

## THE PHENOMENON OF POWER IN PHILOSOPHY OF

**M. FOUCAULT, N. LUHMANN AND E. GIDDENS**

**ZEKRIST RIDA**

Candidate of Philosophic Science, Research Scholar & Professor, Department of the Humanities, Kostanay Social - Technical University Named after Academician Zulkharnay Aldamzhar, Kostanay, Republic of Kazakhstan

### ABSTRACT

There are many points of view on various aspects of the phenomenon of power and a certain unity in the scientific positions is observed. There is the problem of phenomenon of power from the standpoint of a critical analysis of the concept of power presented by philosophers. However, without the support of these concepts is not possible to develop an optimum concept of power today. Consideration of the main interpretations of power as a social phenomenon it possible to determine their heuristic possibilities. Also it is considered the question of the typology of power.

In the aim of effective critical analysis of the basic concepts of power which are developed in the history of philosophy, the author seeks to determine the optimum of their typology, to disclose the nature and typology of power presented concepts to hold their critical analysis.

The article also analyzes the major types of concepts of power and installation of their theoretical relevance.

At the end, the interpretation of power as a social phenomenon, according to the author of the article is correct. However, this does not mean that by doing all the authors that stand in this position right. Each of them in varying degrees, in certain respects is irrelevant.

**KEYWORDS:** Power, Micro Powers, "Will To Truth", Knowledge, Discourse Power, Work, Communication

### INTRODUCTION

The concept of power developed a lot of power, and despite of the fact that almost every grain of truth can be found, they often are difficult to reconcile with each other on a number of parameters. Meanwhile, it need, if not totally common, at least for the main common points on the basic parameters of the concept of power. The absence of such a concept prevents the development of a number of problems of social philosophy, which directly or indirectly in contact with the problem of power. The problem of power is significant for the history of philosophy, philosophical anthropology, philosophy of politics, philosophy, law and others. Philosophy is intended to serve ideological and methodological basis for a number of specific scientific disciplines for which the problem of power is perhaps the central one. Such law science , political science, sociology, social psychology, and others. The lack of good-quality conventional concept of power at the level of the social philosophy of science doom listed on all sorts of errors and even mistakes. After all, the relation of social philosophy and individual sciences is the ratio of general and special. The social philosophy develops problems at the level of universal power, and political science, sociology, and so on. it should be developed it to the level of features in

accordance with the specifics of their subject areas.

The practical aspect of the relevance of this topic is due, above all, contemporary socio-economic, political and general cultural situation. The crisis, as it is known, swept the economy and politics, and socio-cultural sphere. Of course, he also touched upon the political power, which was intended to overcome not only their own crisis, but also to organize its operation, it has contributed to the gradual overcoming of all other crises. Problems in authorities in the sphere of power relations at all levels of public and state the body retain its relevance. These problems - not the kind that can be solved on the basis of a simple experience and common sense media power. Their decision must be based on adequate, sufficient to substantiate the theory of power.

It should be noted that the interest of philosophers, political scientists, sociologists to the problem of power in the post-Soviet time, in comparison with the soviet period, has increased significantly. But many authors have the lack of the ideological and methodological culture studies. The well-known researcher of the phenomenon of power V.G. Ledyayev quite reasonably says: "the power has become fashionable to understand anything, and it is not only in journalism and propaganda articles, but also in serious theoretical works" (VG Ledyayev). In this context the problem arises, to critically analyze the basic concepts of power, to discover the essence of this phenomenon, to develop the concept of power, which could become the theoretical basis for the practical implementation of the government to those who authorized it. This is therefore a practical aspect of the topic of this work.

The methodological base of research in this research as a major dialectical methodology applied in the form in which it was developed in the Hegelian tradition. The most involved were principles such as the principle of specificity, the principle of historicism, the principle of determinism, the principle of integrity, the principle of development, etc., as well as the category of part and whole, essence and appearance, form and content, universal and the particular, and others. In addition, a applied the comparative method.

The concept of man and society were very important which are developed by K. Marx, G.S. Batishchev, V.E. Kemerov and his school. A very important role was played those works, which in varying forms and degrees, directly or indirectly held the distinction of globalization and globalism. It was works of A.B. Weber (Weber, 1990), A.A. Galkin (Galkin, 2002), J. D. Granik (Granik, 2008), G.A. Zyuganov (Zyuganov, 2002) K. M. Cantor (Cantor, 2006), and O.V. Nechiporenko A.N. Nysanbayeva (Nechiporenko and Nysanbaev 2006), A.S. Panarin (Panarin, 2000), R.S. Sartayeva (Sartayeva2006), A.A. Khamidov (Khamidov, 2005). Substantial assistance has had the concept of alienation, developed by Karl Marx (Marx, 1956) and has found some specification in the works of G.S. Batishchev (Batishchev, 1969), H. Marcuse (Marcuse, 2011), A.P. Ogurtsov (Ogurtsov, 2001), E. Fromm (Fromm, 1992), A.A. Khamidov (Khamidov, 1989).

A literature review on the topic of research In the twentieth century and the coming of XXI century in western philosophy and problems of the state government, paid and continue (of course, now living) paid to researchers such as Avtorkhanov A. (Avtorkhanov, 1983), Alexander J. (Alexander, 2009), Arendt H. (Arendt, 1992), Aron R. (Aron, 1984), Baechler, J (Baechler, J., 1978), Bauman, Z (Bauman, 1997), Burbach R. (Burbach and Robinson, 1999), Bourdieu P. (Bourdieu, 2002), Deleuze G., Guattari F. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987), Clark, I. (Clark, 1997), Cox, R. (Cox, 1996), Hirst, P., Thompson G. (Hirst and Thompson, 1995), Kaufmann, F.-X. (Kaufmann, 1998), Kiely, R. (Kiely, 1998), Lafonten, O., Müller, Ch. (Lafonten and Müller, 1998), Lasarus, N. (Lasarus, 1999), Marshall, D. (Marshall, 1996), Moosmüller, A. (Moosmüller, 1998), Naudet, J.-L. (Naudet, 1998), Navarro, V. (Navarro, 1998), Ohmae, K. (Ohmae, 1995), Nuscheler, F.,

Perrot, E. (Perrot, 1996), Reinicke, WH (Reinicke, 1997) Rieger, E., Leibfried, S. (Rieger and Leibfried, 1998), Robertson, R., Knondker, H. (Robertson and Knondker, 1998), Schwartzman, KC (Schwartzman, 1998), Stryker, R. (Stryker, 1998), Valaskakis, K. (Valaskakis, 1998), Waters, M. (Waters, 1996), Wrong, DH (Wrong, 1979) [1-32].

It is investigated intensively various issues of power in post-Soviet social philosophy. Firstly such authors as K.A. Abishev, V.N. Abramov, A.R. Aitbaeva, V.M. Adrov, S.A. Baybakov, S.Y. Barsukova, G.A. Beisenova, G.A. Belova, I.O. Belogradov, S.M. Borbasov, A.P. Butenko, A. Gazitski, I.A. Gobozov, V.G. Gravskiy, S. Gurin, V.A. Gusev, A.A. Degtyarev, V.V. Dementiev, A.I. Demidov, A.M. Elemanova, A.M. Yerzhanova, S.E. Zhusupov, A.G. Zdravomyslov, B.I. Zelenko, Z.M. Zotova, A.T. Zub and I.G. Lvov, A.B. Zubov, K.A. Zuev, O.I. Ivanov, A.N. Ilyin, V.V. Ilyin, M.V. Ilyin and A.Y. Melville, I.A. Isaev, A.Z. Kamalidenova, V.K. Kantor, N.B. Kirillova, S.A. Korolev, V.V. Kramnik, B.I. Krasnov, E.S. Kurbanov, N.Y. Lapin, V.G. Ledyae, O.M. Ledyayeva, L.V. Leskov, E.A. Markov, W. Matz, Y.F. Melnikov, V.V. Menshikov, V.I. Mitrokhin, N.V. Naumov, E.V. Osipov, S.P. Peregoudov, O.V. Plotnikova, V.A. Podoroga, A.V. Popov, E.G. Prilukova, G.V. Pushkarev, N.L. Rogalina, N.S. Rozov, N.A. Romanovich, A. Sagikyzy, P.A. Saprionov, Z.N. Sarsenbayev, P.A. Svoik, N.S. Semenov, T.N. Semenova, K.S. Serdobintsev, V.A. Sokolov, R.I. Sokolova, A.I. Solovyov, V.A. Spiridonova, D.B. Tev, V.I. Tymoshenko, G.A. Tosunyan and A.Y. Vikulin A.V. Truhan, A.B. Franz, V.F. Khalipov, A.A. Khamidov, E.M. Kharitonov, R.A. Homeleva, F.V. Tsann-kai-si, S.V. Tsirel, A.E. Chirikova, E.B. Shestopal, V.D. Shinkarenko, Y. A. Shetinov and others.

It is studied intensively the various problems of the state and the authorities in post-Soviet social philosophy, political philosophy and political science. It is, first of all, authors such as K.A. Abishev (Abishev, 1996), V.N. Abramov (Abramov, 1992), S.A. Baybakov, S.Y. Barsukova, G.A. Belov (Belov, 1992), I.O. Belogradov (Belogradov 1992), A. Gazitski (Gazitski, 1992), V.G. Grafskiy (Grafskiy, 1992), V.A. Gusev (Gusev, 1992), A.A. Degtyarev (Degtyarev, 1996), S.E. Zhusupov, Ivanov V.G., A. G. Zdravomyslov (Zdravomyslov, 1996), Z.M. Zotova (Zotova, 2001), M.V. Ilyin and A. J. Melville (Melville and Ilyin, 1997), V.K. Kantor (Kantor, 2006), V.G. Ledyae (Ledyae 2012), P.A. Saprionov (Saprionov, 2011), Slizovsky D.E, V.F Khalipov (Khalipov 1995), A.A. Khamidov (Khamidov, 2005), F.V. Tsann-kai-si (Tsann-kai-si , 2011).

If we turn to the problematic lines, which in the twentieth century and the coming XXI century the power is investigated, under the theme of this study can be noted. The problem is the essence of power and its aspect is developed in the works of R.G. Abdulatipov A. Aytorhanov, V.N. Amelin, A.G. Anikevich, M.I. Baytin, Y.M. Baturin, A.A. Bezuglov, G.A. Belov, I.O. Belogradov, R. Bershtedta, T. Ball, F.M. Burlatskiy, E. Wiatr, A.A. Galkin, V. Gelman, E. Giddens, L.Y. Gozman, S.V. Golubev, S. Gurin, V.S. Gusev, R.A. Dal, A.I. Demidov, A.M. Elemanovoy, J.G. Yershov, B. de Jouvenel, A.G. Zdravomyslov, E.A. Zeletdinov, Z.M. Zotov V.V. Ilyin, I.A. Ilyin, I.A. Isaev, V.M. Kaytukov, E. Canetti, M.K. Kapustin, N.M. Keyzerova, K. Clark, T.N. Clark V.V. Kramnik, E.S. Kurbanov, V.G. Ledjaeva, O.M. Ledyayeva, N. Luhmann, D. Mechnick, R. Mills, N. I. Osadchiy, A.S. Panarin, T. Parsons, K.P. Petrov, V.A. Podoroga, G.V. Pushkarev, E.E. Rahova, W. Ricoeur, H. Simon, P.A. Saprionov, V.V. Skorobogatskiy, Y. A. Tikhomirov, O. Toffler, E. Toffler, A.V. Truhan, D.H. Urong, G.G. Filippov, M. Foucault, V.F. Halipov, O.V. Shaburova, V.S. Shevtsov, V.D. Shinkarenko, A.M. Etkind, and others. But, despite the fact that so many authors are paying special attention to the problem of the spirit of power, of a unity of views is not observed. Power is interpreted by some as domination by others - as a manifestation of the will, and others - as the management, the fourth - as a kind of causal relationship, and so on.

The next important problem is a problem of power structure. Here, however, the research is not very much. It should be called such works as V.N. Amelin, N. Bobbio, K.E. Boulding, E. Wiatr, A. Kojeve, I.I. Kravchenko, L.T. Krivushina, K.T. Petrova. And in this thing there is no unity among researchers. The essential problem is the typology of power. Such authors as T.A. Alekseeva, L.S. Vasiliev, M.N. Keyzerova, A.I. Kim, A. Kojeve, N.A. Komlev, I.I. Kravchenko, H. Lassuel and E. Keplena, V.G. Ledjaeva, O.M. Ledyayeva, B.M. Makarov, V.V. Menshikov, N.I. Osadchiy, T. Parsons, G.B. Pushkarev, V.L. Usachev, V.F. Halipova, S.V. Tsirel and others. It should be noted that some authors pay attention to the typology of the concepts of power. They are T.A. Alekseeva, A.A. Degtyarev, A. Kojeve, V.G. Ledyayev, V.F. Khalipov. For our theme this issue is very important: after a critical analysis of the basic concepts of power is more convenient to grouping them into common types. But these authors have different typology. Of course, these problems are not confined to the study of power.

We will not consider the concept of listed and turn to the problem of power, understood from the perspective of the global challenges of our time. Consider the problem from the standpoint of power critical analysis of the concepts of power Foucault, Luhmann and Giddens. Based on these concepts, in which power is treated as a social phenomenon, in our opinion, it is possible to develop today the best understanding of the nature of power.

### **The Results of Research and Discussion of Results**

Subject of research is the essence of the concepts of power in M. Foucault, N. Luhmann and E. Giddens.

The purpose of research is to determine the nature of the research field of the phenomenon of power through a critical analysis of the concepts of power.

To achieve these aims there are some theoretical problems.

The objectives of the study.

- For the purpose of effective critical analysis of the basic concepts of power developed in the history of philosophy, to determine the optimum of their typology.
- To analyze the main types of concepts of power and to establish their theoretical relevance.
- To disclose the nature and typology of power presented concepts to hold their critical analysis.

The concepts, in which power is treated as a purely social phenomenon, it is a phenomenon whose existence is limited to within the community, are highly heterogeneous. We offer this type highlight the following two subtypes: 1) The first should be referred to the first concept in which power is treated as a universal social or totally-social phenomenon; 2) The second subtype should include those concepts, according to which the local authority is treated as a social phenomenon, it is a special social phenomenon that exists along with other social phenomena.

We begin our critical analysis of the first subtype. We will analyze this sub-type material on the philosophy of Michel Foucault. In an interview with the Japanese S. Hashum, held in October 1977, he said, looking back on his creative path traversed, the beginning of which he refers to in 1955, said: "... The real challenge for me to see the solution of which, incidentally, now it is a matter for the whole world, namely the question of power "[33, p. 280]. At the time, he said, the issue, so to speak, "was in the air." Some people realize it's more, others less. In all his works, he, according to him, and put it solved the problem of power. "I would say - he says - that even" Words and things "under his literary appearance, under

his own, if you will, purely speculative guise perform the same task, namely the task of establishing various mechanisms of power that exist within scientific discourse : what rule in certain times, people must obey when willing to develop scientific discourse about life, about the natural history of political economy? What you need to submit, any compulsion to obey and how, moving from one discourse to another, from one sample to another, producing different effects of power? But then the whole relationship of knowledge and power, as long as the mechanisms of power play a major role, in fact, is the essence of what I wanted to do ... "[33, p. 282-283]. Therefore, in the work of Michel Foucault and the topic is the problem of power - not just accompanied by other problems, but it is the leitmotif of all this creativity and different pose and solve all the works according to that topic, which they are dedicated. In a lecture at the Franco-Japanese Institute of Kansai in Kyoto in April 1978 Foucault said: "... My studies are turning to techniques and technologies of power. They focus on the study of how power dominates and forces himself to obey "[34, p. 319].

He argues that none of the concepts developed in the course of the history of philosophy, did not give the correct answer to the question about the nature of power and the mechanisms of its implementation. It is suited neither conceptual system or methodology. The phenomenon of power, says Foucault, is very complex, "had neither Marx nor Freud to help us to know that such a mysterious thing, both visible and invisible, present and hidden, invested elsewhere, which we call the power" [35, p . 75].

What is the Foucault sees the reason for failure of all previous conceptions of power? It is, in his opinion, is that until now the phenomenon of power identified and inertia continue to identify with the state and its institutions - the army, the police, the judicial proceedings, and so on.. In this context, the theory of the state and could not qualify for the to cover the phenomenon of power in its entirety. It is also limited in this aspect are the various kinds of research, and social institutions. Power, and most importantly - its nature and mechanisms of the escape in such cases the researcher. Therefore, all teaching, according to which power as such in the hands of the government, which exercises it through the institutions subordinated to him, according to Foucault, is entirely untenable. Political power is only one form of government, but in the meantime it is in the general consciousness of the people is perceived as an authority in general. At the same time the people and did not realize that this power is exercised not only by the well-known social institutions, but also - and this, according to Foucault, the essence - and even through a variety of institutions that, at first glance, have nothing to do with it [36, p. 119-120]. They include education and training institutions, prisons, medical institutions, especially psychiatric hospitals, and so on. D. Each of them, on the basis of their very nature, uses its own methods and its own technology, the exercise of power. But they are all equally involved in maintaining the existing political power. Besides, says Foucault, this power penetrates into society far deeper than people realize that.

But the power, according to Foucault, is not reducible to state power. In fact, he says, "there are relations of power (this is something, in spite of everything, we know, but it does not always draw conclusions) and pass through a number of other things. After all, there are relations of power between men and women, between those who know and those who do not know, between parents and children within the family. In society, there are thousands and thousands of different power relations ... "[33, p. 289]; "Relations of power embroiled in other types of relationships (production, marriage, family, sex), where they play at the same time defining the role ..." [37, p. 313]. In an interview with G. Deleuze, in March 1972, Foucault said that in its purest form, in its naked nakedness power exists in prison [35, p. 71-72]. It is unreasonable in this regard, he said, to say that, for example, the power relations between the sexes, between the sick and the healthy, between

knowledgeable and ignorant, and so on. D. Emanate from public authorities. They are independent of it. Rather the opposite: government relies on them. Foucault writes that around each individual there is "a whole bunch of power relations", which he related to his parents, from his employer, and so on. D. [33, p. 289]. In this regard, pointless, says Foucault, trying to change the state power, limiting the change of government and certain social institutions by which this power is exercised by themselves. Change is necessary that system micropowers ("net power relations", according to the characteristic of Foucault), upon which this government. Power is omnipresent, because it is anywhere produces and reproduces itself. "The authorities everywhere not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere" [38, p. 193].

The power, especially the state, is usually associated with violent suppression, and is assessed as totally negative phenomenon. If that were the case, says Foucault, it would be something very fragile and weak. But we see that it is strong, it is quite well, and this is because, in addition to the negative, it produces positive action, so that has a support level micropowers.

Foucault offers his definition of power in the "will to truth: the other side of knowledge, power and sexuality." Here, he first determines what he does not consider the power, and then what it is, in his opinion, is. He writes: "Power is not what I call" power "as a set of institutions and devices that ensure the subordination of citizens in any country. Under the rule, I do not mean this as a way of submission, as opposed to violence that would shape the rules. Finally, I do not mean the generalized system of domination by one element (or group) over another, the rule, the results of action is through a series of successive branches have permeated all social body. The analysis in terms of power should not be postulated as the source data sovereignty of the state, the shape of a law or a rule of embracing unity; likely in contrast, is only terminal forms such an analysis. Under the rule, I think it should be understood first of all, a plurality of power relations that are immanent to the area where they are implemented, and that constitutive for its organization; understand the game, which by incessant battles and clashes of their transforms, strengthens and inverts; to understand the support that these relationships are forces in each other so as to form a chain or a system or, on the contrary, to understand the bias and inconsistencies that they marginalize each other; Finally, under the authority of the strategy should be understood within which these relations reach their power efficiency, the strategy, the general outline or institutional crystallization of which are embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the forms of social domination" [38, p. 191-192].

According to Foucault, the "power - this is not an institution or a structure, not some definite power that someone would be endowed with: a name that gives a complex strategic situation in a given society" [6, p. 193]. Usually it refers to the "powers that be", the "seizure of power" on the "transfer of power" and so on. N. According to the Foucault's "power is not something that is acquired, breaks or divided, something that is held or missing; power is exercised from innumerable points, and the game moving relations of inequality ... "[38, p. 194]; "No one is its owner, but nevertheless it is always carried out in a certain direction, when some are on one side, and the other - on the other, and we do not know who has, but we know who hasn't "[35, p. 76].

What are inherently power relations? According to Foucault, "power relations are relations of power, the opposition ..." [33, p. 290]. Individual attitude of the authorities, therefore, is a kind of attitude, which are the two sides, or two poles: the pole of force application and a pole of opposition, resistance, counteract the force. The poles thus are at a disadvantage. The ratio of power, therefore, is the intensity of the dynamic attitude. Foucault emphasizes that "power

relations are relations of power, the opposition and, therefore, they are always reversible. And there is no power relations that have prevailed fully and domination which would be irreversible "[33, p. 290]. This is due to the fact that, according to Foucault, not only in the relations of power there tension, it is still largely takes place between micropowers, of which there are many in society. Within this set of species there is inequality of power and struggle. "Every fight - writes Foucault - revolves around a particular focus of power, one of the countless small foci, what might be some small boss, a gatekeeper in the municipal building, the prison governor, a judge, an employee union, the chief editor of magazine " [35 , from. 76].

And at this point it becomes clear that the philosophical source, from which grew the concept of power Foucault. He deliberately distanced himself from Marx and Marxism, as well as "from paramarksisters such as Marcuse" [39, p. 166]. But not in order to move forward from them, and to go back . to Nietzsche. It's not that his concept of the "will to knowledge" or "will to truth" copied from Nietzsche's concept of "will to power" (as shown in the preceding paragraph, the term "will to power" there and Heidegger, but it means he is not self-existent primary reality, like Nietzsche, only an attribute of being - this true, according to Heidegger, primary reality). That is the philosophy of Nietzsche's will to power, being universal, is present and is being implemented in any natural form, which appears, in his terminology as "punctuation will" each of which is in relation to other "punctuation" in a state of incessant Hobbesian "war of all against all. " Similarly, we see and Foucault, not only in relation to the universe, like Nietzsche, but only in relation to society.

Foucault is known as a philosopher, closer than anyone before him, to bring closer the concept of power and knowledge. This topic has long been discussed in the literature [40, p. 206-255]. We note only the following. Some researchers say the full "merger of power and knowledge" in the teaching of Foucault [41, p. 15-18]. But in his work "Will to truth: the other side of knowledge, power and sexuality," the philosopher said bluntly: "I think that in the eyes of the readers I am really the one who said that knowledge is interwoven with power, it is only a thin mask thrown over structure domination, and the latter has always been oppression, imprisonment and so on. According to the first point, I will respond with laughter. If I said or wanted to say that knowledge - is power, I would have said it; and after that, I would have said it, I had nothing else to add, because I do not understand why it would be me after I identified them to persist in showing their various relationships. I'm just trying to understand how similar forms of power could become a pretext for the emergence of knowledge are extremely different in their objects and structures "[38, p. 321]. He added: "He who says that knowledge to me - it is a mask of power, in my opinion, just missing the ability to understand" [38, p. 322].

This is in general the concept of power Foucault. The question is that it is acceptable and what - no? It is, in our view, take the position that the state, or more narrowly political, power - this is only one of the forms of the phenomenon of power. The society can exist and in fact there are other, non-political forms of power. Such, for example, the power of the head of the family in the patriarchal culture. The fact that the government uses the army, the judiciary and other institutions for their implementation right. But in certain historical circumstances, they can buy and relative independence. However, the position of Foucault that power as such dispersed almost without exception in all socio-cultural phenomena, in our view, fundamentally wrong.

This is a completely reductionist position. Foucault seeks any socio-cultural phenomenon, if not wholly to reduce the power, then interpret it as containing within itself the power. Jean Baudrillard once said that the very discourse of Foucault's power as such "is also a discourse of power ..." [42, p. 37]. We can not accept the concept in Foucault and

Nietzschean motif of constant struggle kinds of power among themselves. It would be a caricature of human history, which is much more complex and richer in content. Therefore, the concept of power proposed by Michel Foucault and some poststructuralists can not be accepted as well-founded. More researchers are right those who treat power as one of the social phenomena. It should be added that Foucault is not the only one who is in the position to say, omnipresence of power. This solidarity with him, for example, Giddens [43, p. 49.56] and A. Toffler [44, p. 22.574], although power each interprets in his own way.

Thus, we turn to the analysis of the second subtype of the type concepts. However, getting to know them discovers that he is not uniform, that the phenomenon of power are treated differently. Under this subtype can be isolated and analyzed several options. Let us call them, and then analyze. These are the following options: 1) interpretation of power as the ability to change; 2) treatment of the authorities as a means of communication. There are other, for example, existent in some areas of western political science "market" treatment of government in which power is treated as a transaction or as a commodity or as a rule of interpretation of the authorities; interpretation of subordinating power as a force; interpretation of power as the realization of the will; interpretation of power as a gaming phenomenon. But in this article we will not consider them.

Interpretation of power as the ability to transform belongs to the famous author of the "theory of structuration" by E. Giddens. Without going into the essence of this theory, we note that Giddens relates to the activities of the authorities, "the concept of activity - he says - means power ..." [43, p. 49]. It thus refers to the "Oxford English Dictionary» («Oxford English Dictionary»), in which a figure, or stakeholders, it is said that it is "someone who has the power or achieve results." The concept of operations, he said, is applicable only to a specific individual. "Speaking about the activity - says Giddens, - we have in mind not only the intention of the people to do something, but their ability to do this in the first place ..." [43, p. 49]. Activity, according to him, has the ability to influence the course of events, to make changes in the situation. And the one who loses the ability to do so, is no longer a figure. For making changes to convert means "to implement certain kind of power" [43, p. 56]. We give two more statements of work Giddens. First. "We - he writes, - declare that the activities logically implies power, understood as the ability to change. This is the most versatile their value - the power logically precedes and exceeds subjectivity order reflexive behavior monitoring. In our view, the last is particularly emphasized, because the concept of the power used in the social sciences, tend to reflect the duality of subject and object ..." [43, p. 56-57]. And the second sentence: "The authorities have the opportunity and ability to deliver results, whether or not they are associated with a purely private interests" [43, p. 355].

It is easy to notice that Giddens offers a very broad interpretation of the phenomenon of power. Every individual is capable of some - significant or even insignificant - change. Such transformations are carried everywhere and constantly. This, in fact, rests the existence of human society and history. Giddens adds: "The authorities in the framework of social systems, which are characterized by a certain length of time and space, implies regular relations of autonomy and dependence between individual actors or groups in the context of social interaction" [43, p. 57-58]. Yes, in time and space, there are always some form of both autonomy and heteronomy (dependence) between individuals and groups. They can be caused by many different factors, and can be folded to disintegrate. Is it possible in each case to say that in the case of autonomy, we are dealing with the government, and in the case of addiction - a dominion? We think the answer is no. So, this interpretation of the authorities, too, is untenable.

There is interpretation of power as a means of communication. It belongs to the German sociologist N. Luhmann. He begins by saying that from the XIX century. It inherited two main options for a social theory: 1) the theory of social differentiation and 2) the theory of socio-cultural evolution. It is believed that with the evolution of enhanced differentiation. Luhmann considers them inadequate and claims the creation of a "general theory of symbolically generalized communication" which would, in his view, to combine both the above. He writes: "Just as the evolution demonstrates the temporary nature of the social system of meaning and differentiation - its semantic nature of the subject, communication articulates the social nature of meaning" [45, p. 13]. Thus he says he comes from "hypothesis according to which the social systems are generally formed solely by communications ..." [45, p. 13]. In this case, the sociologist, said, breaking into a long-open door. After all, back in 1846 in a letter to Marx Russian writer P. Annenkov asked the question: "What is society, whatever its form? - He answered: - The product of human interaction "[46, p. 402]. This interaction is not nothing but a chat or speak a different language, communication.

In the process of communication, says Luhmann, there are a variety of selective processes "anticipative or reactively mutually define each other" [45, p. 13]. Choose between "yes" and "no" by means of language. But that, says Luhmann, we need only in primitive societies. Therefore, in the more developed societies are formed more complex communication facilities to ensure the possibility of selection. Among this kind of tools Luhmann along with such as love and truth applies power [45, p. 14]. Communication tools are used partners, which Luhmann calls "ego" and "Alter". He further writes: "Symbolically generalized communication media have (and in this respect they can be compared with the language) necessary system reference, which is society. [...] Power, so - concludes Luhmann - a vital global universal: the existence of society "[45, p. 139].

We give another, rather extensive, a quotation from the work of the sociologist. He writes: "The power as a communicative tool works well only when this basic condition. It organizes social situations oboyudonapravlennoy its selectivity. In addition, it is necessary to distinguish between the ego and the selectivity selectivity Altera, as in respect of each of them in the case of power completely different problems arise.

The fundamental condition for any government is, therefore, that with respect to the selection carried out by those in power of Altera, there is some uncertainty. Alter always chooses - indifferent on what basis - from several alternatives. When making his choice, he can lodge in your partner uncertainty or eliminate it. This constant shift from manufacturing to the uncertainty of its elimination is a major prerequisite for the existence of power, a condition that forms a space of generalization and specification of special means of communication, and by no means represents something like a special power source on a par with others. Also in relation to the ego subordinate foreign power, that power implies openness to other possible actions. Power involves sampling results undertaken by it and thereby has the ability to influence the selection of actions (or inactions) of subordinates in the face of other opportunities. Power is more powerful if it is able to achieve the recognition of their decisions in the presence of attractive alternatives to the action or inaction. With increasing freedom subordinates it only strengthened "[45, p. 17-18]. This is in general the concept of power Luhmann, which, in his opinion, stands out from all the other [45, p. 29].

Giddens and Niklas Luhmann are the authors, whose concept of almost all parameters do not agree with the classical tradition. To criticize the interpretation of the phenomenon of power, it is necessary to criticize almost all the

concepts they use. This primarily relates to the concepts of "activity" and "communication", which communicates power. It seems that for them nor Kant, neither Marx nor Karl Jaspers, nor many other classics existed. No wonder that they feel like pioneers – one is pioneer of activity, another of communication.

In this article we reviewed the basic interpretation of power as a social phenomenon. They were obtained in pure form in order to determine their heuristic. We come to the conclusion to which more than a quarter of a century ago came to Russia (and at that time - Soviet) philosopher A.G. Anikevich. He wrote: "There is no doubt that each of the existing definitions in the literature reflect the essential characteristics of power, but does not seem completely" [47, p. 44]. The same can be said about the emerging definitions of power after a quarter century. Each of the review of the concept, of course, contains a lot of positive. However, almost each of them stand out as differentiaspecifica power of some one or more elements, losing sight of the other. At the same time elected member hypertrophic inevitably to the detriment of other elements. However, without the support of the above concept is impossible to develop a concept of optimal power.

## CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the interpretation of power as a social phenomenon is true. However, this does not mean that by doing all the authors that stand in this position right. Each of them in varying degrees, in certain respects is irrelevant. Thus, the interpretation of the authorities as allegedly dispersed almost without exception in all socio-cultural phenomena, fundamentally unsound: it all manifestations of human activity are treated as having a domineering start. It is actually based on an uncritical attitude toward alienation prevailing in modern society. In this case, any dependence or causation wrongly interpreted as a display of power. The power is interpreted as a purely social phenomenon, in certain aspects, it is irrelevant. In various embodiments, the interpretation of power as a social phenomenon contains a lot of both positive and negative, which necessitates further investigation authorities as a social phenomenon.

## Perspectives for Research in the Future

Review of the problem is not limited to the study of power. You can list the topics on which we study more power, but that for the theme of this work is not directly relevant. These are the themes: "the power and the right," "government and business", "power and social organization", "the power and the intellectuals," "the power and the opposition," "money and power." There are other research topics, as noted above, existent in some areas of western political science "market" treatment of government in which power is treated as a transaction or as a commodity, or interpretation of power as dominance, subordinating power, the implementation of the will, a game phenomenon, management and others. This analysis leads to the conclusion that there are many points of view on various aspects of the phenomenon of power and some unity is not observed. The main thing is that there is no any single view of the nature and structure of power. This state of affairs, and raises the question of the need for further study of these issues. To participate in these studies and research work will be focused in the future. This suggests possible prospects for further research on the topic being studied.

## REFERENCES

1. Baechler, J. Le pouvoir pur [Text]/ J. Baechler. – P. : Calmann-Lévu, 1978. – 273 p.
2. Bauman, Z. Glokalizacja, czyli komu globalizacja, a komu lokalizacja [Text]/ Z. Bauman //Studia socjologiczne. – Warszawa, 1997. – № 3. S. 53 – 69.

3. Boulding, K. E. Three Faces of Power [Text]/ K. E. Boulding. – Newbury Park; London; New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1990.
4. Burbach, R., Robinson, W. I. The fin de siècle debate: globalization as epochal shift [Text]/ R. Burbach, W. I. Robinson //Science and society. – N. Y. – 1999. – Vol. 63. – n 1. – P. 10 – 39.
5. Clark, I. Globalization and fragmentation: International relations in the twentieth century [Text]/ I. Clark. – N. Y. etc.: Oxford university press, 1997. – X, 220 p.
6. Clark, T. N. The concept of power [Text]/ T. N. Clark //Community structure and decision-making: comparative analyses. – San Francisco: Chandler, 1968. – P. 45 – 81.
7. Cox, R. W. Global “perestroika” [Text]/R. W. Cox //Approaches to world order /Ed. by Cox R. W. with Sinclair T. J. – Cambridge, 1996. – P. 296 – 313.
8. Dahl, R. A. The concept of power [Text]/ R. A. Dahl //Behavioural science. – 1957. – Vol. 2. – P. 201 – 215.
9. Hayakava, I. J. Language in thought and action [Text]/ I. J. Hayakava. – N. Y., 1949. – P. 221 – 222.
10. Hirst, P., Thompson, G. Globalization and the future of the nation state [Text]/ P. Hirst, G. Thompson //Economy and society. – L. – 1995. – Vol. 24. – N 3. – P. 408 – 442.
11. Kaufmann, F.-X. Globalisierung und Gesellschaft [Text]/ F.-X. Kaufmann //Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte. – Bonn, 1998. – N 18. – S. 3 – 10.
12. Kiely, R. Globalization, post-Fordism and the contemporary context of development [Text]/ R. Kiely //International journal of sociology. – L. – 1998. – Vol. 13. – N 1. – P. 95 – 115.
13. Lafonten, O., Müller, Ch. Keine Angst vor der Globalisierung: Wohlstand und Arbeit für alle [Text]/ O. Lafonten, Ch. Müller. – Bonn: Dietz, 1998. – 352 S.
14. Lasarus, N. Charting globalization [Text]/N. Lasarus //Race and class. – L. – 1998/1999. – Vol. 40. – N 2/3. – P. 91 – 109.
15. Le Duigou, J.-Chr. Mondialisation: mieux comprendre pour mieux agir [Text]/ J.-Chr. Le Duigou //Analyses et documents econ. P. – 1998. – N 74. – P. 72 – 76.
16. Marshall, D. Understanding late-twentieth-century capitalism: Reassessing the globalization theme [Text]/ D. Marshall //Government and opposition. – L. – 1996. – Vol. 31. – N 2. – P. 193 – 215.
17. McMichael, Ph. Globalization: Myths and realities [Text]/Ph. McMichael //Rural sociology. – N. Y. – 1996. – Vol. N 1. – P. 25 – 55.
18. Moosmüller, A. Interkulturelle Kommunikation und globale Wirtschaft: zu den Risiken und Chancen von kultureller Differenz [Text]/ A. Moosmüller //Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde. – Zürich. – 1998. – N 2. – S. 189 – 207.

19. Naudet, J.-L. Face au neo-liberalisme et la globalisation [Text]/ J.-L. Naudet // Analyses et documents econ. P. – 1998. – N 74. – P. 66 – 71.
20. Navarro, V. Neoliberalism, “globalization”, unemployment, inequalities, and welfare state [Text]/ V. Navarro //International journal of health services. – 1998. – Vol. 28. N 24. – P. 607 – 682.
21. Nuscheler, F. Reiche Welt und arme Welt [Text]/ F. Nuscheler //Die neue Welt-politik. – Baden-Baden, 1995. – S. 112 – 122.
22. Ohmae, K. The end of the nation state: The rise of regional economies [Text]/ K. Ohmae. – L.: Harper Collins, 1995. – X, 214 p.
23. Perrot, E. Penser la mondialisation [Text]/E.Perrot //Recherches descience religieuse. – P. – 1998. – Vol. 86. – N 1. – P. 15 – 40.
24. Reinicke, W. H. Global public policy [Text]/ W. H. Reinicke //Foreign affairs. – Washington. 1997. – Vol. 76. N 6. – P. 127 – 138.
25. Rieger, E., Leibfried, S. Welfare state limits to globalization [Text]/ E. Rieger, S. Leibfried //Politics and society. – Stoneham. – 1998. – Vol. 26. – N 3. – P. 363 – 390.
26. Robertson, R., Knondker, H. Discourses of globalization: Preliminary conside-rations [Text]/ R. Robertson, H. Knondker //International sociology. – L. – 1999. – Vol. 13. – N 1. – P. 25 – 40.
27. Schwartzman, K. C. Globalization and democracy [Text]/ K. C. Schwartzman //Annual revue of sociology. Palo Alto. – 1998. – Vol. 24. – P. 159 – 181.
28. Shams, R. Liberalisierung, Globalisierung und Regionalisierung: neue Anzats-punkte zur Integration der Entwicklungsländer in die Weltwirtschaft [Text]/ R. Shams. – Hamburg, 1996. – 45 S.
29. Stryker, R. Globalization and welfare state [Text]/ R. Stryker //International journal of sociology and social policy. – Hull. – 1998. – Vol. 15. – N 2 – 4. – P. 1 – 49.
30. Valaskakis, K. Mondialisation et gouvernance [Text]/ K. Valaskakis //Futu-ribles. – P. – 1998. – N 230. – P. 5 – 28.
31. Waters, M. Globalization [Text]/M. Waters. – L.; N. Y.: Routledge, 1996. – XIV, 185 P.
32. Wrong, D. H. Power: Its forms, bases and uses. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1979. – VIII, 326 p.
33. Foucault, M. Power and knowledge [Text] / M. Foucault // Foucault M. Intellectuals and power. Selected Political articles, speeches and interviews. - M .: Praxis, 2002. - S. 280.
34. 403. Foucault, M. Disciplinary society in crisis // Foucault M. Intellectuals and power. Selected Political articles, speeches and interviews. - M .: Praxis, 2002. - S. 319.
35. Foucault M. Intellectuals and power [Text] / M. Foucault // Foucault M. Intellectuals and power. Selected Political articles, speeches and interviews. - M .: Praxis, 2002. - S. 75.

36. Foucault, M. On Human Nature. Justice against the government [Text] / M. Foucault // Foucault M. Intellectuals and power. Selected Political articles, speeches and interviews. - M.: Praxis, 2002. - S. 119 – 12.
37. Foucault, M. Power Strategy [Text] / M. Foucault // Foucault M. Intellectuals and power. Selected Political articles, speeches and interviews. - M.: Praxis, 2002. - S. 313.
38. Foucault M. The will to truth: the other side of knowledge, power and sexuality. Works of different years [Text] / M. Foucault. - M.: Magisterium, Qastal, 1996. - 448 p.
39. M. Foucault Authority and the body [Text] / M. Foucault // Foucault M. Intellectuals and power. Selected Political articles, speeches and interviews. - M.: Praxis, 2002. - S. 166.
40. Podoroga VA Power and cognition (the archaeological search for Foucault) [Text] / VA Podoroga // Power. Essays on contemporary political philo-sophia West. - M.: Nauka, 1989. - S. 206 - 255.
41. Yerzhanova A.M. Contamination of power and knowledge in Western philosophy. Author. Dis. ... Cand. Philosophy. Sciences: 09.00.01. / AM Yerzhanova. - Penalty. - Almaty, 2001. - 29 p.
42. Baudrillard J. Forget Foucault [Text] / Jean Baudrillard. - SPb. "Vladimir Dal", 2000. - 91 p.
43. Giddens, E. dispensation society. Essay structuration theory [Text] / Anthony Giddens. - M.: Academic Project, 2003. - 525 p.
44. Begunov Y.K, Lukashev A.V, Ponidelko A.V. 13 democratic theory [Text] / Y.K Begunov, Lukashev A.V, A.V Ponidelko. - . Univ. House "Business Press", 2002. - 236 p.
45. Luhmann, N. Power [Text] / Luhmann. - M.: Praxis, 2001. - 250 p.
46. Marx, K. Pavel Vasilyevich Annenkov. In Paris. Brussels, December 28 [1846] [Text] / Marx // K. Marx and F. Engels, Works. - Ed. 2nd. - T. 27. - M.: Politizdat, 1962. - S. 401 - 412.
47. Anikevich, AG Political power: questions of research methodology [Text] / AG Anikevich. - Krasnoyarsk: Publishing house of Krasnoyarsk University Press, 1986. - 178 p.

