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Scott Turow narrates the story of his student life in the most prestigious law school in the country when he becomes a "One L," as entering students at Harvard Law School.

**Takeaway**

 **Integrity**

The learning process is holistic, which manifested in the common goals of teaching and learning. The learning process involves the processes of cognition and active interaction with the teacher. Communication provides a high level of motivation, determines the attitude towards the educational process. Factors such as clarity and functional organization of work, the teacher's dedication to his work, tact in relations with students, assistance in mastering the material, and adequacy in assessing knowledge contribute to the development of students' interest in the subject. The following can reduce the effect of interaction, lack of attention from the teacher to the style of communication. Poor organization of educational activities. The basis of training is information formed in the human mind into objective reality. Skills that allow you to carry out practical and theoretical actions independently. Skills that are not under the control of consciousness (sensory, motor, intellectual). "Look,' he told me, 'if I were going to law school, I would be going because I wanted to meet my enemy. I think that's a good thing to do. And if I wanted to meet my enemy, I would go to Harvard, because I'd be surest of meeting him there,”(Turow,2010). The integrated qualities of the legal system determine the methodological foundations of its research. Thus, a single legal norm or an article of a regulatory legal act, separated from the integral legal system, is not able to influence the relevant social relations. Only in unity with other lawful means that are part of this legal system, is effective legal regulation of this relationship achieved.

 **Learning to Love the Law**

Analysis of systemic formations in law reveals a different level of a multiplicity of their complex: along with single-system, there are also multisystem legal formations. So, the system of the legal "cell" - the rule of law - is relatively simple, one system. But already, the policy of the institute of law includes several simple systems (subsystems), relevant legal norms, and thereby becomes a multisystem. Multisystem education at the level of the branch of law is even more complex since it includes subsystems of various standards - legal norms and institutions. Finally, the pinnacle of a multisystem is the legal system, consisting of subsystems - legal models, institutions, and industries.

Moreover, the operation of law is not just a combination of its subsystems, but a system of subsystems. It creates a hierarchy of legal systems that create a harmonious building of the legal system. The method of law operates, functions, plays a specific role. Not only the legal system as a whole function but also each of its components. Furthermore, the features of the ingredients are determined, derived from the purposes of the system as a whole. The legal system does not and cannot be inactive components. The "dead" element, as a rule, "stops" the entire system; as a result, while maintaining pure integrity, it loses the quality of systematicity.

Before proceeding to the analysis of this fundamental legal building in the aspect of its systematic nature, it is necessary to dwell on two points of methodological significance for the study of law in this aspect. The study of legal systems involves the analysis of all those real conditions, factors, and circumstances that, with objective necessity, generate, determine, and determine their development. First of all, it is necessary to study both qualitative and quantitative characteristics, parameters, measurements of the achieved level of productive forces, production relations, the specifics of civil society, and the political system, in their systemic totality, the law, and legislation that correspond to them. Only an integrated qualitative and quantitative study of these social complexes will help to clarify the social nature, real purpose, and role of law and current legislation (Turow,2010).

The legal system can be recognized as closed relatively because it is determined by the socio-economic system as a whole, depends on it, and develops with it. But it's not only that. The legal system has intersystem and intersystem connections of both direct and reverse order; it consolidates economic, political, and social networks (and subsystems), acts on them through its generally binding regulatory and regulatory properties, and to a certain extent directs their movement, change, and development. These intersystem relations of the legal system also determine the nature of its intra-systemic ties, which are formed as a result of the determining influence of those systems on which, so to speak, the legal system is "superimposed." Since, further, internal and external relations of the legal system can be both homogeneous and heterogeneous, insofar as the problem arises of the correlation of their qualitative characteristics and quantitative changes (we proceed from the assumption that only comparable relations can be quantified). Let us dwell, at least briefly, on the question raised.

But only a quantitative analysis, abstracted from the qualitative essence of the legal system (and its components), does not have any significant scientific value. Only their integration in a systematic study of law and legislation gives a high coefficient of scientific effectiveness of cognition. At the same time, the leading link in this integration, as the historical experience of big science shows, belongs to the qualitative side, since the use of quantitative methods for studying legal systems is limited only to measuring the homogeneous connections of this system (Turow,2010).. Quantitative methods do not apply to those legal systems whose level of generality is abstracted from certain types of legal systems. In other words, universal legal systems (for example, the legal regulation system as a whole) precisely because of their universality and universality; they are applicable only with a limited degree of commonality of legal systems. At the same time, using quantitative methods, it is possible to detect the most significant factors of public life and determine the measures of the influence of each of them on legal processes. In these studies, as experience has already shown, statistical data should be used, diverse methods of quantitative expression of qualitative variables characterizing law-making and especially law-making activities, the construction of formal generalizations and modeling with the widespread use of mathematical apparatus, cybernetics, the theory of operations, queuing theory, game theory, etc.

The necessary integration of qualitative and quantitative methods of research into legal systems and existing legislation, law-enforcement activities is especially evident when using specific sociological and specific legal methods. It should be noted, however, that in recent years, among some sociologists and lawyers, it was not just an erroneous, but even an ill opinion, that these methods were acquiring almost fundamental significance in the development of science. Meanwhile, the empirical material collected and systematized with the help of these methods, for all its importance, is not yet of scientific significance, because it should still be comprehended at the level of rational generalization. Failure to understand this adversely affects the concrete sociological and specific legal methods themselves, primarily because it deprives them of an everyday methodological basis and a single conceptual core. As a result, they are often applied haphazardly, spontaneously, accidentally, and therefore lose any value to science.

The effectiveness of the quantitative approach to the knowledge of legal systems, legislation, and the practice of its implementation depends on the nature and nature of the object under study, on the tasks, goals, and aspects of the research itself. So, while a quantitative analysis in a given point of specific legal subsystems achieved some success, so far, no one has been able to obtain the same results using the same methods when studying the legal system as a whole. Some authors believe that the reason for this is the insufficient development of the quantitative techniques existing in the world (their "children's state"). But it is thought that even with the sufficient development of these methods, their use will not yield any severe results in the study of legal phenomena and processes, where mainly and above all, a qualitative analysis is necessary, Essential generalization of their substantial content nature. Moreover, in general, analytical jurisprudence, which is still waiting for its detailed development for various levels of research of legal systems, should be based on the general methodology of cognition of phenomena and processes. In such integration is the guarantee of her future scientific achievements.

The main property of any system, arising from its previous characteristics, is its integration, which, on the one hand, forms the quality of the system, and on the other hand, combines its components into an internally organized structure. The functioning nature of the legal system determines the methodological foundations of its study, which boil down to the need to study the activities of each component of this system. Besides, the study should reveal both the interaction between the individual components of the legal system (internal mechanism of communication) and the interaction of this system with the environment and other networks (an external device).

The uniformity of system components, their integration into a single structural and organizational integrity, relative independence, and autonomy of functioning, stability, and stability do not mean the invariance of the system. The system is dynamic; it is continuously developing due to its inherent internal and external contradictions. This implies the need for the study of the legal system to identify these contradictions, to find ways to resolve them.

Any system exists in a particular environment and for this environment. Therefore, the study of the legal system will be most comprehensive when considering the entire set of conditions determining its economic, social, and spiritual spheres of society and the inverse impact of the system on these areas of public life. The system has a core around which its components are integrated, integrated, and structured. This core also plays the role of a guiding, animating principle in the organization and functioning of the entire system and each of its components; under its influence, the coordination of the activity of the whole complex of system components is carried out, the development of each element and the entire system. Such a core of the legal system is the constitution, based on following and in fulfillment of which the legal regulation of public relations is carried out (should be implemented), all law-making and law-enforcement activities of the state.

Summing up the previous arguments, we note their conclusions: firstly, not every whole is a system, but any system is integral. There is no system without a whole that gives it unity; secondly, in a similar way, not every structure is systemic, but any system cannot but contain a structure. There is no system without a structure that, when removed, is included in the policy; thirdly, the same applies to functions. Not every functioning is systemic, but any system cannot be non-functioning. There is no system without functioning, which determines its dynamic development. The concept of a system, therefore, is more extensive, lavish, universal in comparison with the ideas of the whole, the general. Thus, definitions of the type "integral system," "structural system," "functioning system" are equally redundant, since both one and the other and the third (whole, structure, function) are inherent properties of the system. From this point of view, the use of these definitions in the present work could be avoided. Still, we deliberately made such use with the sole purpose of demonstrating the epistemological role of each of the main components of the concept of a system, their relationship, relationship, and interaction.
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