



SCIREA Journal of Philosophy

ISSN: 2995-7788

<http://www.scirea.org/journal/Philosophy>

December 22, 2025

Volume 5, Issue 1, February 2025

<https://doi.org/10.54647/philosophy720128>

On the Meta-dialectic equivalence between concept(s) based on contradictions and systemic (physical) interpretation(s) of Force (as driving / changing prerequisite)

Igor Janev ^{1,*}

¹Institute for Political Studies, Serbia

*Corresponding author: Svetozara Markovica St. 36, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia.

Email: igorjanev@mts.rs

Introduction

In my examinations I have discovered a new fundamentally relevant Dialectical principle omitted in Marxistic or Hegelian dialectical philosophy. That principle is related to acceleration of processes, rather than the simple static velocity based principle(s) of movement. As a consequences of that new approach we have proven in this article the equivalence of the theory and methodology of conflicting contradictions with the concept of Force (F), originally developed by Isaac Newton in 17-th century. That also contributed to discovery of at least one new dimension or level of a comprehensive doctrine and holistic philosophy. The societal implications of these principle(s) are that the economic, political social and cultural dynamics should have a decisive impact on the domestic and foreign policy of states and on the International Relations.

The General Dialectic philosophy/methodology of eternal and infinite movement and development of the *Everything that Exist(s)*

The general philosophy that focused on the cause of the universal motion and movement/changes/dynamics is mostly based on the four universal dialectic principles (Hegel, 1977; Engels, 1968): 1) in any phenomenon of whatever kind, or element of any structure, there is constant conflict and unity of internal contradictions, which are the prerequisites and driver(s) of permanent changes in the material world or any phenomena, structure(s) or its element(s). A logical derivative of this dynamical principle is that any element a is never absolutely identical to itself ($a \neq a$)¹; 2) in addition, there is the principle of negation of (any) negation, as a necessary principle or element of the changes and the dynamics; 3) transformation of the quantity into a new quality at a given critical level of the change of the quantity; 4) due to the principle of conflicting contradictions and the dynamics of double negation, as well as due to the total inter-connection and interaction between all elements and structures, there is a constant change in any element, structure and of the totality in the nature and/or society. The holistic dynamics is explained in fact by the systemic changes and movement in the elements of the totality, as well as by the changes, movement and transformation of the totality, as a whole (Engels, 1968). Therefore, Marxism formulated in the form of its Dialectical principles represent genesis of the first comprehensive holistic systemic philosophy and theory (of Everything that is (E)). The overwhelmingly general (and, therefore, insufficiently precise) character of these General principles may in many instances lead to incorrect conclusions in social sciences, and particularly in the research fields of natural sciences (e.g., failing to support some of the findings of modern quantum physics on the structure of matter).

The new principle of Dialectics not seen or discovered in the Classical Dialectic logic and methodology.

When we reduce the main Dialectical logical essence of the cause for any material changes to the conflicting contradictions, we in fact find striking resemblance of these theory/methodology with the I. Newton interpretation of psychical changes in material world through the change of speed (or mathematically: acceleration), deriving Newton to logical conclusion that the Force (F) is the General cause of any movement and all changes. Namely,

¹ This principle does not negate, however, that in absence of a time- (or logical) process, when the change of time is almost zero, this non-identity relation transforms itself into an absolute identity, $a \equiv a$. This is the case when the time related to a process (or a logical process) converges absolutely and approaches the zero value.

the change of the velocity (by definition an acceleration(a)) is caused by the material physical Force (F) that provides material elements, bodies or particles to start moving (or changing previous movement), and in fact more generally that force (F) is measured by that acceleration of the given mass (m) in the form of the product: $F=m*a$. If we for instance apply these theory on the phenomena of mechanical pressure, we can easily difference in potentials (p_1-p_2) represent the main cause of movement caused by the Force (F).

Therefore, as it seems to be true is that in comprehensive Dialectical model based on systemic eternal movement, the fundamental category of an acceleration is omitted and that simple principle of infinite comprehensive and eternal movement those not satisfy natural and only possible logic that change in velocity is the crucial category, and not just the velocity (v), as implied in the Classical model of dialectics. Namely, mathematically the first Derivative of the velocity, as dv/dt equals acceleration or a .

In conclusion, the above mentioned holistic (dynamic) dialectical principle of comprehensive eternal movement, in fact based on the velocity (statically) should be amended with Dialectical principle that states for the Everything that is (E): that its only exist(s) if there is an eternal acceleration (i.e. not simply a movement of the Everything).

By implementing this amendment (to set of Dialectical principles), we may easily reduce the concept of conflicting contradictions to the more known physical concept of the Force (or Newton theory), present-day generally accepted in the natural sciences. Concept of the Force (F) is in fact in systemic dialectic theory, therefore equivalent to the primitive concept of the conflicting contradictions.

In addition, it appears that on the structural level of the system, an element may not be the starting point or the most fundamental category (of an Everything). Instead of the most fundamental element, in our research we discovered the quantum (systemic) relation, as irreducible category in the General System Theory (GST) (Janev, I. (2013). Existence of a systemic relation is, thus, a prerequisite for the existence of a system. The intensity of a relation depends on the amount of capacity of each of the elements (poles) involved in the relation. This property of the element depends on internal factors (by definition the size of internal variables) and represents its potential for interaction with other elements in the system (or interactive power i.e. interactive intensity) and consequently the intensity of interaction defines the force (F). Force (as a measurement of interaction) in society (as in physics / nature) is the capacity to cause a (physical) change or movement (work).

Relationist Approach to State Genesis Theory

In society, the totality of the relations in a system defines (its) regime and change. The fundamental nature of the relation originates from the fact that it is only an abstract expression of an interaction having two poles, conceived in the GST as “elements” (or “units”) of the system. The basic premises of general systems theory (GST) are similar to the principles of dialectic doctrine. They are: 1) the totality of a system of elements and their interactions creates regime; 2) the openness (also in a logical sense) of this totality is the main feature of the dynamic regime; 3) there is a dynamical, inter-connected movement and change of any point, pole and element of this “totality“, as well as a (dynamical) creation of collective features and collective behavior. This principle includes synergism and introduces collective variables characterizing the system as a whole; 4) there is an influence of any element to any other regime’s element, and to the dynamics of “totality“, as a whole; 5) there is dynamic self-regulation of all collective movements of the elements, poles and the “totality“ (Von Bertalanffy, 1971).

Relationistic methodology could interpret the primitive order in society and norm-creation as a relationistic product of a *bandage force* (not only or necessary contradiction(s)) related to development of common rules or organization and understanding of mutual goals and interests from the binding order and social order or institutions. That *cooperative* anti-contradiction interaction or more generally a *force* appear not to be sufficient *per se* for the genesis of an entity such as a *state*, as the supreme authoritative institution-organization with *sovereignty*. Relationism thus comes to the conclusion that along with *collective cooperative non-contradicting interaction* or the *bandage force* exists as prerequisite (for state-creation, for instance) dialectic competitive conflicting interaction (or contradicting *force*) that ultimately created institutionalized order or in case of a state the monopoly (of physical *force* over population in the state).

Thus *relationism* in political theory could define a genesis of a state through the existence of two *poles* of (intensive) *interaction* (or a force) sufficient to produce official status of sovereignty. One pole in that interaction is the potential (or pole/element) of the organized supreme power, and the other is a *pole* of the submissive subjects (people under the state jurisdiction) of that sovereign dominance, where their obedient status is defined by state’s Law and rules (or the Constitution). Law of the sovereign state could not emerge before the creation of an official *title* (i.e. *titulus*) for the supreme rulers or monarchs, where by definition such governing *title* is subject to inheritance in favor of ruler’s sons or daughters

(heirs/descendants) of the supreme rulers (or monarchs). *Relationism* with respect to state genesis discovers in fact the set of governing interactions (both contradictions and anti-contradictions) and sufficiently strong social force in the interactive intensity to create the transfer of the supreme power, as a prerequisite of that genesis.

Recognition of rules as law is the interactive *two-way* process, between assumed obedient (submissive) subjects and ruling individual (s) or group(s) in possession of state political power who constitute the political elite. Political elite governs and control the society and its elements in an organized way. It should be noticed that even in the extreme cases when there is a full autocracy as a form of the political system enshrined in the state, law protected by the formal government still has the relational nature (by itself), because rules as given or taken orders always systemically connect the center of the power (i.e. *pole* of rulers) and the pole of the absence of that potential i.e. submitted powerless subjects, who on their side must honor the autocratic decisions and orders (as a second *interacting pole in that (political) interaction*).

From the legal point of view it should also be concluded that such an supreme institutionalized power legally define category of *sovereignty* as a right to *sovereignty*. This term besides the supreme domestic authority, legally presupposes subject (of relations) fully independent from any external authority or decision-makers and actors (states or organizations). In sense, *sovereignty* with that foreign dimension defined as external independence must be legally always preserved, and international (legal) personality inherently constitute an element of the statehood. Thus, a state is a sovereign international person (subject of law and actor of international relations) and in the same time sovereign domestic authority that exist as an institution formalizing existence of the two interacting opposing poles. In modern International law a *state* is an entity characterized with: 1. sovereign power, 2. territory, and 3. population of that entity. In our opinion, this set of conditions for qualifying entity as a state should be extended by a one more important feature that is indispensably bilt-in modern statehood: that is the *international juridical personality* (as capacity to contract, be represented, etc.). Juridical personality as political-legal element historically (in some components) emerged even in the ancient time when diplomatic envoys started to be treated as immune and privileged representatives of states (i.e. kings) and particularly from the moment in history when states begun to *contract* with each other. If the *juridical personality* is the essence of a (modern) state (bilt-in statehood), we may also conclude that the emergence of the *domestic juridical personality* indicate general legal nature of the *state or statehood*. In essence, state's juridical nature is remarkably similar to the

fiction of *social contract* concept exploited by the Theory of Natural Law for centuries (liberal political philosophy). In our view mentioned dimension of *juridical personality* (where a state is obliged to their subjects of law, too) revive the old liberal concept of unwritten virtual treaty as a basis for the state creation. States as (international and internal) subjects or persons to significant extent resembles modern international organizations that are indeed a products-creations of the intergovernmental treaties (i.e. treaties among their constituent elements - states as contractors). Furthermore, in order to obtain full statehood modern states needed (and still need) to obtain a diplomatic (political) *recognition*, and formally such processes involved legal acts of recognition and bilateral exchange of *notes* or an agreement. Taking that in consideration, we may at this point now draw a logical conclusion that state creation is in fact externally dependent and ultimately based on recognition agreement of external type, proving its international capacities.

Domestically, modern states acting as a legal person *vis a vis* their citizens behave almost as they were bound by the formal treaty or a contract between the state authority and its subjects. This aspects of responsibility originate from the idea of *legitimate power of state* and legitimacy of the government that conceptually emerged in the ancient times and later gradually developed, particularly by the liberal philosophers and concepts of human rights. Phenomenon of legitimacy on the other side, particularly in modern times limits the freedom of ruling will and intensity of (state's) force, particularly arbitrary use of the force and institutions, almost as they were bounded by a formal agreement with people as subjects. A rise of the constitutionalism implemented the idea of legitimacy and formally restricted government, so that freedom of behavior of rulers and use of their physical force were subject to regulation and certain level of control by the people, who become subjects of rights (paralleled with obligations) *vis a vis* state or government. Thus any constitutional state can be defined as a contractual product, where the state contract (connecting government and people) was actually enshrined in the constitution as a sort of generally accepted agreement for conditions of governance. From the Relationistic point of view, even from the first stage of *state* genesis, political ruling center (king or elite(s)) in order to minimize social conflicts and avoid the struggle for power, a state invented convenient (form of) *legitimacy*² relating to justification of their different protected and privileged status (formal position) or a *titulus* as a ruler's prerogative.

² In relationism *legitimacy* is a *two-way* political process where interactively rulers constantly need to deserve an acceptance of people for their governance, where given consent resembles *social contract* with virtual legal dimensions described by Natural Law theorists (J. Lock (*Two Treatises of Government*), J.J. Rousseau and others). See more about types of *legitimacy* by M. Weber, *Politics as a Vocation*, Fortress Press, 1965.

In comparison to Marxist (Leninist) approach where only *accumulated contradictions* at some level-stage creates a *state* (Lenin, 1917), our relationistic methodology explains a genesis of the *state* in the much broader and more developed framework of opposing and non-opposing cooperative interactions where conflicting contradictions represent only one type of interaction involved in definition of a state. In our theoretical approach, basically all types of interactions, reducible as two sorts, can be interpreted as unified social *force* generally directed to provide a movement of (partially integrated) society, *anti-anomie* and by nature creative development of the social system(s) towards higher integration and prosperity (including more power for achievement of the objectives). Social interactive poles with different potentials creates tension or dynamic charge, in the systemic processes of (re)distribution of energy or power. That dynamic charge represent a *force* encompassing integrated social energy (as a capacity to survive and do more work and production), including needs for integrated organizational *efficacy* responsible for *state creation* as political systemic institution based on pre-legal fictions and expectations. As mentioned earlier, opposing poles of interaction between rulers and the submitted obedient subjects is the essence of a state monopoly that brought into live idea of sovereignty. Both poles are systemically connected and cannot exist one without another. Interaction of poles, as we may conclude hereby is endlessly changing in intensity and directed (vectored) to creation of higher level(s) of organizational efficiency in normative and institutional creational political processes. For *state* genesis, the only relevant dimension is the *intensity* of interaction (or *force*) that can move people to behave according to the will of decision-makers (or be controlled by them). Obviously if the ruler governs people using justification of “objective laws” than the price for keeping the power and privileged title or controlling the people would be apparently much lower (for authority in possession of an title). Therefore, social and material energy spent to keep the *titulus* and order would be lower and organized with more efficiency.³ Unlike the mentioned liberal theories of a state, our approach derive the conclusion that *state* was created when the *idea* for a *titulus subject to inheritance* was born and socially recognized for the very first time in history of civilization. The *idea* of privileged title for leaders and their heirs made *state* possible in moment of general acceptance i.e. legitimization of *titulus* status. Therefore, a *state* and its *state law* were created in the same moment in history.

³ Thus, *state* genesis can be explained by profitability of transferring social system to lower level of energy invested for stability of social order. Any leaving creature or system including natural one is prone to minimized energy and transfer system's state to the lower energy level.

Relationist Approach to the Theory of International relations

There are also constituent international aspects of statehood relevant to the relationistic philosophy of *state*. These aspects are related to the independence and protection state as entity from external factors, its survival and especially recognition of its statehood by other such foreign entities possessing a quality of sovereignty and connecting or contracting capacity at international level. Without variable and elements related to the external relational dependence, especially quality of independence and politically recognized sovereignty by other states, it is not possible to formulate a process of a state genesis at all. State can only come into existence after ending of the domestic processes of competition for monopolistic power among groups (aimed at supreme force monopoly) and then extended domestic *sovereignty* that needs to be internationally recognized, becoming international prerequisite or *international sovereignty*. In that context *sovereignty* (domestic and international as a same unified category) is methodologically an ultimate relationist category⁴ that depends from external cooperation and variables outside of domestic system. Therefore, *diplomatic recognition* (as we mentioned here), from ancient to present time represents the fundamental relationistic variable-category of systemic condition transforming society (through interactive cooperation combined with contradictions) into new quality attribute of *statehood*, as new quality attribute. The application of relationist approach to the system of international relations follows the same ideas as outlined above for any general system theory (including the theory of a state). In a complex system there exist always certain collective (systemic) variables that enable the system (or the “element” , in our case a state) with a *capacity to enter into external relations* with other such systems (or “elements”) of the larger (international) system. The relationist approach, thus, recovers the internal structure of the element (state) of a system and its capability to enter into relations with other elements of the system, a property (attribute) that is postulated in the general systems theory (as well as in the related Waltzian neorealist political doctrine; Waltz, 1979). Moreover, within the relationist approach, the (now structured) *element* of the system is regarded as a system on its own, in which the (internal) relations play also a decisive role in its dynamics and define its own systemic variables. The totality of the relations among the elements of international system constitutes the international system of relations. In modern times it is a political system of international relations. As we concluded in previous discussion a one of the consequences of systemic development of *collective force* was a *state* as a relational product. On an international arena,

⁴ *Sovereignty* represent institution of legitimate formal monopoly of power, recognized domestically and by international or external actors.

the modern relational products that emerged also were international inter-governmental, specialized, regional and universal international organizations, all based on treaties between their member-states. In comparison to the liberal fiction of a *social contract* enshrined in the *Natural Law Theory* i.e. the non-formal unwritten *state treaty* creating distribution of obligations and rights with legal expectation from sovereign power⁵, the international *treaties* actually formally created specialized or universal international organizations, as a new form of international subject with their constitutional order enshrined in those *treaties*. These international treaties as legal documents are in format of the state-constitution(s) establishing in single act an administrative and even territorial jurisdiction of organization. These treaty-constitutions implicitly or explicitly provide for the juridical personality of the organization as a subject of law with all important elements of a *legal personality* (e.g. capacity to contract, operate with its own property, institute legal proceedings, and possess immunities and privileges of organization itself and their staff, own jurisdiction, and so on).⁶

Thus, in relationism, such organizations based on intergovernmental treaties, represent a new relational formal and institutional product (of relations), as a natural consequence of aspirations for higher level of organized force (as a state level operation) and systemic needs for power development at international scale. Therefore, relationism at the level of international political system is manifested in fact as a *creationism* that is motivated by eradication of international contradictions, anomie and instability (or anarchy), as a functional condition(s) for global development, prospect. That in fact, dialectically represent the further power-centralization (and institutionalization) at new qualitative level(s).

Dialectic Relationism, compared to Classical Marxism presumes that not every *conflicting contradiction* results in movement, change(s) or synthesis (particularly not always a positive one). Whether system or parts of the system will experience the change(s) or synthesis depends systemically on the character and an intensity of relation(s). Modern World political environment creates the System of Global Governance that is characterized by two, three or more governing Super-powers. Their relations are mainly dependent on a relative systemic distribution of power and perceived national interests, mainly defined by national governing elite(s) and economic or financial factors. System of Global Governance is, therefore, defined by relations of globally relevant political and economic classes or elites that strives for expansion. Political leaders, such as presidents or prime-ministers increasingly are more dependent on domestic elites, usually financial oligarchy or Plutocracy. It appears that such

⁵ That includes a legal expectation from government / king or a sort of primitive form of *legitimacy*.

⁶ See Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations (1946), particularly Art. I.

Deep State elites, creating constant internal contradiction(s) or anti-contradiction(s) will play crucial role in the processes of systemic change of International Relations that could be represented or simplified as the System of Global Governance. Nevertheless, it should be observed that the present order of the Global Governance that is presently characterized as Tri-polar system (US, Russia and China, plus potentially India). In dynamic set of conflicting variables, under combined interactions (relations) it is subject to rapid change so that our International political system, as Relationistic one, inevitable strives to Multipolar systemic world with globally much wider distribution of the power, as relative category, and more intentions (mutually) to equality among nations and peoples.

Conclusion

In analyzing the philosophy and methodology of Dialectics we have derived a one new crucial principle that have, in my view, the potential to improve the General methodology in philosophy and social science. This so far omitted principle was a principle of irreducible systemic *acceleration*, as a prerequisite of any General change and development or the more generally in Ontological sense existence of *Everything that exist* (in eternal conflicting movement, through irreducible fundamental relation/interaction). On Ontological level with respect to *Everything*, were we explain plain material world as structured from, by definition: *Substance* and *Energy* (plus physical field), we may observe omitted category in physical Materialism. According to the Relationism omitted fundamental element is the *Force* (irreducible interaction) that appears to be more crucial and basic category than the *Energy* and even *Substance*, as such.

In addition, in this article I have developed corresponding social Dialectic Relationism, particularly in political sciences. Dialectic Relationism here encompass both conflicting contradictions and anti-contradiction(s), with their respective intensities (as a measures of interactions or the strength of the Force). System of Global (political) Governance is/are, here, defined by relations of globally relevant political and economic classes or elites that strives for expansion. Political leaders, such as presidents or prime-ministers increasingly are more dependent on domestic elites, usually financial oligarchy or Plutocracy. Despite the fact that present Global Governance is characterized as Tri-polar system, our International political system, as Relationistic one, inevitable strives to Multipolar systemic mutual world with globally wider distribution of power and more intentions to equality among nations.

References

- [1] Von Bertalanfly, L. (1971) General Systems Theory. London: Penguin Press.
- [2] Durkheim, E. (1982) Rules of Sociological Method. Free Press; 2nd printing ed.
- [3] Engels, F. (1968) Dialectic of Nature. International Publishers.
- [4] Erman, J. (1979) Was Leibniz a relationist?, in: “Studies of Metaphysics”, Midwest Studies in PH Vol. IV, p. 277. Univ. of Minnesota Press, (Minnesota Archive Edu.)
- [5] Gilpin, R. (1981) War and Change in World Politics. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- [6] Hegel, G.F.W. (1977) Phenomenology of Spirit. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [7] Heidegger, M. (2000). Introduction to Metaphysics. Yale Univ. Press.
- [8] Janev, I. (2013). Relationist Approach to International Political Theory. Международные научные исследования, № 1-2.
- [9] Lenin, V. (1917) The State and revolution.
- [10] Merton, R. K. (1996) On Social Structure and Science. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- [11] Newton, I. (1688, 2013) Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy. Cambridge: Trinity Colledge
- [12] Ray, C. (2008) Time, Space and Philosophy. Elsevier.
- [13] McTaggart, J. (2005) Studies in Hegelian Dialectic, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- [14] Waltz, K. N. (1979) Theory of International Politics. Random House.
- [15] Weber, M. (1965) Politics as a Vocation. Fortress Press.