Materials of conferences

SYSTEM MODELS OF ARMED CONFLICTS

Balikoyev A.V.
The Novosibirsk State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering (Sibstrin)
Novosibirsk, Russia

In our comprehension a *system model* means an abstract and logically closed ("ringed") description of a phenomenon represented in the form of autonomous organization of elements and relations. The construction of an armed conflict system model implies that there is no and *cannot be* any armed conflict, which couldn't be consistently described within the framework of the specified system model [1]. In other words, a *system model* has no (in our comprehension mustn't have) variants and versions.

Any system object, in specialists' opinion, must satisfy certain indispensable principles of consistency, that is: to consist of several interconnected components, to have a relative insularity from other objects, i.e. a particular autonomy, and, finally, to possess a minimal internal integrity (that means that the integer is not organized into a sum of elements) [2].

The construction of armed conflicts system models cannot be implemented out of the field of the following axiomatic statements:

- all armed conflicts have one causal basis at their root;

- all armed conflicts have one mechanism and logic of development (but not one dynamics – it is important not to confuse these two notions).

From these considerations, the simplest system model can exist, where in the limited space with scarce resources the role of components is performed by political actors with "vital interests" dynamically changing their force and direction. This dynamics of basic interests can be easily brought in balance, and even mathematical one, with the dynamics of armed confrontations. The curves of dependence of the probability of its entering into an armed confrontation on the direction or length of the "vital space" enlargement vector can be easily constructed for every component (that corresponds to the direction and intensity of the interest). At that, other dependence parameters, like the geopolitical position (and the correspondent claims for resource zones and areas of influence), the internal dynamics of the actor (the political system evolution, change of technology, etc.), the peculiarities of global processes (the climate, demography, etc.) can be introduced into the specified model. The simplest conditions can be introduced as well; for example, to preset obligatory power balance vectors or vectors of "land" and "sea" fight. Here the simplest dependences can be controlled.

All this can be pictured in the form of forces or vectors, when thinking schematically, directionally working in the limited space. It is clear, that the system on its own account, at any level, moves in the total force direction in the investigated space. The conflicts within the system are caused by the polarization of forces in such a point of the system space, when at maximal expressiveness of the component vectors (mathematically – at maximum tendency to vector module increase) the resultant of political forces tends to zero. When drawing a closer parallel with classical mechanics, the political process actors should be pictured not in the form of simple physical bodies, but as similar charges bearers, the potential of which, at that, is constantly changing dynamically. The force polarization on a definite and limited section of the system leads to an over-strain and a tendency to get rid of an extra potential either by means of an essential reorganization of forces (say, political decision of the problem) or by a direct drop of the potential through an armed exterminatory conflict, like, for example, the Thirty Years' War of 1618-1648.

The dialectical approach brings to this model definite rules or, in other words, structures the course of endogenous processes. The central idea here is a bi-polarization of the system; this polarization bearing not only structural, but substantial character. Within the framework of the dialectical approach many specialists confine themselves with structural oppositions' statements; for example, democracy in some countries – totalitarianism or autocracy in others. Capitalism and communism, West and East, rich North and poor South, etc…. The bi-polarization conditions the rise and development of a variety of contact zones, where political actors' interests collide. If we turn to a vector scheme, we can formulate "political" laws of dialectics, that is – first, there are conditions for every pair of political subjects, where the resultant of their interests' vectors tends to zero, *by all means*; second, for any point of a political system there is *one* pair of subjects as a minimum, the resultant of interests of which tends to zero, by all means. These laws irrationalize the bi-polarity and define the original dialectical contradictoriness of the system. The effects of these laws will be the statements, according to which, first, between any two political actors at corresponding conditions an armed conflict is possible, and, second, there is not a point of the political system space, where the interests of any pair of subjects could meet each other. The state of "zero resultant" can be defined by us as a contradiction of the contradiction subjects – the oppositions, which form a dialectical unity in struggle; the struggle itself being aimed at the contradiction settlement, that results in quality modification and progress of the entire system.

The power balance in this model plays a dual role. On the one hand, it naturally counterweighs the opponents' potentials, that leads to containment or keeping the opponents from extremes – an armed conflict in our situation. On the other hand, the power

balance magnifies the strain due to the same counterweight of the forces and, as a consequence, the formation of well-defined poles equally naturally with the result that the magnifying strain can exceed a certain threshold and find expression in a bloody conflict. While the dictate of the hegemon naturally structures the system rigorously in the unbalanced system. It is what Modelsky means, when speaking of non-anarchy within the system of global leadership. However, the artificial concealment of the *hegemonic dictate* with the idea of the *world's leader* makes his scheme scientifically false conceptually.

Unbalanced systems exist for a little time irrespective of either the matter concerns the power balance within the polity or it is referred to regional or global relations. The peculiarity is that the power balance can never be absolute either, as the subjects are dynamic and the "equilibrium point" always tends to zero on a certain imaginary bidirectional number axis reflecting the power level of the opponents. Though a multi-ray (multiaxial) scheme of the balance, where the number of rays is identical to the number of power "absorbers" would be a more accurate one. It is clear that the ideal variant will be the one with the balance point position in the zero point; actually it is constantly migrating.

The velocity and offset value of the power balance point is of a far greater importance, than even its position and distance vector directivity. The higher the velocity and the more the balance point offset value, the more probable the development of an armed conflict. As a matter of principle, there is, however, a non-calculated purely mathematically velocity and balance point offset magnitude threshold, the exceeding of which with maximal probability gives rise to the development of an armed conflict. Moreover, one can with good reason suppose that for every culturally specific zone this threshold will be peculiar. Furthermore, these threshold values dynamically change with the course of time, depending on political environment dynamics. Theoretically, it is possible even to study the dependence of the specified thresholds change on various universal and unique factors for every culturally specific zone.

References:

1. In science an example of such a universal consistence is Charles Darwin's theory.

2. Achkasov V.A. Comparative politics: course of lectures. SPb.: Sociological society named after Kovalevsky M.M. 2002, - p. 21-182.

The work was submitted to III international scientific conference "Human and noosphere", scientific heritage of Vernadsky V.I., Global problems of present-day civilization, Italy, Sicily, 15-20, July, 2007, came to the editorial office 07.02.2008.

METHODS OF SOCIAL-ECOLOGICAL DIAGNOSTICS: ESSENCE AND REALIZATION FEATURES (EDUCATIONAL ASPECT)

Shilova V.S.
Belgorod State University
Belgorod, Russia

The most important problem of present-day higher education is the one of students' training and mannerliness level quality. It is referred to all the orientations of professional training, including the aspect of students' interaction with the environment, and education in this sphere. The last is conditioned by the necessity to form the readiness of all people to the establishment of optimal social-ecological relations of the corresponding competence.

A constituent part of the quality determination process is the examined object's state diagnostics. Our research has allowed finding out the essence and features of one of its kinds considered. In general, the **diagnostics in the sphere of learning youth's social-ecological education** supposes a purposeful determination of the learners' state of readiness to the optimal interaction with the environment, education in the sphere of social ecological relations conditioned by pedagogical, psychological, social and social-ecological contexts. The pedagogical context supposes the maturity of necessary social-ecological knowledge, social-ecological skills, creative and emotionally axiological attitude to the environment; common pedagogical principles. The psychological context means the maturity of knowledge and skills in the area of general and developmental psychology; the directivity in the subject of psychology of attitude to nature (Yasvin V.A., Deryabo S.D.); the behavior and activity in it. The social context involves the maturity of knowledge, abilities and skills aimed at the identification of social conditions affecting the character of the interaction of personality and natural habitat; peculiarities of macro- and microenvironment creating a foundation of social-ecological culture. The ecological context supposes students' preparedness for the environment quality assessment implementation (monitoring, control and modeling).

The students' training level diagnostics in the area of social-ecological education of learning youth is a complex one, supposes the availability of academic knowledge of natural and human sciences, integrated science areas. The following should be referred to them in this case: ecology, geography, ecosystem exploitation, pedagogy, psychology, social ecology; the idea of research methods of these sciences, and also specific diagnostic methods. The *purposes* of the developed *diagnostics* are pedagogical ones, the implementation methodology has a sophisticated, complex character, supposes the use of methods of all the sciences necessary in this case.

The *diagnostics object* – is the students' education in the area of interaction of the society and na-