Under the rule refers to the ability and opportunity to implement their will, affect the operations, human behavior by using certain tools – the authority, rights, violence and so on.

In fact the government – a type of public relations that is:

• expression of needs in a complex social system of organization and self-regulation (regardless of the type of society);

• result of social conditions, layers and the appropriate relationship between them.

Power to distinguish economic, political, civil, family and others.

Political power is one of the most important of its kind. When political power see the real potential of a state, group, individual exercise their will in politics and legal norms. It is characterized by social domination and control of certain states, social groups and others. Last possess means of physical, economic, psychological coercion sanctioned system of ideological and legal norms.

The main type of political power is state power that closer look at below.

The will and support of the management team is the condition and source of power of certain institutions of society to impose decisions, patterns of behavior and so on.

In turn, direct political power are the subjects of political institutions and agencies that implement the process control of various aspects of life, have means of power (coordination, coercion, control, violence, repression, etc.), choose goals and their uses.

Almost all the theories and concepts of policy based on an understanding of what power relations between large social groups, activities of the State, the struggle for power in the state, as well as the manner of its operation determine the nature of the political sphere of society. However, representatives of various scientific fields have fundamental differences on the interpretation of social meaning and social roots of power, the interpretation process of the struggle for power.

There are basic approaches to the interpretation of the nature of political power:

1. Teleological approach (in terms of specific targets) describes power as the ability to achieve goals related to the myths of power, and intended results (B. Russell).

This definition interprets not only as power relations between men, but in the context of human interaction with the environment (the power over nature).

2. Sociological approach based on the analysis of power in the context of the social conditions of its origin and operation, taking into account prevailing social values, traditions, political culture and so on.

M. Weber (Germany) as the ability to understand the power of one individual to realize their will even if others resist.

Thus, the basis of relations are relations of power domination and subordination.

Founder of structural and functional analysis of T. Parsons (USA) in the context of the theory of social action community considered as a coherent system, elements of which it is integrated social action. At last he understood the behavior of political subjects (individuals, groups, organizations, etc.) depending on the natural (biological human nature, climate) and social (society) factors.

According to the functional principle requires government entities to fulfill social responsibilities and mobilizes resources to achieve common goals.

Within Social Conflict (Marx, Engels, Lenin) was considered in the context of power relations subjugation of one class by another. The nature of this dominance in terms of Marxist concepts of economic inequality is due. But social inequality is also complemented by gender, ethnicity, age, cultural, regional and professional differences. So the logical conclusion is: power is everywhere where there is inequality. Marx and Engels first cited the concept of «social power» and later stated that the main role in the system of social power has the state, political power [20, 33].

M. Dyuverzhe (France) reviewed the rule in the complex: on the basis of violence (physical, economic, moral and psychological) and authority (voluntary submission). This is his definition of power as «two-faced Janus. It is an instrument of domination of some groups over others, but at the same time – a means of social integration and solidarity of all members of society [273, 274].

3. Behavioural (behavioral) approach interprets power as a special type of behavior when one command, and others – are subject.

This concept of power associated with the names mean Merriema [328] G. Lassuella (USA) [315 316] and J. Ketplina (UK) [338]. They withdrew from the nature of power relations man, abandoning the moral evaluation policy. The main reason for the political activity of the person they considered its desire to subjugate others to his will. The balance of political forces must be provided for a system of political institutions.

However, legal (legal) forms of behavior regulation were not enough. Attention to unconscious components in political consciousness (and hence to political behavior) led to the development of psychoanalytic concepts and power within the behavioral approach. The leading thesis of these concepts is to understand power as a means of domination over the unconscious human psyche.

4. Psychological approach based on understanding the sources of power in the consciousness and subconscious of people. 3. Freud (Austria) thought train to power the transformation of sexual energy [285] Jung (Germany) – mental powers in general [46]. C. Ed-axis and-B. Edelman causes psychological subjugation believe in hypnotism captain and crowd interactions [38] and Jacques Lacan – in the subconscious perception special characters expressed through the language of [26].

5. Systems approach is characterized by the understanding of power as derived from the political system rather than individual relationships (behavioral and psychological approaches).

Within the system approach marks out these concepts:

• macrolevel – power as a property or attribute of the macro-cial systems (T. Parsons, D. Easton). It is a way of organization, operational modalities and means of decision-making and distribution of values

• mezolevel – power at specific systems – family, industrial groups, organizations (Kroze M., C. Deutsch, N. Luman). Considered in the context of relations with the organizational structures of society;

• micro level – the power as the interaction of individuals within specific social system (T. Clark, M. Rogers). Thus, the role of individual in society, microsystem is determined by its power, which he is subject.

But there is yet communicative approach version of the system (K. Deutsch, N. Luman). She interprets power as a means of social communication (communication), which gives us control group conflicts and to ensure social integration.

6. Relyatsionistskyy approach (from Lat. Relatio – deliver), considering how power relations between individuals that allow one entity (individual or group) to change the behavior of the other. It emphasizes the role relations, the asymmetry of power relations between subject and object of power.

Through this approach selects such theories:

• Resistance (D. Kartprayt [38] J. coat, B. Reyven [284]), which analyzes the form and degree of resistance in the system of power relations;

• sharing resources (P. Blau, D. Hickson, B. Reyven), which is based on unequal power relations is the allocation of resources between ruler and subject, that power is considered as a function of the individual depends on the distribution of resources;

• distribution of zones of influence (D. Rong), which states that individuals in the system of power relations are constantly exchanging roles of power and its master object.

Investigate the different concepts of political power, proceed to the notion of the power structure.

Overall it should be noted that the Marxist concept of government interprets the latest phenomena in terms of mass struggle and states, leaving aside the person of its direction, will, activity.

Liberal and others close to them the concept, by contrast, going from personality, mental extrapolate internal features on the latest activities of political institutions and structures to obscure the systematic effect that occurs during the interaction of individuals in the process of joint action in policy.

We believe that analyzing social phenomena, it is desirable to use all methodological approaches to the specific peculiarities of the society being studied, its political culture and mentality.

The extent and strength of political and social influence of the shape and structure is largely determined by socio-economic factors. They affect the content and form of policy centers of power (the president, parliament, government), mostly indirectly, although under certain conditions, can come to the fore.

Means of political activity (such as coercion, mastering communications) related to the significant material cost-us. It is clear that under such conditions social groups that can finance a policy to maintain an organizational structure, transport, weapons, media, monopolized or at least maximize their political influence in society.

However, authorities have some autonomy, which is also limited by the following factors:

– Objective long-term interests of the ruling;

– The requirements of social balance, cohesion, modern economic and political systems and so on.;

– The scale and strength of public support, the level of resistance power of public expenditure required for forcing the adoption of certain decisions and so on.

Therefore, the task of direct government entities are:

• to ensure the rule of the ruling elite through the optimization of performance management systems and improve its efficiency;

• ensure social balance and integration as a result of coordination of interests of privileged groups in society in general to all citizens;

• predict and develop ways and forms of action.

Resources power

The term «power resources» as used in a broad and in narrow sense.

In a broader sense of power resources is all that entity (individual, group) can use to influence others.

In a narrow sense – are the means through which the impact of the subject on the object of government.

Resources governments can apply for enforcement, encouragement or persuasion. According to these methods of achieving political goals can be divided and anthropological resources such power as fear, concern, conviction.

According to the nature and sphere of influence distinguish normative, coercive and utilitarian resources (A. Ettsioni).

Legal Resources – tools influence on the psychology, values and norms of human behavior.

Forced resources – the impact of administrative measures that include forcible «persuasion» through the so-called power structures (court, police, army, etc.).

Depending on the power of life resources are divided into economic, social, cultural and information, and demographic power.

Economic resources – wealth, money, equipment, land, minerals.

Social resources – social status (rank), position, education, social welfare, medical care.

Cultural and information resources – information, knowledge, received and distributed through scientific and educational institutions, mass media as to the objective of communication and manipulation of public consciousness.

Outlining the importance of the first two types of resources, recently experts fix the growing influence of cultural and information resources. For example, the sociologist-futurologist A. Tof-Haze (USA) believes that countries in post-industrial knowledge already gained the strength and wealth, becoming a prominent factor in the functioning of government.

Power (incentive) resources – institutions of duress: army, police, security, court, prosecutor's office.

This type of resource is traditionally considered the most effective source of power, since its use threatens the highest human values – life, liberty and property.

Demographic resources are considered in the sense that a person becomes a specific resource of power only when a means of someone else's will. Overall, it certainly is not the only resource of power, but also its subject and object.

According to these government resources distinguish economic power, social, cultural, informational and incentive.

However, we are most interested in political power, which are the following:

legality of the use of force within the state;

rule on other types of power;

publicity (recourse rights on behalf of the entire society to all citizens);

use (except the stimuli) is also economic, social, cultural and information resources.

In this context we should mention the cumulative effect of power, that is its growing accumulation: wealth increases the chance of entering the political elite, access to education and the media, the high political position increases the wealth of knowledge and access to mass media, informational influence promotes political career and increase revenues.

Mergers political, economic, social, cultural and informational power dominated by political power characteristic of totalitarianism. Democracies provides legal and informal power-sharing: government – the legislative, executive and judicial, economic – between the centers of influence, spiritual – between the media, the denominations.

Considering the problem of power, can not bypass the question of its legitimacy. If the government relies solely on force to influence one's ability is quite limited. Much better in terms of power efficiency is to combine coercion with voluntary consent of the population to obey the current leadership.

Legitimate power is perceived by citizens as lawful and just. Legitimacy associated with the consensus of society on basic political values and the presence of government authority.

The largest contribution to the theory of legitimacy has already mentioned sociologist M. Weber, which included recognition of her commitment to the rulers and subordinates to obey the current leadership.

Depending on the motives of conquest M. Weber distinguished traditional and charismatic types of legitimate authority.

Traditional legitimacy (government leaders, kings, kings, sultans) based on the right of inheritance of power, which relies on the divine nature of the power of the monarch. This power is based on the traditions of conquest and coercion of society monarch.

This type of legitimacy is preserved even today in countries such as Brunei, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Jordan, Kuwait.

In most modern societies preserve royal power longer stands, part of the mentality of societies than the real mechanism of traditional legitimacy.

Need examples? Here they are: Britain, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Japan. You surprised that the author did not name Belgium, Monaco, Luxembourg or, say, Spain? This is done quite deliberately. In these countries the institution of the monarchy has certain representational and executive functions even. For example, the Spanish king by the Constitution is the supreme commander.

Charismatic legitimacy (from the Greek. Charisma – the gift of divine Grace) is based on a very prominent as a leader. If the new government to recognize the population can not rely on the authority of tradition or the democratic will of the majority, she deliberately cultivated the greatness of the individual leader. This enables you to use its authority to the dedication of government institutions, contributes to their recognition of the public.

Obviously, the transient, unstable societies, charisma-Atlantic legitimacy is justified. However, with the release of consciousness from the influence of religion probability and expediency of such a foundation of power reduced.

M. Weber, charismatic bearers of real government believed Moses, David, Mohammed, Buddha. Modernize the list, joining with him, Lenin and Stalin (USSR), M. Gandhi (India), K. Ataturk (Turkey), Khomeini (Iran), H. Aliyev (Azerbaijan). Apparently, these leaders are from the eastern countries with a primary type of political culture, which focuses primarily on the personal qualities of leadership, not the power of political structures.

Rational-legal legitimacy characteristic of democracies. its source is the faith of citizens in the correctness of formal rules, such as the necessity of government by universal and free elections, rule of law, law-abiding.

In such a state not subject to individual operator and laws, in the actions of which are elected and government representatives.

Rational-legal legitimacy is mainly structural or institutional and is based on trust of citizens of the state system, not honoring specific individuals. Although «young» democracies, legitimacy can be based not only on respect for the elected institutions as the authority of the leader. But the «old» democracies often happens that ranking leader he presides over top of the political structure, that his personality his personal authority increases the legitimacy of the political structure in the eyes of the electorate.

For example, the picturesque German politician Helmut Kohl for a long time had a lower rating than the rating of his political bloc. (And that's because at this time he was Chancellor of Germany!) And only after the active participation of outstanding personalities held association of German states (1989), he received a «bonus Chancellor, thus exceeded its own rating rating bloc CDU / CSU.

In particular, the ideal type of rational-legal legitimacy transformed into rational-bureaucratic and legal legitimacy, having been.

Weberian ideal type of cover advanced pluralistic democracy. Their government is recognized by most people because of legitimate free elections for a long time already. This type of legitimacy of authority prevalent in Western and Central Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand.

Quite common as authoritarian-bureaucratic regimes, where implemented rational-bureaucratic and legal type of legitimacy.

The level of legitimacy they have significantly lower power and has the support of certain groups by promises, the address of charity and lobbying the interests of various strata, strata, ethnic and social groups.

With some remarks to the same group legitimacy of authority can be named the legitimacy of power based on the support of certain religious and ethnic communities (Iran, Afghanistan, some Balkan countries).

Finally, we note that in its pure form is given just typology of legitimacy of authority is almost non-existent. In each case, the authorities are trying to combine these types in order to raise support for their activities. Of course, not everybody can do it.

Thus the legality and legitimacy is not always coincide. For example, the Russian constitution in 1993, according to a referendum was legal, but illegitimate, not having received the support of the majority.

In Germany, the National Socialists led by Adolf Hitler came to power legally, winning parliamentary elections (1933).

However, one can hardly believe that total terror against dissidents, they resolved later, had legitimate support. But all this – the theme of a separate conversation.