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**Reasons of the configuration changes and conditions of the functioning of the systems of power in societies of today**

**Summary.** The paper describes the evolution of the current system of power in modern states and identifies the factors affecting the changes in its configuration. In a democracy and globalization these factors are the social networks of trust, conceptual inequality and the existence of latent power structures that lead to the emergence of new institutions of power, but also significantly affect the nature of relationships within the current system of government, forcing it to evolve, creating comfort for the operation of each of the its constituent bodies of power.
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Within the framework of modern political science there is a substantial change in study and interpretation of category "power". The transition into another qualitative condition - reproducing of sketchiness of power – takes place. For comprehending of the sketchiness of modern power it is necessary to recreate all his integrity. Sketchiness of power in this sense will be realized as certain configuration which provides the certain method of co-operation between the transcendents of power, instances of power, elites, people. If any of constituents is skipped, it can cause negative consequences.

Absence of positive changes in development of the system of power in the modern states is largely related to that the different by nature organs of power do not form the single system every element of which determines a part of general global task on its level. Globalization and other world social and political processes contribute to the system of traditional public and local self-government authorities and organs of civil society, mass-media and other institutes which in democratic societies also substantially influence society and participate in realization of power. All these factors make the representatives of political science, and practicing politicians to appeal to the system of power on purpose to define what must be changed, which factors of influence are positive, and what, vice versa, threatens the power and society on the whole, and slows the further community development.

It is generally known, that *Charles-Louis de Montesquieu* was the first, who set principle of functioning of a few instances of power separated from each other. However, he speaks not about the division of authorities, i.e. not about that, how to divide one power into three parts, but about a few separate instances of power, each of which possesses an exclusive resource, and these instances have to interrelate with each other.

Possibility of parallel existence of a few instances of power was generated by a few separate types of power, in particular, political, public, state, power of local self-government. All of them are different in aims, methods, forms of display, objects and management subjects.

Sometimes power is regarded only as a system of public organs. "State power is a form of power, having a monopoly of law-making, being obligatory for all the population, which grounds on special methods of compulsion, as on one of measures contributing in laws and orders abiding" [3, 168]. Only state power has a monopoly on compelling the members of society to execute its intentions. State power in an equal degree means both certain organization and practical activity on realization of aims and tasks of this organization.

State as an integral system has certain independent tasks, implementing of which sometimes is possible only under condition of rejecting the just consideration of interests of certain groups and classes or their substantial limitation. If in this concrete case to "reminisce" justice, then, in spite of all attractiveness and value of this concept, its embodiment can in practice destroy national and political life of people. "The state must not and can not conduct reforms that destroy the life in this state or somehow hurt the autonomy of national spirit. Support of the state as an autonomous form of national spirit, makes that verge which is essential for state power" [1, 278].

However, leading principle in modern political strategists is quite opposite. So, in their opinion, number of instances of power must not be reduced, but on the contrary, must be increased rapidly, exceeding the rate of society complication. In this case the power creates field, where people can have guidelines and develop themselves, where freedoms and democracy appear, when people can participate in achievement of consent between the instances of power.

If to study the evolution of concept "power", it is possible to assert that in modern terms mechanisms of power and sketchiness of its realization are better realized by people. If previously power was inviolable and did not undergo to the technical actions of people, then gradually it has become more "mastered". People learned how to build different compositions of power, create new its instances.

Analyzing historical revolutionary periods, changing forms and types of power shows clearly that there can be several instances of power. Problems of the ‘old’ Europe, related to the conflicts between two instances of power, such as churches and states (monarchies), were solved by creating of the special composition of two instances. But the number of instances of power increases with the flow of time. In particular, existence of such branches of power as judicial, executive and legislative instances becomes common. In Europe there are democratic societies, in which new instances can appear as a result of new transcendents, new exceptional resources. It is possible to assert that the process of claim of new instances of power - organs of local self-government - develops in modern society. The only question is concerns exceptional resources they have and on which transcendent they are grounded.

Charles Tilly - one of modern western researchers of problems of power in the conditions of the globalizing world and world-wide popularity of democratic ideas, considers that presently the process of transforming the configuration of power in society takes place. According to his opinion, modern power changes its configuration under influence of three processes: integrations of networks of trust, isolations of categorical inequality and liquidation of independent centers of power that use violence and compulsion [5, 232]. We are going to study in more details each of the indicated processes with the purpose of finding out, what exactly is changing in modern power.

So, trust presupposes that a subject realizes dependence of result from the possible risks, mistakes or failures. Thus, the relations of trust unite people which regularly expose themselves to risk. I.e. in the networks of trust various relations are "formed, mainly, the lasting and durable ones, which people establish in relation to valuable, important and long-term resources and enterprises, exposed to the risk of possible crime, mistakes and failures from the side of other people" [5, 232].

Democracy necessarily carries out the partial including of networks of trust in a public policy. If the basic networks of trust, which are created by citizens for realization of the collective actions, are remote from public policy, then the citizens don’t have enough stimuli for participating in such policy, on the one hand, but on the other hand, there are powerful enough stimuli for concealing the social connections from political intervention. Under such conditions it is almost impossible to implement effectively and consistently collective will of citizens in policy of the state, at least, without revolutionary transformations. But complete integration, for example, in conditions of theocracy, family oligarchy and fascism, also eliminates possibility of democracy, as there is also no transition of collective will of citizens by negotiations in policy of the state [5, 112-113].

Three main processes integrate the networks of trust in a public policy: disintegration of the isolated networks of trust, integration of the previously isolated networks of trust and creation of new, related to the policy networks of trust. Such processes are expedient, in opinion of Charles Tilly, to consider the necessary condition of democratization. "They are needed, because different citizens do not have stimuli to cope with the failures of democratic policy, therefore they easily can leave public policy, if it is not satisfactory for them. Integrations of networks of trust induce citizens to prefer voting right and loyalty to leaving the policy. The processes opposite to mentioned ones, eliminate the networks of trust from public policy" [5, 120].

Inequality is such relations between persons or groups of persons, when one group gets more advantages than the other one as a result of their co-operation. The established categorical inequality can be defined as organizational forms of differences regarding gender, nationality, ethnicity, religion, community and other similar systems of classifications [5, 137].

Charles Tilly gives the number of ten groups of major resources, which have always generated inequality and continue to do it during human history, among which there are: compulsion, labor, animals, soil, traditional institutes, machines, finances, information, mass-media, scientific and technical information, etc. [5, 140]. Either recipient can use such resources for having income by the coordinated actions. When there is lack of resources are not enough, or they can easily be shorten, then recipients resort to usurpation and exploitation of resources, i.e. generate inequality.

Any regime generates inequality and does it in three possible ways: protecting the property of its basic supporters, creating the own systems of collecting tax or rewarding by resources, redistributing resources among the segments of subjected population. "There is considerable material inequality in states with democratic regimes, and the democratic states invest in support of the existing forms of such inequality, so, absence of inequality is not the necessary condition of democracy or democratization. Instead the democracy consists in the isolation of public policy from any questions of existing material inequality. The democratic regime can be formed and exist only until the public policy is not disintegrated according to the categories of inequality. And vice versa, political rights and duties different from the categories of inequality can threaten democracies and block the process of democratization. Democracy is prospering, when inequality of everyday life is disconnected with inequality in relations between the state and citizens” [5, 145].

The considerable changes in degree and character of inequality also influence the democratic prospects [2]. Any substantial deepening of inequality, which at any rate is not compensated by the public policy, creates a serious threat to the existent democratic regimes. Deepening of inequality results in controlling of basic resources by the authorities, that leads to the emerging of authoritarian regimes.

After separating of public policy from inequality and social networks of trust (that has negative consequences), the third important change leading to democracy is elimination of autonomous independent power structures which have proper effective means of violence and compulsion. Such structures can operate both outside the state (for example, commandos) and within the state (for example, the military). The Ukrainian researcher I.Senchenko defines such structures of power as latent, but concerning their role in a political process and system of power in the state, he agrees with Charles Tilly [4]. By overcoming it, the state will submit to the public policy, spreading people’s influence. Thus, state power will be limited by self-government which is, along with self-organization, the basis for functioning of public policy in the modern states.

In opinion of Charles Tilly, three interrelated process limit power of autonomous structures: (1) expansion of political participation (which is quite often compulsory performed by the authoritarian regimes); (2) equalization of access to the non-state political resources and means (that frequently is the result of mass-media coverage and intensification of territorial mobility, but not takes place merely due to the changes in political institutes as such); (3) prohibition of autonomous and/or free power, grounded on compulsion and violence both inside the state and out of it [5, 168-169].

Thus, three basic factors influence new configuration (system) of power, which is being formed under influence of democratic and globalizing processes: social networks of trust, categorical inequality and latent (alternative) structures of power, each of them, either individually or in complex unity lead to establishing of self-organized and self-governing processes as basis of new configuration of power in the modern democratic states.
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**Наумкіна С.М., Маслов Ю.К. Причини зміни конфігурацій і умов функціонування системи влади в сучасних суспільствах. – Стаття.**

**Анотація.** У статті розглядається еволюція діючої системи влади в сучасних державах і визначаються чинники, які впливають на зміни її конфігурації. В умовах демократії і глобалізації такими чинниками є соціальні мережі довіри, концептуальна нерівність і існування латентних структур влади, які наводять до появи нових інститутів влади, а також істотно впливають на характер взаємин усередині діючої системи влади, заставляючи її трансформуватися, створюючи комфортність для функціонування кожній з вхідних в неї інстанцій влади.
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**Аннотация.** В статье рассматривается эволюция действующей системы власти в современных государствах и определяются факторы, влияющие на изменений ее конфигурации. В условиях демократии и глобализации такими факторами являются социальные сети доверия, концептуальное неравенство и существование латентных структур власти, которые приводят к появлению новых институтов власти, а также существенно влияют на характер взаимоотношений внутри действующей системы власти, заставляя ее трансформироваться, создавая комфортность для функционирования каждой из входящих в нее инстанций власти.
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