

ISSN: 0025-1569

MAN IN INDIA

Volume 97

Number 23

2017



Serials Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Publishers & Distributors

Man in India
© Serials Publications

ISSN: 0025-1569

Editor

R.M. Sarkar,
Kolkata, India

Amit Kumar Mishra
University of Hyderabad, India

Editorial Board

Brij Maharaj
University of KwaZulu-Natal, South
Africa

Pierre Gottschlich
University of Rostock, Germany

K. Laxmi Narayan
University of Hyderabad, India

Dr. Mihir Kumar Mallick
Professor and Head, School of
Education
Lovely Professional University,
Phagwara, Punjab, India

Jonathan Miles-Watson
University of Manchester, UK

Luighi Yao, LU,
Professor,
Department of Medicine,
McGill University,
845 Rue Sherbrooke O, Montréal, QC
H3A 0G4

Peter Seele
Institute for Advanced Study in the
Humanities, Germany

Dave Sangha
University of Northern British
Columbia, Canada

Abstracted/Indexed/Reviewed

Indexing and Reviews: Mathematical Reviews, MathSciNet, IndexCopernicus
Zentralblatt fur Mathematik, EBSCOhost, SCOPUS, Elsevier's bibliographic
database, Ei databases index, EMBASE, EMCare, CAP International, Indian
Sciences Abstract and Indian Citation Index (ICI).

SOCIOCULTURAL MEASUREMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL AND FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PUBLIC-POWER INTERACTIONS

Valentin Lyubashits^{*}, Alexey Mamychev^{**}, Galina Uvarova^{***}, Oleg Artyukhin^{****}
and Tatiyana Chapurko^{*****}

Abstract: The object of this research are power relations in the political process of modern society, and its object – institutional, functional and socio-cultural characteristics of publicly-imperious relations in the context of the state-legal organization of society. The authors substantiate the hypothesis that state power as a form of public authority has “its own” institutional-functional dimension that does not correspond with the functions of the state and structural-functional characteristics of the state apparatus. Special attention is paid to socio-cultural adequacy of the functioning of the government. The study used universal, General scientific and special methods. Among the General methods should highlight the systematic approach of dialectical materialist methodology, as well as the disposition method and the anthropological approach that apply to consideration of the phenomenon of public authority in the socio-cultural context. The paper argues that the study of power relations with modern society takes place in different registers of thoughts and contexts, however, in the framework of political and legal organization of society the key characteristics of public-government interaction are the institutional character and functionality. The latter are regarded as universal (generic) and specific (socio-cultural) perspectives. While it’s argued that the institutional character, functionality and socio-cultural adequacy are the key quality characteristics of the government. Their complex analysis allows to overcome the limitations of formal legal and structural-functional approaches to the interpretation of state power.

Keywords: Power, government, institution, politics, political process, political system, sotsiokulturnoj, society, modern society, functions.

INTRODUCTION

Power relations – is, above all, the relations between social agents. Of course, these relations can be involved (space, landscape, architecture and so on. (Lo, 2006; Mamychev, 2017), material (things, technologies, machines (Lo, 2015; Wachstein,

^{*} Doctor of Law, Professor, South Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia. *Email: kafedra_tgp@mail.ru*

^{**} Doctor of Political Science, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russia. *Email: mamychev@yandex.ru*

^{***} PhD, Professor, Department of Economics, Finance and environmental Sciences, associate Professor, Russian presidential Academy of national economy and state service under the RF President (Branch), Rostov-on-don, Russia. *Email: 2188799@mail.ru*

^{****} PhD, Associate professor, Department of political science and ethnic policy of the Russian Academy of national economy and state service under the RF President (Branch); associate Professor, Department of theory and history of state and law don state technical University, Rostov-on-don, Russia. *Email: oart1969@mail.ru*

^{*****} PhD, Professor, Department of philosophy and sociology of Krasnodar University of MIA of Russia, Krasnodar, Russia. *Email chapurko@mail.ru*

2017; Mol, 2015; Latour, 2012) objects, and the very powerful interaction takes place on a specific historical background (Mamychev, Lyubashits et. al., 2016) and specific socio-cultural contexts (Lyubashits et. al., 2015). At the same time within the framework of political and legal organization of society the key characteristics of the power are the institutional character of interaction and functionality.

For example, pre-revolutionary lawyer and philosopher of law Alekseev, pointed out that in the framework of state organization “state can be defined as the power ratio between the personalities. This element of power is one of the most common phenomena in between personal relations. Empirically we observe everywhere.” In this case, is realized in society, the power relations to a greater extent than any other, characterized by the institutionality and well-defined functionality, which are considered as inseparable and interrelated properties of the state: “forming a so-called institutions of the ruling, purchasing a reasonable, moral, and legal form” (Alekseev, 2008).

Therefore, if in some social Sciences is the rejection of the concepts of “subject” in favor of a more “free” and “neutral” categories – actor, aktant, etc. (Badiou, 2005), in the context of the state-legal organization of theoretical-conceptual and practical description of the political and legal process is in the “subjective-oriented methodology”. Indeed, in this context, the entity that implements public authority, is characterized by a clear institutional and legal design of their “positions of power” and a definite fixing of the functional nature of the “power of activity” in the legislative acts (Bourdieu, 2016).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

To explore public power, in particular, for example, the government should not only as a social and cultural phenomenon, but in the context of its institutional and legal organization. Consequently, political-legal section of the problem allows to describe adequately the institutional and functional characteristics of its functioning in the modern political process. So, according to the famous pre-revolutionary scholar Korkunov, “those for whom recognized the right of disposal of government, are the bodies (i.e. are not perceived as individuals but rather as representatives of impersonal institutions, authorities - ed.) power; by these organs of action are the functions of the government” (Korkunov, 2003). In modern studies do they say about supernatural the nature of the government, this “supernatural power to a much greater extent than other forms of power, that is, institutional power” (Gomerov, 2002); it “is an organization of organizations” and “institutional organization of institutions” (Nort, 1997).

Let us analyze this aspect of institutionalism, functionality and socio-cultural how leading qualitative characteristics of public power on the example of the power of the state, as one of the types that a generic category.

THE MAIN PART

In the context of the evolution of political organization of society from the early city States to modern political organizations – interpretation of the essence of state power, its forms and content have been considered through the institutional and functional characteristics, predominantly as impersonal or, rather, supra-beginning. In this case, you should make one important theoretical and methodological remark is about the fact that even in a Patriarchal, theocratic and monarchical concept of power, where the personal aspect is given the highest value, the state power was interpreted in the superpersonal, the institutional plan.

It is important not to equate the power of the father, the priest, the priest, the monarch with the actual political control of the government, which was endowed with any of the above, in its essence and substance do not coincide with the understanding of power that is being implemented in government. It is no coincidence that one of the fundamental attributes of state power are the publicity and specialization. We know for example that in the early organizations of state power is executed through the separation from society, turning it into relatively independent (the level of which, i.e. the boundaries of this autonomy, every era is different, determined by specific historical and socio-normative regulators, values, goals, objectives, etc.) the public apparatus (the Institute) management, which is functionally specialize only on the regulation of social processes (Mamychev, Lyubashits et. al., 2016).

Fair in the plan notes V. Ya. Lyubashits that as a “marker” of these boundaries in the evolutionary stages is the code change normative structures. It is a kind of institutionalized codes of normative order defining the limits of functioning of state power and control. And the change of social functions leads to the modification of these regulatory codes, and the functions of state power, ultimately “to the modification or emergence of a new political and legal regime. Political and legal regimes, thereby conceptualizers through social functions” (Lyubashits et. al., 2016).

In turn, consideration of the institutional and functional characteristics of state power has both theoretical and obvious practical value, since the latter not only clarify, elaborate on social identity, role and purpose of state power, the nature of the mechanism of the state system (organs and structures), but also reflect its diverse directions and priorities of functioning and diverse activities. However, it should be a number of important theoretical and methodological comments.

First, the Institute and the function of intrinsically *vzaimodopolnjajut* each other. And the Institute, as a standardized and sustainable socio-cultural form of human interaction in various spheres (political, legal, economic, spiritual, etc.), always associated with the implementation of a certain “vital functions” (B. Malinowski).

In this respect the Institute and, in particular, certain government institutions, are interpreted in terms of a “broad approach”, developed in studies of the so-called

neo-institutional direction (or new institutionalism) analysis of the political process. In this context, the Institute is not only a formal and stable rules, procedures and norms, but the latter is perceived as symbolic systems, cognitive scripts and moral specimens (for example, public communication of the individual, society, state) that reproduce the “framework values” that control mental activity of a person, their interaction (Hall & Taylor, 1996).

Therefore, from the point of view of the famous Explorer R. Merton, the analysis of functions and institutions should be a “common system process” because any society is institutionally and functionally unified. In a public-power measurement function must be considered as part of a single system of functions in a certain institutional public organization of society, outside of the system and organization “the concept of a function has no real meaning” (Merton, 2006).

Therefore, the existing functions and implement their institutions are vital and mandatory for public systems because “if they are not met, the society will not be saved” (Merton, 2006). To paraphrase Merton, we can say that the institutional character and functionality of public authority is a necessary indication of its existence and the indispensable conditions of its functioning in society. Therefore, the institutional character and functionality of public authority – those socio-cultural and politico-legal form that is necessary for its “social representations”.

Secondly, in the political, legal and sociological theories of the functions of state power as the current generally is not analyzed, since the problem of public authority, generally regarded as a variety of question forms and activities of the state. Only occasionally, the researchers analyzing the essence of state power and its operation, I put the question: “is there a need to allocate the functions of government, as long-established the concept of state functions?” (Vitchenko, 1982).

In most cases, of course, the question is decided in favor of the identification of government functions and state functions. In rare cases, asserted the opposite, namely, that state power is reflected in its inherent functions, which are not the same, content different from the functions of the state (Grigoryan, 1969). From our point of view, the question should be different: initially we should not focus on the difference between functions of state power and the state. It seems, rather start the analysis by considering the functional properties (as certain quality characteristics of the phenomenon) the last, and it is clear that the functional characteristics of state power and state are not the same, in substance and amount (which will be discussed more fully below).

Another aspect of the problems is that the study of modern state organization is not possible without socio-cultural aspect. About this dimension of public power relations in the recently published quite a lot of research (Soloviev, 2006). However, remains problematic relationship to the institutional and functional characteristics of public power, with its socio-cultural dimension.

So, from the perspective of socio-cultural theoretical and conceptual installation political thinking is grounded close “bundle” of institutional and functional characteristics of public authorities with the socio-cultural conditions and structural-procedural aspects of public interaction.

This aspect of the nature and functions of government institutions are closely associated with the socio-cultural experiences, normative value model of a particular society, the specifics and the nature of social interaction. Thus it is proved that its operation is directly related to the conditions and social context that contribute to the institutionalization of a particular modality of power relations, the specific configuration of public-legal institutions and system of social representations about them, requirements and expectations from the operation of the latter. All this together creates a certain cultural text of the era within which “read”, is an evolving institutional and power practice.

So, the functions of power, particularly state power, for Parsons related to the fact that it is a generalized ability that is supported by existing institutions (expressing a collective purpose, interests, needs), which is to “make members of team perform their obligations, legitimized significance for the purposes of the team, and allowing the possibility of coercion of the shrew through the application of negative sanctions, whoever were the actors of this operation” (Parsons, 1997).

Here the essence of both the government and its institutional configuration, and functional areas associated with social relations that are the sources of all the institutions, their functions implemented in society, as well as acting factors in the evolutionary dynamics of the institutional organization of society. For example, from the position in the sociological variant understanding of the power and operation of the organizing and the implementing of its public institutions directly associated with the social relations which:

- remove the traditional power of the problem (e.g., what classes are in power, who rules whom, as to limit the power of certain entities, etc.), “in the sociological version of the power is produced and acts in social relationships... it’s the problems of class and power evaporate” (Terrebonne, 2003);
- focus on resource sharing and permanent redistribution, the quality of power relations, etc. For example, scientists J. Buchanan and D. Tullok in this context indicate that “this approach incorporates political activity as a specific form of social exchange... a mutual benefit for all parties presumably derives from collective relations. So in a very real sense, political action is a tool that allows you to increase the power of all parties if we define power as the ability to manage things desirable for man” (Buchanan & Tullok, 1962).

So, the political sociologist P. Bourdieu, in contrast to the traditional principle of political thinking, not more interested in the subject of power relations as an

element of a particular institutional structure, and the conditions and institutional practices that determine its actions. As a rule, in the traditional approach, the researcher stands in an objective position by interpreting and commenting on the subject as a particle (element) of the structure by abstracting it from social action and denying at the level of the generalized analysis of the cognitive activity and the role of random fluctuations in its activities. From Bourdieu, the social actor acts as deliberately acting within a certain social field, subject to specific institutional rules and social power strategies.

Such a social disposition (*habitus*) of the actors in a particular field sociomental structures allows to classify and to produce a specific power practices. This involvement in the political discourse, on the one hand, contributes to the process of successful political socialization, and also creates the opportunity for effective action and decision-making. With these positions in the implementation of public power, according to his statement, mostly used “official act of nomination”, i.e. “an act of symbolic suggestion, which has the full force of the collective, the power of consensus, of common sense, because it was made through an agent of the state, the monopoly on legitimate symbolic violence” (Bourdieu, 1993).

From the point of view of P. Berger and T. Lukman, the functional characteristics of public power is not only to maintain a certain social order and the prevailing institutional structure of society, but, mainly, provision of power through the institutions of the intersubjective social world, with its inherent “objective”/“recognised” body of knowledge. The role of the latter is due to the fact that the “reality of everyday life contains a scheme for classification, the language of which it is possible to understand others and communicate with them in situations of face-to-face... Our interaction face-to-face will be ordered these typing “.

Any institution that provides social order, according to the researchers, it is mental activity of people, it is the source of the development of various social institutions and social factors in their Genesis: “Every human activity is habituation. Any action which is often repeated becomes a pattern, it may subsequently be reproduced with an economy of effort and, ipso facto, understood as a sample of the executor of his... Institutionalization takes place everywhere, where is a reciprocal typification usual action figures of a different sort, in other words, any such typification is an institution”. From this perspective, any political institution, political order in General are always historical and unique, formed in specific socio-culturally, and functionally defined by precisely these terms: “Institutions always have a history, which they are. It is impossible to adequately understand the institution, not understanding the historical process in which it was created. In addition, institutions have due to the fact of their existence control human behavior by setting predefined samples that give the behavior of one of the many theoretically possible directions.”

Data of theoretical and methodological installations are the basis and political vision of John Gray, who argues that the project of the construction of political society is not simply a set of effective principles, tools and institutions, claiming a rationally organized order relations, but, above all, holistic lifestyle. So from his point of view can not exist a single, suitable for all ideal-typical models of political, public, economic and social institutions capable of organizing an effective and stable manner: "There is a variety of historical forms, each of which is rooted in the fertile soil of culture inherent in a specific community". And, therefore, institutions "do not reflect the national culture, or inconsistent with it can be neither legitimate nor stable: they either change, or be rejected by people with whom they are imposed" (Gray, 2003). In other words, the stability and legitimacy of political and public institutions will depend on how these forms of organization and the results of their functioning remain ethically, culturally and economically acceptable to the General population.

In addition, in the framework of the sociocultural dimension of the institutional and functional characteristics of public authority proves that the "content" publicly-imperious relations and their institutionalization in specific political structures that determine the process of state control depend on the type of society, based on concrete historical specificity of socio-economic relations.

In this aspect, "power in society, of course, should be studied not only from the point of view of nonspecific, naturalized power of organized elites, but also from the point of view of the organization's forms, especially the forms of work organization, which varies according to the type and scope of domination and independence, but the Marxist emphasis on exploitation and class associated with the consideration of the authorities only in the General sense of the last... The definition of power, in terms of responsibility, choice and consent and the distinction between the fate, coercion, authority, manipulation, and power inherent in the subjectivist discourse and, as such, lie beyond the strictly Marxist analysis. The latter does not begin "from the point of view of the acting person", but from the point of view of the unfolding of social processes" (Terrebonne, 2003).

It is important that not only structure in which a certain configuration of power and institutions functional orientation, but also the processes of reproduction of power relations in society. For example, a well-known researcher of the nature of power and power relations S. Lukes for this reason remarks that "the capitalist process of production, considered in a General context or as a process of reproduction, produces not only commodities, not only surplus value, it produces and reproduces the capitalist relation itself" (Lukes, 2010).

In other words, the functional responsibilities of government institutions, as the special structure created by this system of socio-economic relations, includes the

production and reproduction of public relations, the maintenance of certain forms of domination and the type of public-legal organizations.

In this political setting, a research practice focusing on the analysis of the institutional and functional characteristics of state authority, related to such issues as: “what kind of society, what fundamental relations reproduced? What are the mechanisms? What is the role of structure and action (or inaction) of the state (or local authorities) in the process of reproduction - how do they contribute to him, just make it possible or prevent it? Fertility analysis provides the opportunity to answer the question about how linked in society, the manifestations of power, even if there is no deliberate interpersonal communication... the fact of the reproduction of particular forms of exploitation and domination is a Testament to the class of the Board and an important aspect of power in society” (Terrebonne, 2003).

The core problem in addressing the institutional and functional characteristics of state power are the issues of state influence on the production and reproduction of certain types of power relations and forms of public power organization. Since the state structure of the mechanisms that (re)production of get formalized and normative support, the rule of one class, elite groups, etc. is carried out through government institutions. And the conviction of Terrebonne in this approach the main outcome of the research practice is to develop the typology of state intervention and the typology of state structures to ensure that the reproduction of relations and type of organization (Terrebonne, 2003).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we note that the analysis of institutional and functional characteristics of state power has obvious theoretical and practical value because they not only clarify, elaborate on social identity, role and purpose of the given kind of public authority, nature of operation mechanism of the state system (organs and structures), but also reflect its diverse directions and priorities of functioning and diverse activities. In addition, the Institute and the function of the inseparable, mutually determine each other, and the institutional character and functionality of state authority is a necessary indication of its existence and a precondition for its functioning in the political process due to socio-cultural and legal-political forms. As a private problem that requires a separate study above, it was identified that the functions of the government, as such, generally are not analyzed, because the issue of the latter's functions, usually considered in the aspect of the forms and activities of the Institute of the state (i.e. state functions). However, the institutional and functional properties (how certain qualitative characteristics of the phenomenon), public authorities do not coincide in content with the functions of the state.

Acknowledgement

This work was done under the financial grant of the President of the Russian Federation for the state support of young Russian scientists-doctors of Sciences No. MD-6669.2016.6.

References

- Alekseev, N.N. (2008). *Essays on the General theory of the state. Basic premises and hypotheses of the state of science*. Moscow.
- Badiou, A. (2005). *Meta/Politics: is it possible to think politics? A brief treatise on metapolitics*. Moscow: Logos.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology of a policy*. Moscow.
- Bourdieu, P. (2016). *About the state: the course of lecci at the Collège de France (1989-1992)*. Moscow.
- Buchanan, J. & Tullock, G. (1962). *The Calculus of Consent*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
- Gomerov, I. N. (2002). *The state and state power*. Moscow: UCEA.
- Gray, J. (2003). *The Wake of the enlightenment: politics and culture in the twilight of modernity*. Moscow.
- Grigoryan, L. A. (1969). Socialist state power and representative form of implementation. *Soviet state and law*, 3, pp. 89-90.
- Hall, P. & Taylor, R. (1996). Political science and three new institutionalisms. *Political studies*, 44, p. 947
- Korkunov, N. M. (2003). *Lectures on the General theory of law*. St. Petersburg.
- Latour, B. (2012). The politics of explanation: an alternative. *Sociology of power*, 8, pp. 113-143.
- Lo, J. (2006). The objects and the space. *Sociological review*, 5 (1), pp.30-42.
- Lo, J. (2015). *After method: mess and social science*. Moscow.
- Lukes, S. (2010). *Power: Radical view*. Moscow: Higher school of Economics.
- Lyubashits, V., Mamychev, A., Mordovcev, A. & Vronskay, M. (2015). The social-cultural paradigm of state authority. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(36), pp. 301-306.
- Lyubashits, V., Mamychev, A., Mamycheva, D. & Vronskaya, M. (2016) The northern caucasus in the 21st century: Sociocultural and political-economic viability of Russia's state sovereignty. *Central Asia and the Caucasus*, 17(3), pp. 14-22.
- Mamychev, A. (2017). "Post-disciplinary discourse" of archetypal research: statement of the problem. Territory of new opportunities. *Bulletin of the Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service*, pp. 18-25.
- Mamychev, A.Y., Lyubashits, V.Y., Shalyapin, S.O. & Filippova, M.K. (2016). Prognostic problems of the public and power organization of the Russian society: Archetypes and sociocultural basis of functioning and development. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6(S6), pp. 85-89.
- Merton, R. (2006). *Social theory and social structure*. Moscow, pp. 120-123.
- Mol, A. (2015). Multiple the body. *Sociology of power*, 1, pp. 232-247.
- Nort, D. (1997). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Moscow.

- Parsons, T. (1997). About the concept of “political power”. *Anthology of world political thought*, Vol. 2. Moscow.
- Soloviev, A.I. (2006) *Political science: Political theory, political technologies*. Moscow: Aspect Press, pp. 31-50.
- Terrebonne, G. (2003). What makes the ruling class. When he ruled? Some reflections on different approaches to the study of power in society. *Logos*, 6, pp. 76-84.
- Vitchenko, A.M. (1982). *Theoretical problems in the study of state power*. Saratov, Moscow.
- Wachstein, V. (2017). *Rebuilding of everyday life: drones, lifts and project PkM-1*. Moscow: Logos.