed a new noun ethice – Ethics, found in Piece («Great Ethics», «Nicomachean's Ethics», «Evdemov's Ethics») [2, p. 3]. Thus, in the IV century BC ethical science gets the name that is until now.

The history of the concept of ethics is repeated again on Roman soil. Roughly analogous to the Latin word «etos» the

word «mos» (moris), which also means luck and a man's character, style of clothing and fashion, custom and order. The ancient Roman philosopher Cicero, formed the adjective «moralis» (belonging to nature, customs), and from him later, the concepts of «moralitas» – Morality[4]. Consequently, the etymological meaning of the Greek «ethice» and Latin «moralitas» match. During the historical and cultural development of the concept of «ethics» and «morality» are filled with different content. In the public mind morality are understood as real phenomena (mores of society, has become a norm of conduct evaluative notions of good, evil, justice, etc.). Ethics have begun to consider how the science that studies morality. Thus, the history (memory) terms leads to the conclusion that ethics – the science of morality (morality). By the way the latter is the subject of ethics. The purpose of ethics is a rational justification of morality and the identification of its nature, the essence of a place and purpose in the development of man and society. If the object of the study of ethics more or less clear, the more difficult with its subject. In the historical development of human civilization changed the subject of ethics. We can now define what the moral standards are the subject of ethics.

Based on the above, the object of study of bioethics based on etymological

interpretation of this concept can be considered as system requirements, norms and rules of human behavior (as biosubject) that historically and compliance with which is voluntary. If component «bio» of the term «bioethics» understood not as a subject but as an object, the definition at «Bioethics object would look like this: system requirements, norms and rules of human behavior that historically and compliance with which is voluntary nature towards other bioobjects. So the second definition is narrower than the first. However, under bio – understood the object of knowledge of biology as a science, that is life in all its forms and at all levels of organization of living (wildlife, creatures that inhabit the earth or already extinct).

So in advance, based purely etymological interpretation of the term «bioethics» can be defined as a system of requirements and rules of human behavior in relation to the objects of nature (in the biological sense), with which compliance is voluntary. This definition combined the previous two and can more accurately reflect the nature of bioethics based on its etymological meaning.

### Views on bioethics national (Russian-Ukrainian) scientists, philosophers late XIX and early XX centuries.

The second step in the study of the nature of bioethics, we can assume the appearance and formation by Russian-Ukrainian scientific philosophical thought in the late XIX to early XX centuries, the concept of «Living Ethics» or «ethics of

<sup>1</sup>Hermeneutics (from the Greek. Ἑρμηνεύειν - interpretation) - in the original sense - the direction of research activities related to research, explanation, interpretation of philological and philosophical, historical and religious texts. In XX century becomes wider significance as a method, theory or philosophy of any interpretation.



life». Definition last fact reflects the essence of bioethics in international regulatory legal acts. This interpretation allows to put these scholars views on the basis of world scientific opinion on the definition of «bioethics». Thoughts following the Russian-Ukrainian philosophers were further developed in the works of famous foreign «founders» of bioethics. So the concept of Russian-Ukrainian «Ethics of life» can be divided into three areas.

*The first of them* – the concept of moral epistemology, including ethical regulatives. It was an outstanding representative of Russian chemist D. Mendeleev (1834-1907). Unfortunately, this area has not received any further extension and development, although this idea was developed in the functions of modern ethics committees.

*Another area* – «Living Ethics», developed a number of representatives of Buddhist thought. The most famous among them was M. Roerich (1874-1947) – Russian painter, philosopher and mystic, writer and social activist; the founder of the so-called «Living Ethics»[5]. Having founded their own rules for living beings, he emphasizes it is their mental component.

K. Tsyolkovskyy (1857-1935) – founder of the Soviet space program, the theoretical astronautics, the inventor is also linked his «cosmic ethics» in Buddhism. He sees ethics as a way of overcoming death and human suffering as a way of inspiration of nature. The guiding principle of ethics is the requirement that «all life is welfare» because «life is continuous, there is no death» [6]. Actually K. Tsyolkovskyy considering ethics as an opportunity to get some Psychometric Reading, uncertain at present by which a person can know the immortal (if changing its shape) – and in this way he sees mankind to happiness.

Rules of human behavior in the medical field (by the way, the object of modern bioethics), based on Buddhism, trying to highlight Russian doctor of Tibetan medicine P. Badmayev (1851-1920). He founded in St. Petersburg the medical school of Tibetan medicine and translated the main treatise at Tibetan medicine «Hood-shee» [7].

*The third area* of the ethics of life can be called naturalistic because it focuses on natural sciences, in biology. Representatives of ethics in the life of

the Russian mind a lot, and they offered interesting and promising ethical concept. They are united by the desire to understand life as a natural-historical phenomenon and justify ethical ideas of struggle with death.

The best known representative of this trend in the early XX century was N. Umov (1846-1915) – an outstanding Russian physicist and philosopher who came from the fact that the specific lives lies in its antyentropy [8] (regularizing – Y.T.), that it is always connected with the fight against «discordant». This term is essentially identical to that in modern physics, called chaos, disorganization. According to N. Umov's words «is probably the discordant condition, which seeks unorganized nature. In contrast, harmony of movement – the basis of organized matter ... [9]. Terms of N. Umov in the idea that ethics should be based on understanding the specificity of life and is inextricably linked with the natural sciences [9]. Author insists that the main purpose of ethics – the desire to eliminate the evil of human life through effective intervention in the life of nature, in turning chaotic forces of nature in organized, «slender». He proposes a «covenant» new ethics: «work must based on scientific knowledge» [9]. These provisions N. Umov's conception condition later we meet in the book of American professor oncologist V.R. Potter (1911-2001) «Bioethics – a bridge to the future».

At the same time, another representative of this trend P. Kropotkin developing ethics of altruism. This ethic is the new realistic science of morality, freed from religious dogma, superstition and metaphysical mythology and yet inspired by higher feelings and bright hopes. The latter have to get into the mind of man with advanced knowledge of man and his history. Science should give the basics of ethics. Ethics should be justified scientifically, that is built on the basis of science, including Darwin's theory of evolution. P. Kropotkin strongly criticizes the basic principle of Darwin's theory – the principle of the struggle for existence. It must be supplemented by the principle of mutual aid as one of the most important factors in the evolutionary process. This means that the roots of morality – the instinct of sociability, have originally existed in organic nature. P. Kropotkin called nature the first teacher of ethics, moral principles of ethics [10].

So the third line of Living Ethics is more «prosaic». Its representatives were focused on naturalistic science, and then tried to justify the rules of human life from this position. Ethics of life seems they are much broader than, for example professional medical ethics. The latter is the only one of its objects. This provision of medical ethics and remained within the modern definition of bioethics.

At the same time, Russian natural scientist, philosopher and public figure V. Vernadsky (1863-1945) develops a theory of the transition of the biosphere into the noosphere, the sphere is created by the human mind embodied in science and technology. V. Vernadsky stands out from three directions understanding of «Living Ethics». The ethical component of the teachings of V. Vernadsky's noosphere is expressed primarily in its optimism and approval of laws that do not conflict with the development of the noosphere, and continue to the laws of evolution of the biosphere. V. Vernadsky repeatedly emphasizes the unity of biosphere and noosphere, namely that the noosphere is born from the biosphere. Thus V. Vernadsky understood man and mankind as a natural part of the organization of living matter as a natural stage in the evolution of the biosphere. V. Vernadsky develops optimistic concept of transition of the biosphere into the sphere of the mind, which plays a crucial role not only science, but also ethical mind united humanity. Noosphere combines scientific understanding of humanity with his moral understanding and technique.

Sometimes optimistic concept of the noosphere opposed another approach that did focus on the destruction of human and natural ecosystems inexorable degradation of natural ecosystems and communities as a result of the expansion of humanity. The well-known Soviet biologist B. Kuzin (1903-1975) believed that everything created by man, it would not be called the noosphere, but kakosphere or scope mad [11]. By the way about such human impact on nature noted foreign bioethics researchers such as V.R. Potter. Their work is mainly focused on humanity clause of this.

#### **Understanding Bioethics foreign researchers.**

So as you can see, the Russian-Ukrainian researchers had formulated the concept of «bioethics», which they



then called «Living Ethics» or «Ethics of Life». Official modern name given this set of ideas only gain in 1927.

That year in foreign scientific thought appeared the term «bioethics». Introduced him Fritz Yahr in the article «Bioethics: A review of ethical relationship of man to animals and plants», «Bioethical Imperative» as the concept of the moral principles of using laboratory animals and plants [12]. Then, under the rules of bioethics understood the human behavior in relation to other biological organisms in their biological value (excluding their spiritual and social component).

The future is expanding the boundaries of «bioethics» definition. In the second half of the XX century, its essence was somewhat expanded, prerequisites which have different social and cultural phenomena. A new level of technological capabilities of human scientists set new ethical challenges that need to be addressed every day in practice. Thus, arose the need for a new elementary ethics that would be effective and could be used in practice. Quest to find an updated system of moral and spiritual guidance, a new spiritual potential led to the emergence of a new interdisciplinary field of knowledge – Bioethics. The aim was to study bioethics and the creation of conditions in which is possible to preserve life on Earth.

Generally the middle XX century can be called «boom» of bioethics. Almost simultaneously the problems of bioethics interested B. Dzheninhson, R. Vich, A. Hellehers and V.R. Potter.

Andre Hellehers – American embryologist and an obstetrician, defined bioethics as an interdisciplinary biomedical research ethical issues related primarily to the need to protect the dignity and rights of the patient. This definition of bioethics A. Hellehers formed under the influence of the ideology of human rights movement, which was recognized in 1960 [13]. By the way a modern interpretation of bioethics generally includes an understanding A. Hellehers's the basic concepts of bioethics.

In 1971, the U.S., the book American biochemist and scientist-humanist Van Rensselaer Potter (VR Potter) «Bioethics – Bridge to the Future», which became, in the opinion of many, «Bible» of bioethics [14]. The author defines «bioethics» as a compound of biological knowledge with

knowledge of human values. As you can see from this formulation, the value of bioethics is very far from its etymological meaning (as the research of biological objects only from a biological point of view). The purpose of bioethics, according to VR Potter is the doctrine of the separation of morality of human behavior from a position of bio-medical field and other socially-oriented life sciences. V.R. Potter called bioethics science of survival. In this he has gone forward in defining the essence of this science. By the way his «Science of Survival» is not known how, to him such thoughts we met at a Russian scientist and philosopher M. Roerich (see page up).

It should be noted that the V.R. Potter's book dedicated to the memory of his teacher – Oldo Leopold (1887-1948), who was a famous American public activist, writer, belonged to the followers of the American environmental school. At one time created special A. Leopold ethics – ethics Earth and spread its effects not only on individuals, but to all species and ecological communities [15]. He believed that the earth ethic aims to confirm the right to exist in natural conditions just what constitutes ecosystem. He believed that the earth ethic aims to confirm the right to exist in natural conditions just what constitutes ecosystem. Bioethics has changed the role of humans in the biosphere, making it from natural invader to the legal representative of the biological community. Contrary to the traditional view, the new ethics proclaimed the right of each species to exist, irrespective of its economic value or benefit. These same ideas we met in the Russian scientist (see page up).

In 1995, in an address («Evangelium Vitae») to the faithful Ioannes Paulus II identified bioethics as biology of spirituality, which warns young people in the face of life, which often manifest themselves as selfish pleasures. In his view bioethics – a set of concepts and principles aimed at moral improvement of humanity, protection of human rights and human dignity in connection with the revolutionary achievements of modern biology, especially molecular genetics, genetic engineering, decoding the genome of humans and animals. The task of bioethics is to determine the boundary of medical human intervention, and defining moral value of medical acts [16].

So when bioethics foreign researchers, in broad terms, mainly understood as the science of the rules of survival human in nature. However, we note that they understood the essence of bioethics, other than etymological meaning of the term. Foreign definition of bioethics similar to her understanding of the Russian-Ukrainian scientists thought that we cited.

#### **Current understanding of bioethics.**

Depending on the understanding of bioethics distinguish different objects last. In general, it should be noted that the present stage of development of the concept of «bioethics» can be described as «immersion into the depths». There are various facilities bioethics, its objectives, principles, directions and thus formulate its various definitions.

So Italian researcher Elio Sgreccia, in his work «A Guide to Bioethics» Bioethics at the object determines the morality of human behavior in bio-medical field and in health care with respect to its compliance with good morals and values. Admissibility of medical interventions in human body in terms of law, particularly those interventions that are associated with the development of biological and medical sciences [17]. According to the Russian scientist R. Petrov in the field of bioethics interests include problems of development and introduction into the biosphere transgenic plants and animals, genetically modified foods [18].

Depending on the object of research of bioethics, some modern scholars have identified and some of its areas: medical, environmental, global, feminist, zoethics, pharmethics.

However, all of the definitions of bioethics and discourse around them, could well remain a constant issue in the scientific community if the final point was marked in official international documents.

Formal concepts of bioethics and its scope, reflected in the Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights.

This Declaration adopted by UNESCO's General Conference on 19 October 2005. For the first time in the history of bioethics Member States and the international community pledged to respect and implement the fundamental principles of bioethics contained in a single document. Declaration undermine ethical issues related to medicine, life



sciences and related technologies used to humans, and as reflected in its name, is based on the principles that it says in the rules that ensure respect for human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms. Settling bioethics in international rule of law and ensuring respect for human life, the Declaration, thus, recognizes the relationship between ethics and human rights particularly in the field of bioethics.

So as we can see from this definition facilities is a medical field of bioethics, life sciences and technologies that can be applied to a person (person as an object of study) and in accordance with applicable human beings (as entities that conduct such research). The man in this statement is seen not just as a living being (bio), but as a person who is endowed with certain rights (social component). These rights are guaranteed by the international community and corresponding responsibilities for violation of which has come a certain kind of legal liability established by law. Thus formally defined understanding of bioethics similar to the bioethics definition given as a Ukrainian-Russian scientists and their international colleagues. In fact, this paper was the only official document that provided a legal definition of bioethics, which must continue to comply with all the international community.

Summing up all of the existing ideas about understanding bioethics conclude that this term combines several meanings, representing interest and as a science and as a special type of social practice, and as a special academic discipline and as a social institution.

Twenty-first century was marked by the history of bioethics, legal confirmation of this concept, which effectively put an end to the long-term and even centennial discussions on this topic. However, in pursuit of a formalization of the concept, the international community did not notice as cemented substituted the notion of (domestic) and actually gave it a meaning which it is etymologically not peculiar. We noted above that component «bio» – the term «bioethics» means life in all its forms (living and inanimate nature). However, the concept of «life» is only a determination of biological criteria – all other (spiritual, social, etc.) are outside. How would we similarly interpreted the term «bioethics», its value would be erected to a certain system requirements,

norms and rules of human behavior (definition of «ethics») applicable to biological objects (such as a person but as a biological organism – set of organs and tissues, excluding social, spiritual component). But the whole history of the formation of bioethics suggest otherwise because its component «bio» – extended to the social (spiritual, mental) criterion.

In terms of conceptual purity, of course, this is incorrect. But do not comply international documents that formally consolidated international traditions (the essence of the term «bioethics») also cannot.

Given the historical importance of bioethics, which was the basis for its interpretation in the official document – «Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights», in particular in its principles, and taking advantage of the lack of a clear formal definition, we propose to copyright the term «bioethics». *Bioethics – Philosophy direction, intersectoral knowledge, a world view about the rules of human existence.* Then the object of bioethics in our opinion is the new knowledge that mankind has been, is, or will receive as a result of scientific and technological progress. Accordingly, the subject of bioethics have specific dilemmas that arise from new knowledge. In modern society the latter include: the collection and use of biometric data rights, euthanasia, abortion, cloning, genetic engineering, nanotechnology and more.

This is too broad, at first sight, the definition is not casual. Bioethics has become not only the science but also the unique shape worldview that reflects the moral relation of man to the surrounding world and its perception of it and its place in it. The main task of man – not to interfere with the environment: other living beings, flora, ecosystems and so on. It is in such an aspiration to establish harmony and purpose is bioethics.

However, we believe bioethics feature is that its subject is changing. Depending on the new achievements of mankind, and will vary subject of this science. However axiological basis the latter is more constant category, because they do not depend on objective reality: the achievements of scientific and technical progress, moral standards, the objective laws of nature (force of gravity, terminal limits the life of creatures, etc.). Axiological basis of bioethics – are the tools to use it. All new

knowledge (at the stage of design) has passed through the axiological basis. If these projects meet the bioethical basis – in which case they may be eligible. Applying axiological basis (principles) – we are able to form an inexhaustible list of rules (norms) of bioethics, which can be organized (codified, incorporated or consolidated).

#### List of reference links:

1. Гомер. Іліада. – Харків : Фоліо, 2006. – 416 с.
2. Ставнюк В. Арістотель. Нікомахова етика / Αριστοτελους. Ηθικα Νικομαχεια. – К. : Аквілон-Плюс, 2002. 480 с. ; «Евдемова етика» в восьми книгах / пер. с древнегр. Т.В. Васильевой, Т.А. Миллер, М.А. Солоповой. – М. : ИФ РАН, 2005. – 448 с.
3. Аристотель. Сочинения: в 4-х т. Т. 4 / Пер. с древнегреч. ; Общ. ред. А. И. Доватура. – М. : Мысль, 1983. – 830 с.
4. Марк Туллий Цицерон. Цицерон – Философские трактаты. / пер. Г.Г. Майорова – М. : Наука, 1985. – 382 с.
5. Рерих Н.К. Живая этика. – М. : изд. дом Шалвы Амонашвили, 1999. – 224 с.
6. Циолковский К.Э. Грезы о земле и небе. – Тула : Приокское книжное издательство, 1986. – 448 с.
7. Бадмаев П. Основы врачебной науки Тибета «Худ-ши». – М. : Наука, 1991. – 256 с.
8. Antyentropy – a structured and orderly return of entropy value that represents the degree of uncertainty. Antyentropy – organizing energy of the human body, it has a positive effect on all cells and the activities of all organs without exception, supporting their vital functions and slowing down aging. – Шредингер. Э. Что такое жизнь? Точка зрения физика / Пер.с англ. Малиновского А.А. – М. : РИМИС, 2009. – 176 с.
9. Умов Н. А. Собр. соч. – М., 1916. Т. 3. – С. 162.
10. Кропоткин П. А. «Этика». – М. : Политиздат, 1991. – 496 с.
11. Кузин Б.С. Воспоминания. Произведения. Переписка. Мандельштам Н.Я. 192 письма к Б.С. Кузину. – СПб. : ООО «Инапресс», 1999.
12. Goldim, JR (2009). Revisiting the beginning of bioethics: The contribution of Fritz Jahr (1927). *Perspect Biol Med*, Sum, 377-380; Sass, HM (2007). Fritz



Jahr's 1927 concept of bioethics. Kennedy Inst Ethics J, 17 (4), Dec, 279–295.

13. Галкін О.Ю., Григоренко А.А. Біоетика в Україні: від теорії до практики. Нормативно-правові та навчально-наукові аспекти. // Наукові вісті НТУУ «КПІ» – № 3. – 2011. – С. 12–19.

14. Potter, Van Rensselaer. Bioethics: Bridge to the future. Englewood Cliffs, nj Prentice-Hall, 1971 (196 pages).

15. Леопольд О. Календарь песчаного графства. – М., 1980. – 216 с. (Aldo Leopold «Sand County Almanac». Random House Publishing Group, 1970. 295 p.).

16. Ioannes Paulus PP II. Evangelium Vitae, Rome. 1995.

17. Sgreccia Elio, Manuale di bioetica. Vol. I: Fondamenti ed etica biomedica. Milano, Vita e Pensiero-largo A. Gemelli, 2007 (III), pp.1001.

18. Петров Р.В. Биоэтика // Наука в России. – 2001. – № 3. – С. 50–53.

## ГОСУДАРСТВЕННАЯ ПОЛИТИКА УКРАИНЫ В СФЕРЕ ВЫСШЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ: СОСТОЯНИЕ И НАПРАВЛЕНИЯ РАЗВИТИЯ

Юрий ФРОЛОВ,

кандидат юридических наук, доцент, декан юридического факультета  
Бердянского университета менеджмента и бизнеса

### Summary

Research of the content and direction of the state policy of Ukraine in the sphere of higher education at the present stage of its development, which involves the formulation and solution of such basic problems as: content analysis of the concept «public policy in the sphere of higher education», the definition of the key principles of modern education policy, characteristic of its organizational and legal grounds, as well as setting priorities for realizing state policy in the field of higher education.

**Key words:** higher education, public education policy, education system, higher education establishments.

### Аннотация

Проведено исследование содержания и направленности государственной политики Украины в сфере высшего образования на современном этапе его развития, что предусматривает постановку и решение таких основных задач: анализ содержания понятия «государственная политика в сфере высшего образования», определение ключевых принципов современной образовательной политики, характеристика её организационных и правовых основ, а также установление приоритетных направлений реализации государственной политики Украины в сфере высшего образования.

**Ключевые слова:** высшее образование, государственная образовательная политика, система образования, высшие учебные заведения.

**П**остановка проблемы и актуальность ее исследования. Система высшего образования в Украине находится сегодня в процессе кардинальной трансформации, обусловленной как общемировыми факторами (постоянным ростом роли знаний в жизни современного общества, созданием единого образовательного пространства), так и социально-экономическими и культурными преобразованиями, происходящими непосредственно в украинском обществе. Развитие системы высших учебных заведений в условиях реформирования как всего общества, так и, в частности, сферы образования, приводит к изменению традиционных и становлению новых механизмов регулирования их деятельности. Качественная перестройка высшего образования требует формирования современной государственной политики в образовательной сфере, применение современного инструментария, внедрения эффективных методов и средств государственного управления.

Исследованию вопросов, связанных с государственной образовательной политикой и управлением образованием

на современном этапе его развития, посвящен целый ряд работ таких учёных, как А. Адамский, А. Алёхин, В. Андрущенко, В. Астахов, Г. Атаманчук, С. Барабанова, О. Бердашкевич, Р. Валеев, Б. Данилишин, В. Журавский, В. Жураковский, С. Зарецкая, И. Каленюк, А. Кирилловых, К. Корсак, В. Кремень, В. Огаренко, В. Полонский, Л. Прокопенко, О. Смолин, В. Филиппов, В. Шкагулла, Е. Щербак и др. Однако анализ существующих научных источников по данной проблематике показал, что вопросы современного состояния и дальнейшего развития государственной политики в сфере высшего образования в условиях инновационного развития и интеграции в европейское образовательное пространство остаются всё ещё недостаточно разработанными, что и определило актуальность данной статьи.

Целью данной статьи является исследование содержания и направленности государственной политики Украины в сфере высшего образования на современном этапе его развития, что предусматривает постановку и решение таких основных задач: анализ содержания понятия «государственная