

Concepts of political axiology

Kryukov Victor Vasilyevich

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Full Professor

Siberian State University of Geosystems and Technologies

Abstract. In the article, from the point of view of the theory of values, the main categories of political philosophy are considered: politics, management, power. The tribal community was governed by rituals and taboos. In civil society, it is necessary to develop an order of relations between strangers, and for this it is necessary to adopt some rules of behavior that become laws and develop into legal codes, sets of legal norms.

Two circumstances are of fundamental importance in the functioning of social roles: due to the fact that the social role is a secondary and transformed form of personality, it represents, replaces one, several or many personalities. The phenomenon of representation is dialectically accompanied by its reverse side – the personification of a social role. The performer of a particular social role, occupying a position, being nominated for a particular post, being endowed with a certain rank, rank or degree and title, not only freely, but also out of necessity identifies himself and his social position.

Keywords: politics, government, power, representation, personification.

In the political, civil sphere of public life, social institutions are formed and social roles are formed as institutional values. This area is studied by such special disciplines as *political science* and *jurisprudence*. Social philosophy is interested in such problems as the difference between political and legal institutions, their emergence and interaction, as well as the essence of the *social role* as a transformed form of the human person.

The term "*politics*" (anc. Greek πολιτική - civil activity) is a concept that includes issues and events of public life associated with the functioning of the state. Its meaning goes back to the ancient Greek name of the city-state - πολις. [2, p. 95-98] The art of city management, regulation of relations between people in civil society, Aristotel called the word *polyteia*, and Plato generally used the term *cybernetics*, borrowing the word from sailors who called the *cybernet* of the helmsman who controlled a stern oar and responsible for the direction of the ship's course.

The need for the art of managing social life arises precisely in cities during the transition from barbarism to civilization. The tribal community was governed by customs and traditions, rituals and taboos. In civil society, it is necessary to work out

the *order* of relations between strangers. To do this, you need to accept some rules of behavior, which, by virtue of the dictates of the authorities or with general consent, approval and voluntary submission, become laws and are added to legal codes, codes of legal norms (from Latin *us, uridis* - custom, law, legal) [2, p. 95-98]. Lawlessness is social chaos, anarchy, anarchy and "war of all against all", open and continuous violence. Therefore, among the great sages among different nations were legislators who wrote codes of laws and thus brought peace and order into the lives of their fellow citizens. Such are the Tsar Hammurabi in Shume-re, Solon of Athens in Ancient Greece, Emperor Justinian in Ancient Rome, Prince Yaroslav the Wise in Kievan Rus.

The main value in politics is *power*, [3] and the most important element of the system of political relations in society is the *state*, literally in Russian, *rule*. M. Weber's definition is popular in modern social philosophy: "The state is a human community that claims the monopoly of legitimate physical violence within a certain area - geographic, demographic, economic." [1, p. 645] In turn, the community (*Gemeinschaft*) is understood by F. Tönnis "...as a being or a thing whose actions are united in their internal and external orientation", while he considers society (*Gesellschaft*) as "an aggregate or mechanism based on a convention (the form of universal will, supported and preserved by everyone for his own benefit) and natural law". [5, p. 10]

Political and legal elements in the system of institutional values are classified on the basis of the division of social subjects into *individuals* and *legal entities*, and then the *direct* actions of individuals, spontaneous or organized, riots and uprisings or coups and revolutions - are in essence *political actions*. Whereas the actions of legal entities - parliamentary hearings, congresses of parties, election procedures or plebiscites and referendums - introduced into the legal framework, that is, *mediated* by legal norms, *written* acts and regulations, *officially adopted* codes and *publicly* approved constitutions, are *legal actions*.

Let me give you a mundane example. Let's say that I borrowed a certain amount from a friend and do not give it back. He can put pressure on my conscience,

rant about honesty, try to repay the debt by force or denigrate my reputation in front of mutual acquaintances - all these are direct relationships of individuals. It is quite another matter if I wrote a receipt or concluded an agreement. Then my friend will go to court, he will resort to the intervention of intermediaries in the person of a state body, which will issue a resolution and the bailiffs will recover the debt from me in an indisputable manner, up to the forcible seizure of property and restriction of my freedom. And this will be *right*, in other words, *rightly*, in accordance with *a rule* that has the necessary character, since in this situation I am no longer just a friend as an individual, but a defendant as a legal entity.

You can't live without rules. Suppose we sat down to play chess. We played the opening, and I suddenly declare that from the next move the knight will move not with the letter "L", but with the letter "P". Reluctantly - after all, the position is prepared for the attack - you agree. We played the middlegame, and I again insist that the knight should move with the letter "M" in the future. If you grab the pieces off the board and throw them in my face, you'll be right. You can't play like that! The rules must be negotiated "on the shore" and followed from the beginning to the end of the game.

In the functioning of social roles, two circumstances are of fundamental importance. Due to the fact that the social role is a secondary and transformed form of personality, it *represents*, replaces and represents one, several or many personalities. Representation (from Lat. *Representatia* - new presentation) is a demonstration of a thing or personality in some form of secondary objectivity: not in its own, but in another embodiment, literally *in someone else's body*. Due to the fact that the Russian word for *representation* has several meanings (literally: to put in front of someone - a demonstration, spectacle, show, presentation, idea, concept, understanding), then when it comes to representing one object through another, in modern Russian The language often uses the Latin word representation as a word with a more specific meaning. [2, p. 95-98]

The lawyer represents the client in the court; the delegate represents at a meeting or congress his team, who entrusted him to act "on behalf of and on behalf

of"; the deputy in the assembly represents the inhabitants of his district; the president is the popularly elected spokesman for the needs and aspirations of the country's citizens. When we give our vote to one or another candidate in an election, the meaning of this procedure is literal: further we will be silent, and our deputy, if he is elected and represents us in the legislative body, speaks for us, *signifying* that we all speak in his voice, he - our *sign*. At least - *in theory* it should be so.

The phenomenon of representation is dialectically accompanied by its reverse side - the *personification* of a social role. Personification (from Latin *persona* - person, and *facio* - I do) *personification*, *prosopoeia*, *anthropopathism* (from Greek *ανθρωπος* - person, and *πάθος* - feeling) - representation of natural phenomena and forces, objects, abstract concepts in the form of actors, including the number of the likeness of a person, or the recognition of their human properties; attribution of the properties of the human psyche to objects and phenomena of the real or fictional world. [2, p. 95-98]

The performer of this other social role, occupying any position, being promoted to this or that post, being endowed with some dignity, rank or degree and title, not only freely, but also out of necessity, identifies himself and his social position. And then the chairman of the board of directors sincerely says "my firm", and the administrator - "my district". The mayor expresses and realizes the needs of the development of *his* city, and then we see what he is more inclined towards: the construction of the metro or the construction of bridges. A diplomat, foreign minister or president, speaking at an international forum, say: "Russia is against... Russia believes..." [4, p. 193 - 196]

It is not just an impersonation as a figure of the tongue. This is the personification of a social role - a source of influence, *charisma* (charm) of a political leader or statesman, colored with bright colors of originality and attractive power of the personality of the performer of a social role, since a politician, like an actor, can be talented or mediocre. At the same time, a genius actor is powerless if he does not rely on a *social base* - a mass of people who invisibly stand behind him and on whose behalf he speaks and on whose support he relies.

Institutions (from Lat. *Institutum* - establishment, foundation) are organizational forms of social life, a set of social roles as matrices of human behavior, where these roles are presented as people transformed into a secondary product. Let's imagine that there is a certain social role: let's say the position is the dean of the faculty. Accordingly, there is an official instruction that prescribes all the actions of the dean, defining his rights and obligations, and this is the form. Who exactly will occupy this position, it matters only under the indispensable condition of the performance of official functions. There is a person as an individual - this is any of us; and there is a person as a legal entity - an official in an office, a defendant in a court, a deputy in the Duma, etc. And a person as a legal entity does not behave at all as he wants, but as prescribed. This is the social role.

We all play many social roles on a daily basis. If you come to the university, you are a student or an assistant professor. I went out into the street - you are a pedestrian. I got on the bus - you are a passenger. When you come home, you are a son or a father, a husband or a son-in-law, and in each case there are canons of behavior: you can be rude to your mother-in-law, but you cannot be rude to your wife; you need to command your son, but not your mother, and so on. Social roles also set the social status of a person, since they, as a rule, are fixed by documents. The fact that a person is a citizen of the state is certified by a passport; the fact that he has a higher education is confirmed by a diploma; the fact that he is a professor can be declared by presenting a certificate. Thus, a document is a form of objectification of a social role. With a document, you are a full-fledged legal entity: you have presented a mandate or a certificate and you can already demand something and make a claim.

In the same way, the social institutions themselves are for the most part objectified and even reified. For example, our university has not only a legal, but also an actual address; educational buildings, a sports complex, a cultural center, hostels and even out-of-town recreation centers. All this is not just property, but the "body" of our organization. On the pediment of the entrance to the main building, large letters make up the name of our organization, on all buildings there are plaques with

the name of the university, on the doors of classrooms and offices there are signs of what is located there or what kind of official works there. This is how the university space is organized. Inside the buildings, there are placards everywhere, which indicate the working hours of the services, the schedule of office hours for officials or the schedule of lectures and seminars, etc. This is how the university's opening hours are organized.

With respect to converted or secondary values, the following dependence will be valid: their high rank is determined not so much by the measure of the costs of forces and means for their production, as by the *measure of the costs of their consumption*. This applies primarily to spiritual or ideological, in particular intellectual values. A scientist makes a discovery, an inventor creates a new structure, a philosopher writes a treatise - and we still know all this, we use it, we read and think about it together with the creators. We re-read great books, we are ready to listen to great music again and again, we can and want to see pictures of great artists dozens of times, and they always evoke in us new and new experiences and associations. The situation is similar in relation to the commandments of religious faith. Canons of faith, such as the Bible or the Koran, have shaped the worldview, morals, and behavior of millions of people for millennia. These are eternal values.

The same principle applies to institutional values. The value of a social role is determined by what we can get from its performer. What exactly depends on this or that official, on what and on whom he can influence. Social roles, such as positions, degrees, titles, statuses, ranks already constitute a hierarchy in themselves, in which we are looking for the level of competence we need in order to receive a certain service: whether state, expert, legal, intellectual or any other. The higher the status, the more visible is the influence, power, power of its bearer. "Power in general is precisely an institutional value". [3, p. 18]

So it turns out that the *direct dependence* of the rank of value, its significance in the existing hierarchy, its place in the subordination of goods is characteristic of the primary elements of society - people and things, and it is determined by the *measure of costs for their production*. Whereas the *inverse relationship* takes place

for the secondary elements of society, transformed forms of people - social roles in institutions, and transformed forms of things - signs and images in the form of ideas and ideals, and it is determined by the *measure of costs for their consumption*. [6, p.100]

References

1. Weber, M. Selected works [Text] / M. Weber.- M.: Progress, 1990. – 808 P.
2. Kryukov, V.V. Philosophy: a textbook for universities / V.V. Kryukov. – 4th ed., rev. and add. – M.: Yurayt Publishing House, 2021. – 182 P. – (Higher education).
3. Kryukov, V.V. The modes of power // V.V. Kryukov / Limits of Power: Round Table. – Ideas and ideals. – 2012. – №4(14). – P. 5-20.
4. Melnikov, M.V. Private and public in the historical process. Theoretical and sociological analysis: monograph / M.V. Melnikov. – Novosibirsk: Publishing house of NSTU, 2016. – 396 P.
5. Tönnis, F. Community and society: basic concepts of pure sociology / F. Tönnis.- St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2002. – 450 P.
6. Kryukov, V.V. The sum of axiology: monograph / V.V. Kryukov. – Novosibirsk: Publishing house of NSTU, 2018. – 207 P.: ill., 10 col. ill. (Series "Monographs of NSTU").