

Ramona O. NICOLESCU
University of Pitesti,
Muntenia Training and Performance Institute,

FUTURE TRENDS IN STRUCTURING POWER AND ITS ROLE IN SOCIAL SELF-REGULATION

Keywords

Energy

Time

Power

Social power

Social self-regulation

JEL Classification

Z13

Abstract

This paper is trying to prove how social normality should start from a prescriptive, judicial reflection of democratic rationality in social-economic relations instead of starting from the generalization of exceptions under the form of normativity.

From the point of view of realistic systemic knowledge, “real levels” and “necessary levels”, as well as the rational interaction between them can be determined sufficiently accurate for all social sub-systems, based on present knowledge. The necessary and sufficient condition is that self-regulatory decisions are independent of the speculative groups of the society (i.e. of politics and oligopolies). There are numberless approaches for separating governance from politics but the social power which supports these approaches is still incomparably smaller than the power of those who do not want social normality.

Therefore, the study of economy (different economic methods proposed by economists) is relevant for understanding social self-regulation and the role of “social power” in this self-regulation.

Introduction

Although sociology mentions also the economic processes, without studying them thoroughly, it studies the phenomena specific to social groups and their historical developments. On this line it recognizes that dominance is based on the asymmetric distribution of resources (natural and goods). Dominance exists also in nature, social power exists only in human society;

Sociologists, as well as economists recognize the existence and influence of interest groups that influence the power of the state. The state is "legitimized" by political power, "democratized" by political pluralism and holds the **monopoly** of "physical and economic constraint".

Definition of concepts "power" and "social power" in systemic view:

➤ **Power** is a parameter of any form of energy and represents: "*the energy issued (by a source), transmitted (by another element of the system) or received by a receptor, in time unit*". So the universal mathematical expression of power is: $P = E/T$, where : P= power, E = energy, T = time.

➤ **Social power** expresses the ability of governing systems to produce transformations specific to human society and on natural environment, *with a specific rhythm, a specific amplitude (level) and a specific sense (positive or / and negative);*

➤ According to the **principle of dualism** (universal principle of systems), social power, objectively will have at least two dissonant varieties:

- a) From the point of view of the objectives:
 - democratic (economy – socially positive);
 - antidemocratic (economy - socially negative);
- b) From the point of view of the resources used in achieving the objectives:
 - visible (legal, legitimate, apparent);
 - invisible (secret, hidden).

Consequently, the existence and action of the two systems underlined by conspiracy sciences have an objective fundament. Their detailed verification cannot be carried out by individuals, but only by well-organized information systems;

In fact, legitimate (visible) social power, is influenced by interest groups in both categories, national and / or world balance being permanently

dynamic, oscillatory between the two limits from point a..

Definition of the concepts of "power" and "social power" from the point of view of sociological sciences [4]

Some sociologists [4], deal in an integrated manner with the concepts of power, domination and distinctly, political power. The following quotations illustrate sufficiently well the concepts set:

[4/246] "*we should specify that power, although based on the asymmetrical distribution of resources, inherent to domination structures, tends to restore, by using these resources in interaction, the corresponding domination structures; as we should recognize, by widening substantially the framework of this analysis, the generator character of power, i.e. to show how it participates in the formation of new domination structures (which is irreducible to the transition from one society totality to another).*"

[4/247] "*sociological analysis contributes to highlighting the contrast between the perishable feature of domination structures, meant to be transformed or destroyed, and the durability of power, which cannot be absent from any empirical society.*" "*it is important to emphasize the "generator" element of power, in its double capacity of doing and undoing the modalities of domination.*"

[4/ 248] "*Political power differs from other forms of power firstly by its territorial feature: as Jean Baechler writes, "in order for the power to be political, it must be started by exercising it within a delimited space" (1979, p. 83).*"

[4/250] "*This once we also used the guidance given by Max Weber by its way of relating physical constraint and legitimacy in the definition he gives to the state. In effect, what differentiates the state from a simple political group is the fact that it "vindicates successfully for itself" – or at least for its administrative management - "the monopoly of legitimate physical constraint": thus the state displays its demands of becoming a "unique source of «the right»" to physical constraint. Without doubt, as Philippe Braud points out (1985, p. 389), this centralized regulation manner, exercised by "governments that hold in a programmed manner the monopoly of legitimate coercion", is a "specific form of the modernity of politics; and*

it must reminded **that monopolization of legitimate coercion to the benefit of certain specialized agents is NOT met in the societies governed by customary order**, in which political power goes into pre-state forms, or as a trend towards such a monopoly, even if it existed, it was not accompanied by a complete institutionalization in patrimonial political units, in the absence of agents appointed expressly to this effect. But, speaking for ourselves, emphasizing **the relation between coercion and legitimacy**, a capital phenomenon, is the most important thing, even if it carried out in variable degrees and through varied mechanisms depending on the political regimes. The importance of this "pole" of legitimacy, as it is known, was clearly recognized by Weber; **and the keen observation according to which "all dominations try to awake and maintain the belief in their legitimacy"** (1971, p. 220) expresses the state of mind in which he carried out the analysis of legitimate domination and of its three modalities, **rational-legal, traditional and charismatic.**"

[2/250] "Nevertheless, we consider that a significant step was taken by Denis Wrong in the special chapter dedicated to the "interaction of coercion and legitimacy" (1979, cap. V), as he defines it in a revealing way. Starting from Mosca²²'s remark and illustrating with examples from Karamazov Brothers in 1984, he develops the idea according to which **even during the most unmerciful, if not the most monstrous, regimes political regimes, there is a "need for legitimacy", not only from the holders of power, but also from those who endure it and are its victims, in various degrees. But Wrong is not tardy to supplement the picture - and correct it at the same time, adding that, even in the cases in which the legitimacy action has known the biggest successes (always relative), the obedience to the authority keeps something from the coercive experience, at least psychologically, even when the possibility of appealing to possible physical constraint was not evoked.**"

[4/251] "On one hand, coercion serves both for discouraging possible reckless people, and for punishing possible renitence acts; on the other hand, legitimacy, recognized explicitly or simply assumed by the majority of sighted social actors, makes the orders received from authorities to be

perceived as obligations that fall on them: imposed obedience changes its color and, thus, its significance in their eyes. Such conditions are favorable for the development of the effectiveness of political power: Parsons insisted rightfully on this line, even if more global parallelism between the economic system and the political regime, based on which he approaches this theme, remains debatable."

[4/252] "In order to correct the possible partial feature of Parsons' view, it would be obviously appropriate to add the fact that **not everyone participates equally in the definition of collective purposes**, and some of them **will be less inclined to recognize themselves in them; and we must also add that the accomplishment of these collective purposes may be first of all beneficial for a specific type of group**, even if it is not necessarily about the "dominant class"."

From the point of view of conspiracy theories

Social power is exercised through the financial –banking component of globalized and secretized organizations (whose activity, richness, influence, etc. are not accessible to the public), even if they are registered and operate visibly, such as: Central Bank, World Bank, Federal Reserves System (FED) of the USA; International Monetary Fund (FMI), International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (BIRD), etc.

Banks hold the economic and political control of main developed states of the world and impose strategies for world development on two ways:

- Directly through the banking policies imposed to governments and hence to population (exempla in Romania wages freeze imposed by FMI, on account of limiting the inflation);
- Indirectly through international influence structures such as: Tripartite Commission, Council on Foreign Relations (Council on Foreign Relations- the USA), ONU, NATO, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), etc.

COMPONENTS OF SOCIAL POWER (MIXED, SOCIO-ECONOMIC TREATMENT OF POWER) [1,4,7]

The most suggestive view on social power

The most suggestive view on social power is given in [7/20 ...28]) by the **analysis of the triad of power components**, expressed palpably in chapter “2 – Muscles, money and brain”.

- The transcription of the following paragraphs from page 21, is more than conclusive:

„Moreover, the spade or the muscle, jewelry or money, and the mirror or the brain form together only one interactive system. Under specific conditions, each one can be converted into another one. A pistol can bring money, or it may get information forcedly from a victim. Information or a pistol can be bought with money. Information can be used for scaling up money or for increasing the force available to you.....”

Moreover, they can all be used at almost all the levels of social life, from the privacy of the domicile to the political arena.

In private sector, a parent may slap the child (using force) can get his unobtrusiveness for a dollar (using money or its equivalents) or – in the most efficient way - can model the child’s values so that he wishes to listen to him. In politics, a government can imprison or torture a dissident, can punish financially its critics and remunerate its supporters, and can manipulate the truth for creating consensus.”

- In the civilization of the second wave, the main components of social power were “the force of state” and private fortune, which are maintained presently, too;

- In the civilization of the second wave, the informational component will probably be predominant compared to the other two, increasing the pro-democratic feature of social power (in the optimistic variant that the majority of people will have unlimited access to important information).

Other present views on the components of social power

Some authors, and especially certain media structures, try to confuse the population by forming a simple perception on social power, in the sense that each personality has components of “social power”, which are valued only by successful people. Among these components, the following are emphasized: charisma, sex, professionalism, verbal communication and especially the non-verbal one, etc.

Such a view does not represent social power, but, at most, the elements of individual power known as leadership.

Historical evolution of the components of social power, causes

The evolution in time of the relation between the three components of social power triad is magisterially explained and studies thoroughly in the entire paper [7]. In essence:

- In the beginning (primitive age), the individual physical force was predominant. The strongest ones became leaders, fact which applies also to animal life;

- In Middle Ages and feudalism (“prosum” society [7] = *produces for its own consumption*), physical force remains, but richness is added. By the agency of richness, private armies were constituted, and with their help other people’s fortune was “confiscated”. Information is held exclusively by the rich ones (each rich person had his personal teacher, doctor, and even the religious servant);

- In the society based on market economy (capitalist or socialist), physical force goes to the second plan, and fortune and then information are situated fore. Market economy (production is intended for sale through the market), is based on the use of technologies capable of transforming the employees in “self-adjustable energetic amplifiers” [1], who can produce much more than the necessary for own consumption with their help. Excess goods are produced and they can be “confiscated, taken” and sold to other consumers, by those who hold power. Capitalist market economy differs from the socialist one by the predominant form of property on wealth and modality of distribution of PIB. Consequently, market economy needs professionalized (professionally informed), humble and punctual employees. Information loses its private characteristic and becomes a public good, which means for the majority of the population (by general and vocational education);

- In the society of future [1], **information will probably be the main component of social power**. One can already see the concerns of pressure groups **to monopolize information** (privatization of education, media, electronic processing means, establishment of special organizations for purchasing secret information, etc.), the classification of information by law and

the restriction of the access of majority citizen to major interest information from the economic, scientific and political points of view.

Internet, mobile telephony and new technologies enables the “democratization” of this component of the power, with consequences difficult to be pre-assessed by political power.

At the same time globalization of electronic means for information processing enables complex surveillance of society and people, by the centers of power, with consequences impossible to guess by the majority citizen.

Pro-democratic and anti-democratic groups amplify their influence with the help of these means, generating complex processes: increase of sales by using virtual environment, and also of the crimes through the same medium; increase of communication and association of both pro-democratic and anti-democratic groups, etc.

Main causes of the changes in the relations between the components of social power:

- technical-scientific revolutions regarding:

- new sources of non-renewable energy (steam, internal combustion, electrical, laser engines, etc.);

- new micro-systemic theories and technologies: genetics, nanotechnologies, etc.;

- new means for processing information (computers, copiers, mobile telephony, internet, etc.);

- establishment of trusts for modeling the perception of the population (media);

- use of sciences for creating new weapons and hence means of forced assertion of international relations, such as :

- nuclear weapons;
- biological weapons;
- psychotropic weapons;
- sonic weapons; etc.

Future trends in structuring social power

➤ **Influence of globalization**

- **Political globalization** is the present predominant trend and aims at maintaining the domination of elitist structures. Main political globalization structures: ONU; European Council, NATO; UE; OPEC, etc.

- **Natural globalization**, due to the circulation of information, technologies, populations, tends to generalize the highest level of sciences and civilizations, of democratic

governances. Most known positive structures: ISO, Doctors without frontiers, Greenpeace, Red Cross, Red Crescent, etc. It began through the internationalization of trade, then information (mail, radio, telephone, internet, etc.). Then international banking systems and transnational companies, which exercise powerful influences on political globalization, appeared.

➤ **Influences of cybernetics**

- Reduction of demand for low skilled labor force;

- Generalization of the robotics of production and domestic work;

- “Cybernetic family”;

- Computerized economy, expansion of virtual services and trade;

- Control of populations;

- Volatilization of values and increase of its dynamics, which accelerates wealth polarization;

- Total control of global banking.

Role of social power in social self-regulation

Human personality has not changed substantially in the last 2000 years, ***pride, greed, the trend of dominating fellow humans remaining capital sins, exploited to the maximum by the results of political, economic and social theories*** by power elites. The whole ***speculative economy*** is based on these human self-adaptive features, amplified by intellectual energy and its latest control and guiding technologies. Conspiracy theories highlight the existence of methods and means of domination based on these “human weaknesses” (e.g. Protocols of Zion Philosophers [3/40...45], directives of KGB to the secret services of former communist countries, etc.)

Scientific knowledge of personality, society and ***the promotion of realistic self-regulation models is the only hope for democracy.***

Understanding the importance of indirect self-regulation loops (intellectual, rational) in moderating the influence of the natural ones (domination, prides, pomposity, greed, etc.), of the ways of establishing and imposing certain LEVELS NECESSARY in all human activities may lead to a predominantly pro-democratic self-regulation.

In current models of free market economy, ***the necessary levels of universal human rights,*** stated as a result of the influence of pro-

democratic social power structures, are not included in any way.

Knowledge of current *micro and macroeconomic models*, of local and world trends help us deliver information on *possibly better models* to the new generations.

Main ways of acquiring fortune described in the literature and confirmed by practice are: inventions (talent), wars, robberies, inheritances, smuggling, organized crime, business, and highly specialized remunerated work.

CONCLUSIONS

Wealth, as the main current component (and in the foreseeable perspective) *of social power* is acquired in several ways, of which the economic path is determinant. Wealth was the basis of social statuses, of constituting pressure groups on purpose to use “state force” in amplifying own fortunes, of generation and use of latest information (qualitative component). Although wealth sources are different, their real basis remains national or / and world economy. For this reason, the study of economy (different economic models proposed by economists) is relevant for understanding social self-regulation and the role of “social power” in this self-regulation.

Bibliographic references

- [1] *Alvin Toffler: The Third Wave*, Ed. Politic . 1983;
- [2] *Jean van Helsing: “Secret Organizations – Who runs the world?, Third Book*, Ed. SAMIZDAT, 2000
- [3] *Jean van Helsing: “Secret organizations and their power in the 20th century – vol. 1 and 2”*, Ed. SAMIZDAT, 2000;
- [4] *R. Boudon .a: “Sociology treaty”*, Editura Humanitas, 1991 (2006)
- [5] *Richard G. Lipsey, K. Alec Chrystal: Positive Economy*, Ed. Economic , Bucure ti, 1999;
- [6] *Teodor Ghi escu: “Educational systemic management”*, Ed. MATRIX,Bucure ti, 2006
- [7] *They de Montrial: “World action and system”*, Editura Expert, Bucure ti, 2003