

наукова істина та цінності добра і справедливості, досягнення правової теорії та практичний юридичний досвід, правові ідеали, інституціонально-нормативні утворення і правові відносини, що втиснути все це у рамки якоїсь універсальної дефініції просто не можливо [4, с. 12-13].

На сучасному етапі розвитку, на нашу думку, для праворозуміння фактором удосконалення є юридична практика, а для практичної діяльності

фахівців у галузі права таким стимулом мають стати нові підходи до цієї проблеми, адже проблема праворозуміння безпосередньо пов'язана з ціннісними орієнтирами суспільства, правами і свободами людини і громадянина, якістю законодавства, зрештою, з утвердженням у країні конституційного принципу верховенства права, який, на жаль, виявився в останнє десятиліття значною мірою дискредитованим.

Література

1. Плавич В. П. Сучасна концепція праворозуміння та його моделі // Юридичні та політичні науки: Збірник наукових праць. - 2005. - Випуск 27. - 281 с.
2. Кістяківський Б. О. Вибране. Бібліотека часопису «Філософська і соціологічна думка». Серія «Українські мислителі». - К., 1996. - 371 с.
3. Честнов И. Л. Правопонимание в эпоху постмодернизма / И.Л. Честнов // Правоведение. - 2002. - № 2. - С. 99-103.
3. Оль П. А. Правопонимание : от плюрализма к двуединству. - СПб., 2006. - 261 с.

УДК 340.115

DEFORMATION AND INTEGRATION IN LEGAL SCIENCES

Шалюта В. – ст.1 курсу

Науковий керівник – к.пед.н., консультант з мови, Форостюк І.В.

Університет Державної Фіскальної служби України

Current legal science is transforming itself in terms of integration changes and deformations. We can observe several tendencies of that transformation. One of them, and probably the most significant, is searching appropriate, partially new, methodological approach. Such search is important in modern integration changes of contemporary Ukraine

The problems of European integration are studied by I. Yakoviuk, A.Yegorov, L.Luts, S. Ratushnyi and others.

Far ago legal philosophers have been using in their research methods and tools that were typical for legal science, especially text analysis. Some researchers especially from social sciences allege that legal philosophers (and legal scholarship in general) do not have their own methodology (in pure sense) characteristic for separate field of knowledge. That dispute is still vivid and it is all touchier that legal philosophers started lending tools and methods from other, especially social, sciences, since existing methods appear to be insufficient [1].

The world is changing. The changes do not omit law. External integration of legal sciences can be understood as using in legal research also findings and methodology of other sciences. The discussion on the problem, thus, has to do with tradition of multidimensional legal research.

Difficulties in predicting scientific changes do not need to constitute an obstacle to studies of the future in the field of legal science. The development of legal science, which has been relatively stable in many respects, differs in many ways from the more or less revolutionary

development that can be observed in other domains. The paradigm shifts can easily be calculated here, and when the pace of development becomes uneven, it proceeds in small jumps. An established point of view also indicates that the object of legal science is primarily of the legal dogmatic kind, i.e. that the main task of legal science is to investigate and systematize the applicable law. In such an approach it is often assumed that the selected method is a familiar and a well-functioning one, and that any explanations that must be given are related to the way in which the separate sources of law relate to each other in the area in question. The research material - the applicable law - is something given here, and the only things to be done on the theoretical plane are to find a compromise between the seemingly incompatible standpoints expressed in the old masters' works, spread the existing knowledge, and make sure that the method is preserved and that it will be used. Such an approach may also embrace the viewpoint that it is incorrect to draw parallels between legal science and other forms of science, or, in any case, that results obtained in the field of legal science are of a different, special character [2].

So we can do the conclusion that in spite of the fact that the new legal disciplines are unequal, their methodological and theoretical meaning is like they need to have status unquotable for example applied, but legal sciences – are generally scientific. In the frames of legal lore, character, status and profile, which increase sophistication, dynamic of legal lore in general reflects its ability for self-development [3].

References

1. Iwona Rzucidlo-Grochowska , In search for the appropriate methodological approach. The present and the future of legal philosophy. / Iwona Rzucidlo-Grochowska, [Electronic resource] Режим доступу: <http://www.uef.fi/documents/300201/0/I.+Rzucidlo-Grochowska%2C+Finland-2.pdf/db38f24c-cbd1-4746-80a6-0d6f2ffe7822>
2. Peter Wahlgren, On the Future of Legal Science. / Peter Wahlgren; - Stockholm Institute for Scandianvian Law, 2009. - p. 516-517.
3. Юридична деонтологія. – [Electronic resource] Режим доступу: http://pidruchniki.com/11570718/pravo/perspektivi_rozvitku_yurisprudentsiyi