

Kaloyan Smilkov
Varna Free University

The Archeology of Power Experience

Hard political reality could not be described in clear boundaries and rules because it is dual. Furthermore, it is both static and dynamic, interrupted and continuous, daily and legitimate, individual and public. Policy has its own universal laws that are not promoted in political legitimation. They are found only as characters in unreflected power relations and their respective conflicts. Political reality precludes alternatives to parallel existence. In many *political systems*, such alternative in fact exists only through a declassification of the series, as in real asymmetric relations, standing in the way, but in general, and political ideas. Philosophical discourses are often expressed through separating the rational from the emotional life, but developed through various logical configurations. But most often they seem to be compared to the dominance of the ego and thus rejected the heavy task to explain the power experience. This is a humanistic sensibility of political interpretation. It is built on the concept of political perception of man. Ernst Cassirer has expressed this view in *An Essay on Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture* (1972). According to him: "The history of anthropological philosophy is abundant with raging passions and human emotions."¹

The roots of philosophical anthropology is the bosom of the Enlightenment project to society. As word for humans, it often has a legitimising function. For Immanuel Kant violence equals to power, but the indirect violence is not associated with the power-loving. In *Anthropology from a pragmatic point of view*, Kant has solved the problem of the unreflective domination.² The philosophical anthropology justifies every single person in the name of humanism through the Rhön, the thought of Descartes: *Cogito, ergo sum*. In Cartesian spirit, Jean-Paul Sartre in being and thinks nothing *L'être et le néant* (1943), that man himself is being-himself-on-his-own³.

¹ E. Cassirer, *An Essay on Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture*, Yale University Press, New York 1972, p. 38.

² See: I. Kant, *Political Writings*, New York 1995.

³ See: J.-P. Sartre, *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*, New York 1956.

Absolute subject, everything else is external and alien. Thus, in philosophical anthropology any authority shall be regarded as foreign and alien to the man. The difference is that, for the political anthropology the power is inherent in the man. Only the reflection of power is not required for humans. If anthropological thought up by standing existential illusions, it is only to be controlled political space in question. Thus the situation of non-engagement in the political relations does not exist. Power up to each member in a society, through the principle of asymmetry. Even if you are not interested in power, it always likes you. The anthropological perspectives on the political sphere can be listed in a major encyclopedic item. This experience does not favour any of them, and enjoys the achievements of all of them. According to the prominent political anthropologist Georges Balandier and its **political anthropology** *Anthropologie politique* (1967), there are six approaches:

1. Genetic approach, which gives a magical or religious meaning of the power in a culture.
2. Functional approach in which the power is an aspect of the whole organisation and is searching for an analogy between cultural and natural.
3. Typological approach is a continuation of the functional. According to its representatives, there are different types of societies, depending on the form of power established in them.
4. Terminological approach, whereby the object of political anthropology is not well defined conceptually.
5. Structural approach using the structural methodology, replacing the genetic and functional.
6. Dynamic approach, supplementing the complementary aspects of the structure fixed. This approach is preferred by Balandier⁴.

In his version of political anthropology, the approaches are discussed according to their characteristics unreflective used and interpreted in the text. Power realities could not be examined without also considering its logic and technique. For example, power in its modern form can only be sustained but not seen, because it is not subjective. This provides a parallel between political ideas and political experience. They are expressed in the sequence of political legitimacy and power of techniques that political eras. Only through the power of differentiation's techniques can be clearly delineated the political era. It is in this context to distinguish balance of power, because there is only one force or continuity between the various political discourses. Such continuity does not exist in a purely philosophical attempts to legitimise a political idea. Therefore, theories of policy can be tested only descriptively, and studied – only normatively.

Making a clear parallel between them, respectively, describes the conflicts between the state – the culture, the power – the freedom, the society – the individual and their political implications. Starting from the nature of these oppositions, it should be remembered that the basic principle of political anthropology is that the genesis of the policy is in itself a

⁴ G. Balandier, *Anthropologie politique*, P.U.F., Paris 1967, p. 26–35.

social structure. It is legitimate institutions, including the state, even when establishes its values and norms in laws and regulations.

The essence of politics is not in the complex of norms (constitution, laws, regulations) which regulate the system of government, but in the logic and techniques with which it is possible given the political legitimation⁵. This possibility is culturally constructed and is called the power relations or political reality. It is composed of “genetic“ links with the social fabric which is based on rituals, customs and *kinship system*, etc., by purely geographical and cultural specificity. These are deep power relations, their configuration is always uncertain. They are not reflective but by contrast interpretative. From anthropological point of view their logic is very diverse. The political anthropology is interested in the technology for their realisation, in short the basic principle of their origin⁶. The contradiction in the opposition situation – a society or government – the society is in some sense incorrectly presented because there is no society without institutions, without the power structure, which to some extent is not graduated by the state⁷.

The fact of their opposition is the co-existence of the modern era to gulp large conflicts. Political realities of modernity does not allow anonymous individual, but anonymous observer of government. Therefore, political theory is a tool for establishing identity.

This tool is so, through a discursive classification, but it does not imply any comment, criticism or new interpretation. This is pure legitimation of social and political asymmetry derived from the principles of existential faith of freedom. The laws of society are always formulated in a priori. They are given the power. Fate of power stems from its nature to be comprehensive, to be total. It is also about knowing when it does not involve itself in the analysis of the power realities, but it plays. As J.-F. Lyotard believes these are the “*big stories*” of modernity. They do not belong to the postmodern culture and time in which there is parallelism in discourse. Postmodern political anthropology is a science, because it explores the political paradoxes. It is out of the register of social and political scientist and has broken radically with legitimising positivism, also a theoretical illusion of rational human nature. Political anthropology only sees conflict and instability, and permanent change of strategy for the power situation. Political signs and symbols in the society are tools that can be a state of the space. That is to be in a situation dominated by manipulative discursive practises and changes in perceptual attitudes. Regardless of the form of government, its strategies are consistent and dynamic. According to political anthropology, where the man lives in society, it is politically aggressive or passive, according to the strategy used. The anthropology avoids legitimising the political meanings of “good” and “evil” and their historical positivism. So science is not comprising only of the static structures and models, but also of the dynamic political instabilities and contradictions. Unreflective description of power relations and conflicts is through the prism of the postmodern reflection of knowledge, which is plural and decentralized.

⁵ N. Rouland, *L'anthropologie Juridique*, Paris 1990, p. 4–6.

⁶ J.L. Myres, *The Influence of Anthropology on the Course of Political Science*, University of California Press, Berkeley 1916, p. 38.

⁷ P. Clastres, *La societe contre l'Etat*, Minuit 1974, p. 160, 186.

The description of the anthropological concepts relativity states of characters in political reality, and outlines their historical continuity and incompleteness.

Pioneers

The Florentine Niccolo Machiavelli is most frequently defined as the precursor to political anthropology. His major work *Il Principe* (1531) contains abundant evidence for this claim.⁸ The most vivid example is the illustration of Machiavelli's *Prince*. This collection of tips and case studies played a fundamental role in the political constitution of the anthropological knowledge. These are discoveries that reveal the medieval mechanism of power, not the modern one, as it is often considered. The fact is that the method by which he explored politics and human rights, is contrary to the moral canons and dogmas that are legitimising power. For Machiavelli, the power derives "from some people over others" without the mediation of God. More accurately to say is that he was the first European thinker who believes that for the execution of power the genetic link between the ruler and possession is not required. It is a relation of image. This makes it a very questionable definition for first modern political thinker (in the sense of legitimate). Rather he is the first classical thinker in the modern era because the modern legitimation of power is indispensable interconnection between the ruler and possession.

Moreover, Machiavelli defines the human nature as not being image of God. According to him they must be animalistic they embody many qualities to succeed politically and otherwise must rely on reconciliation and security, which also belong to nature, but feels stages. The Florentine author interprets Hesiod that few are those who managed to get control over the public, often interpreted as a wrong assumption of modern elitism. Compared to the political relations "there are three kinds of minds." Ultimately, the basic principle of politics monarchist and republic for which Machiavelli wrote, is the principle of war *ius belli*, known from Roman times *inter arma silent leges*. This also applies to the time of "useless minds". Substitution of theocratic legitimacy of the new, modern ideology stands in sharp contrast to any later versions after "animalistics" of Machiavelli.

Charles-Louis Montesquieu is the founder of the political geography. It is a very important component of the pluralist's principle of political genesis in the political anthropology. Unlike the other representatives of the Enlightenment in his main works – *Les lettres persiennes* (1721) and *De l'esprit des lois* (1748), he tries to give an idea of the power in the spirit of anti-machiavelian literature⁹. The political writer Montesquieu does not reflect on the natural rights of man and nature, like other thinkers of the XVIII century. He does not believe that man is a "wolf in nature", nor that the man is gregarious and social, and puts him in other aspects of thought – the geographical factors. The main focus as it is in climate and lifestyle as they are directly related to policy forms, laws and governance

⁸ See: N. Machiavelli, *The Prince and the Discourses*, Modern Library, New York 1950.

⁹ See: C.-L. Montesquieu, *The spirit of the Laws*, Hafner, New York 1962.

of a society and culture. According to him ancient polis and the Venetian Republic are appropriate for the Western political forms.

Montesquieu, however, is more than just a theorist of Enlightenment politics. He is a political researcher of various political forms, which makes him a political anthropologist. He believes that the freedom is of the most important human values and this leads him to investigate the causes of the human obedience. They are in the cultures of fear in the different societies. A good illustration of this is the novel *Persian Letters* (1721), where the impossible is done through intercultural dialogue. By contrast he presents vividly different morals, values and ideas. Thus emerges parallel political geography of the human world. The laws are relations, according to Montesquieu, that are derived from the nature rather than culture. These natural rights imply all manifestations of social life. The question of forms of political correctness is whether these natural laws are complied with. In *The Spirit of the Laws* (1748) there is a multi-faceted expression, suggesting esoterics in the political judgments of Montesquieu. The human nature is both aggressive and timid, but it is also inadequate to its needs, because it lacks an intellectual culture that ensures a gratification. The religious values and beliefs appear to be a compromise for this lack. Wars and despotic government prove these arguments. At this point there is a close proximity to the natural law of Thomas Hobbes. Montesquieu has more goals, as he believes that each culture gives a specific layer of values on natural laws. This layer is studied by the political geography. It is this important segment of the political anthropology.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau corrects such humanistic confidence, “the man is good by nature”. The fact is that politics and morality are incompatible in the modern era. The motto of people without a God is *homo hominis lupos est*. Rousseau makes an anthropological reflection in custom work *Reflections on the following question proposed by the Academy of Dijon: What is the origin of inequality among people and is it based on natural laws?* (1735–1750)¹⁰. Jean-Jacques Rousseau explores the human nature and culture, and separates them. Asymmetric in the sense of community, he transmitted the culture. According to him when studying human needs through various means one needs to fix the differences between people manifested in the culture. He places the first emphasis on natural inequalities. Only the cultural (moral or political) inequality is what makes people unequal. Everything that man produces, is cultural. The state is also a product of the culture, which introduces inequality. According to Rousseau each culture is threatened by tyranny and despotism: “...if there is one person who is not subject to the law...” The biggest crime of the enlightened person is that he considers himself to be a higher being, and considers others as inferior. He believes that only the person living in a natural state is good and fair. Rousseau denies the historical justice of the state unless it is affixed by a social contract. Rousseau’s major contribution to the political anthropology is the principle that the researcher should not carry their cultural notions when studying the neighboring communities. This makes it impossible for the political person to comprehend by gaining knowledge. Starting the study, he observed an alien world. In order to know the others it

¹⁰ See: J.-J. Rousseau, *The Social Contract and Discourses*, E.P. Dutton, New York 1950.

is necessary to abandon yourself. For Rousseau the most important skill of a man, as an anthropologist is to examine, confess, but to write on behalf of others.

Evolutionists

The evolutionary approach in the political anthropology is a principle of British authors from the XIX century. The creation of positivism as an intellectual milestone in the modern era which was marked without a doubt by the works of Auguste Comte. Conquered by the utopian ideas of Saint-Simon, Comte outlines a next stage of political development of mankind or just describes the parameters of the coming era of industrial modernity. Fully completed, positivism crystallizes in the political evolutionism that became the nucleus of political theory and philosophy of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. This approach is most clearly formulated by Herbert Spencer. The knowledge in the modern era needs authority and transcendental principle and centering its hierarchy, replacing the missing monotheistic God. According to evolutionism forerunner Thomas Malthus social processes are governed by transcendental regulator through the positive and preventive limitation of the human population. Such a category is ‘sociocracy’ according to Auguste Comte.

For the evolutionist Charles Darwin those are the principles of natural selection and the struggle for existence in its forms. For him, the natural body is composed of two types of non survive and survive or ‘survival of the fittest’. This philosophical opposition ‘human-animal’ by Darwin is not only an anthropological hypothesis of one word, it is a political theory¹¹. Historical opposition “old man – new man” carries the same charge in that sense.

Lewis Henry Morgan created the popular evolutionary scheme: *savagery, barbarism, civilization* for political-anthropological typology in his book *Ancient society* (1877). The scheme becomes a classical model in the political anthropology of evolutionism. The evolutionary model was followed by Edward Burnett Tylor in his main work *Primitive culture* (1871) and *Anthropology: an introduction to the study of man and civilization* (1881)¹². In the intellectual interpretations of evolutionism not only the sociology of the nineteenth century is present, but also the specific field of social anthropology that found its undisputed leader in the person of James Frazer. His evolutionism is special. It’s mental. Fraser assumed that the modern science has no different political function than that of the magic in the primitive societies and in traditional religion. Fraser’s thesis for evolutionism is the most courageous one, which separates him from the general trends in modern science and human society. It leaves a lasting mark in the anthropological searches. As a professor of social anthropology in Britain, he includes with priority in his research programs the rites, the origin of religion and traditions of government. In *The Golden Bough* (1922) Fraser is explicit that genesis of power exists only in the presence

¹¹ See: C. Darwin, *Origin of Species*, Cambridge University Press, New York 1981.

¹² See: E.B. Tylor, *Anthropology: an introduction to the study of man and civilization*, D. Appleton and Company, New York 1896.

of religion, generally codified form of faith¹³. Unlike the evolutionists of material, Fraser is a spiritual evolutionist, clearly expressed by his modern form of science. The question remains whether in this way he does not find the metamorphoses of the knowledge.

Progressists

Progressists could not exist without evolutionists. The basic ideas of progressive approach in the political anthropology are exposed in the work of Friedrich Engels, *The Origin of Family, Private Property and the State* (1884) and not to a lesser extent in the *Capital* (1867) by Karl Marx¹⁴. The progressivism in the polity-anthropological typology is further elaborated by the evolutionary design principles of the dialectical. It grades the forms of political and economic organization of the clan, slavery, feudalism, capitalism to communism with the first (transitional) phase – socialism. The last step has essentially brought the progressist's charge. Friedrich Engels stresses on the fundamental closeness between progressivism and evolutionism in its unfinished (and unknown to many of his Soviet interpreters) *Dialectics of the Nature* (1873–1886). Progressist's understanding of political anthropology rejects the evolutionism only in its legitimacy as arguments in the work *Anti-During* (1878). As the progressists are repeatedly interpreted by followers, those ideas have many ramifications and interpretations. One of them is Paul Lafarg. His anthropological ideas are presented in a study on the origin of the family, which clearly outlines the basic legitimizing structure of the progressivism, observed in the analysis of the patriarchal family. The main structure of legitimizing progressivism is built entirely on the egalitarian in man. It is the antithesis of human difference (*isonomia*), and hence diversity in culture. Progressivism approach believes that everything must relate to future world.

Skeptics

There is a whole range of skeptics of political rationality, which are difficult to generalize. These are undoubtedly Max Stirner, Gustave Le Bon, Sigmund Freud. But Friedrich Nietzsche provoked the most serious doubt to the Modern Age, creating a tradition of critical reevaluation of all values. His work *The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Music* (1872) is fundamental to the explanation of political principle, enshrined in the contemporary culture and eurocentric country. Nietzsche describes there the culture of the ancient Greek polis as a dual model. At one pole there is Apollo, and at the other is Dionysus. The dual character is built on rationality and irrationality. The balance of these two essences marks the harmony in the ancient Greek society and culture. However the Socratic irony sends the anthropological search to the direction of the rational pole. According to Nietzsche, this “event“ has radically changed the historical trajectory of human nature. Nietzsche sees this tradition in all modern science and policy. *The new idol in Thus Spake*

¹³ See: J. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, Wordsworth, London 1993.

¹⁴ See: F. Engels, *The Origin of Family, Private Property and the State*, Resistance Books 2004.

Zarathustra (1891), where he made a criticism of European culture, he writes: “A state, is called the coldest of all cold monsters¹⁵.”

Nietzsche confirms the paradox of modern power – as in terms of knowledge. Knowledge can no longer be unpolitical nature. How, knowledge, be thought of apolitical without the cognitive functions of history, geography, psychology, sociology? Aren't they the limits of thinking, that clearly outline the space called political? The political genealogy of Nietzsche captures this problem by annihilation of the legitimizing essence of the knowledge through polarization of the morality. His unique judgment of human history as a struggle between various forms takes the purely moral romantic passion to seek a common interest in socio-political relations. Not only them, but in more sensitive areas of conflict between the individual and the mass. In this skeptics line – the problem of morality is well caught by multiple consecutive attempts in that direction.

Nietzsche establishes undisputed sense of political unreflective genealogical in history. This is morally, introduced in a total time of immutable rules of epistemic one good and one evil. Nietzsche is not starting from a historical analysis of this opposition, because see its importance especially in the knowledge of man. Human behavior manifests itself in thousands of directions, but morality and knowledge are always giving its frame. This limiting frame mirrors, reflected in government. The inability to separate from the cognitive power is rejected by one of Nietzsche's untimely meditations – *For the benefit and harm of the life history* (1874). The power experience of Nietzsche is shown in the classification's parody of the three categories: animal, man, overman. They are in the genealogical link, like: “Man is a rope stretched between animal and overman – a rope over an abyss¹⁶.”

The man has gone too far to return and become a beast, driven by natural instincts and forces of nature. He is a creature that is sentenced to be cultural, but in no case again natural. Therefore, for Nietzsche, the man is the cause of itself *causa sui*. Comprehensiveness and integrity of Nietzsche's superman is a human sacrifice at the altar of life. But do not sacrifice as coercion, but as will the human be deprived of 'overman'. Beyond the will to power as Nietzsche's superman stands alone. He does not tolerate the hypocrisy of morality in which man has acquiesced. General event for the death of God stems from the fact that man has become a target for the modern thought. The one that has rationalized in a consumer way his life and believes that he is the master of nature. Therefore, the modern man is the last one because he has lost himself, has lost his nature. The eternal return is a political judgment, which runs through the works of Nietzsche. According to him it is something cyclical, rather than the result of endless efforts of humanity to release. Whole constellation of discourses of freedom appear to the XVIII century. In all ages until today they are genetically related.

Discourse, describing the power of different institutional discourses of freedom with his assessment radical tinge. Ever since then the concept of power should be the concept of freedom. The concepts of power and freedom are coupled in the political anthropology of Nietzsche. So he launched one skeptical approach to the political anthropology,

¹⁵ F. Nietzsche, *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, Dover Publications 1999, p. 43.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 15.

certainly crossing with his literary pathos. This approach brings the assumption that the political discourse is necessary to counter the master and Slave morality, and slave masters' vision of politics.

The skeptical version of Oswald Spengler was one of the most powerful provocations against the legitimization of modern eurocentrism. His assessments in the historical perspective of linear and cumulative continuity are inspired by Nietzsche. The “morphological analogy” to the historical “forms and cultures” is Spengler’s attempt to resolve the crisis of the West from the early twentieth century. This methodology is shown in *The Decline of the West* (1918–1922), rejecting the proposed historic decisions and functional subjectivity¹⁷. This anti-modern and anti-progressed morphology is preserved in *Man and Technology* (1931). Spengler has provided the tools with which to examine and explain each culture, without taking into account its own definitions of significance and historicity. With the help of those tools connections and closeness can be found in the different cultures. Thus the problem of world history, with no connection to Europe, is solved by Spengler as homologous and analogous forms of proximity of youth and old age, childhood and maturity, insight, which is empirically found in all animal species.

As described cosmology connections are formed and function of life, but rather a sharper vision of the dominant scientific paradigm, which enjoys a political protection, in the sense of trust of individuals for whom these scientific paradigms have become protective buffer against religions, painted a virtual picture of the political consciousness. It is precisely such political modernists that are afraid to admit that the cover of civilized democracy, market economy and constitutionalism is not the only alternative to the totalitarian order. They are afraid to look at the exposed system of the state machinery as a useless one, as Nietzsche thinks, that perverted human instincts and the proliferation of human kind in the mass man who increasingly and dynamically destroying the limited available resources. The issue is not only in ecological rationality and consumption, it is now much deeper, for the technical transformation of human nature and the political expectations of them.

Functionalists

Functional approach opposes evolutionism, progressivism and skepticism in the political anthropology. Thus it starts the theoretical dispute about the power experience in the anthropological sciences. Franz Boas is considered to be a pioneer in the anthropology regarding functionalism. He is a field researcher. According to him the value system of every society has been granted from the past and the contemporary societies can hardly be functioning without it. This gives him the judgment status of a pioneer in the anthropological knowledge of functionalism. The major works of Boas, containing political and anthropological ones are: *Race, Language and Culture* (1940) and *Race and Democratic Society* (1945)¹⁸. Levi-Strauss has rated Boas as the first anthropologist, who is freed

¹⁷ See: O. Spengler, *The Decline of the West. Form and Actuality*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York 1926.

¹⁸ See: F. Boas, *Race, Language and Culture*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1995.

from the illusions of evolutionaryism and progressivism. Even with his Latin dissertation *Montesquieu and Rousseau – Forerunners of Sociology* (1892), for Emile Durkheim the social and anthropological knowledge should be independent of the philosophy. He is both a researcher and a theorist of politics in anthropology and sociology¹⁹. His main works illustrate this fact. The man exists in a dual reality of individual and social, the latter is dominant. For Durkheim the society is a particular reality, which is above the individual²⁰. Therefore, the social science must be knowledge of social facts. They should be treated as property. According to him the complicated societies are a combination of simple elements, and the social institutions have their prototype in its elementary forms. The whole society is interdependently integrating its parts, but each of its systems is a specific social organism. Any social function corresponds to a particular social need. With these considerations Durkheim is admitted to be the founder of the structural functionalism. He believes that the social explanation of political phenomena will help the society and its management. The science for society is an idea that does not occur by chance with the idea of political science. We should not understate the fact that Durkheim defined the sociology as a science for the proper conduct of society. That his work is political, but in a way yet to mark its political content. So as it streamlines its policy in the domination of social reality. An essential element in anthropological theory is the concept of Durkheim's anomaly (*anomie*) in *Suicide* (1897) Durkheim made a brilliant anthropological analysis. The anomaly is the dissolution of social organization as a moral ethos. This is evident in the transformation of the traditional society with the advent of the modern structures of life. The state of anomaly is expressed in the melancholy and disgust to life. The unconscious categories existing also in the contemporary societies can be revealed through such theories. In terms of elementary societies Durkheim believes that not the savage should be investigated, but only its primitive thinking, understood as a collective idea. The emphasis is on the common laws, rituals and traditions. For Durkheim anthropologists must deal with social phenomena through the analysis of total social facts in order to define the social context of the internal structure of society. And anthropology is a science which can explain all political phenomena by their social context. The political anthropology of Durkheim is a research and experimental one. What might be variants of a given society is a major issue. In essence, this is the question of human nature. Emile Durkheim regarded society as an independent object outside of human will, but not from human nature. He wants to know what the basic power is because the modern is rational. For example, the connection of confession and power to profane. So it is quite elementary distinguished from the modern society and its political difference.

The functionalism of Bronislaw Malinowski is expressed in the anti-historical principle: cultural-historical phenomena can be explained by today's means. This approach is displayed in his book *The Dynamics of cultural change: An Inquiry Into Race Relations in Africa* (1949), *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays* (1948). According to

¹⁹ See: E. Durkheim, *Montesquieu and Rousseau: forerunners of sociology*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor 1960.

²⁰ See: E. Durkheim, *Les Formes élémentaires de la Vie Religieuse*, P.U.F., Paris 1991.

Malinowski the speculative historical conclusions are not necessary “anthropology of war”²¹. He opposes to the historical nationalism, that is built retrospectively on the basis of individual cultural values: “cultural pathology”, “tribe-nation” and “tribe-state”²². The most popular representative of the political anthropology’s functionalism is Alfred Radcliffe-Brown. His theoretical work *Structure and function in the primitive society* (1952) is revealing in details the relationship between religion and social structure²³. It is the author’s synthesis and theory of the functionalist approach. Radcliffe-Brown is a major theoretician of functionalism both in anthropology and sociology. His thesis is that every instinct refers to a particular institution. Examples are security institutions and those in the defense of power in all societies. He wants to transform the anthropology in theoretical and experimental science, aiming to group the facts on a genealogical principle through analogies. Through such approach any historical study is losing its meaning. Radcliffe-Brown believes that if anthropology is aiming to find only the facts, it will not be different from history. Its goal is to consistently formulate hypotheses, identify all stages of development of a culture and describing all of the events that has happened in it. The anthropologist must live like the representatives of that culture. According to Radcliffe-Brown the most elementary thinking can be easily explained with the help of the primitive societies. Purpose of the anthropological study is to describe all objects and the relations between them. One of these objects are the ritual objects of religious faith. The religion appears to be extremely important in most cultures, because it contains all of the social and political ‘cement’. For Radcliffe-Brown the violation of the traditions and rituals in a culture leads to severe penalties. This is the legal structure of the ‘primitive society’. Through parallels with the contemporary society, the past of the human civilization must be revealed ‘specific social function’. According to Radcliffe-Brown all problems within a society that is seeking for solutions from its contemporaries have already been solved in the primitive societies.

Structuralists

The structural approach introduces the notion of communication to a society in the political anthropology. The enormous interest of the structuralists towards the language is the cause for studying all communication relations in a society. The most prominent representative of the structural approach, and its major pioneer in the anthropological theory is Claude Levi-Strauss. He is the founder of the modern anthropological science. His role does not overlap with the representation in the structural approach. Levi-Strauss pays special attention to the few pioneers in the anthropological researches: Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Marcel Mauss, Emile Durkheim, Franz Boas, as the authors who have contributed their part to reach to the field of the humanitarian knowledge that can autonomously

²¹ B. Malinowski, *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays*, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois 1948, p. 278–279.

²² *Ibidem*, p. 291.

²³ See: A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, *Structure and Function in Primitive Society*, New York 1952.

ly investigate the specific facts related to man and society. In no lesser extent his theoretical inspirer is Ferdinand de Saussure. He tries to define the object of structural anthropology, the social structure or 'pattern' as a basic concept, allowing to explore a society converting it into a scientific model. Thus, human sciences get new tools, allowing the public to be considered as a separate subject and a system without an emphasis on the individual elements from which the integrity of the system can not be completed. This idea is consistently unfold in many works of the author, the view for the need of new methodology to become a science without the need for the human to accept the scientific claims of other available methodologies of "law and political science."²⁴ Levi-Strauss derives those facts that lend themselves to symbolic typology. The author of the structural concept of society is clearly stating that all of the social events must be examined, such as gender relations, the system of kinship, rituals and rites in which primal forms of domination in every society are most clearly visible. According to him, they represent a complete model structure, which is an absolute invariant of the level of social and political life. These characteristics appear clearly expressed in the primitive societies that according to Levi-Strauss are incorrectly nominated by the modern scholars²⁵. Such examination of the above-mentioned structures is possible only through the filter of the invisibility in the social and political characteristics of a culture and society. Thus the term 'entity' acquires general significance for the anthropological research. As in physics and biology where there are described only the relationships of the elements of one group rather than the elements themselves. Thus, the concept structure differs from the evolutionary interpretation. Levi-Strauss firmly believes that no element of the social structure has any meaning if viewed only by itself. It should be viewed as an element of a system, after determining its place in relation to all other elements. Meanwhile, to establish the relations in the structure, they must be antagonistic in their order, opposition to opposition and conflict. This study defines a stratification of the individual members and groups through observation and experiment. Claude Levi-Strauss introduces two types of models that can be used consecutively 'conscious' and 'unconscious'. Both types of models are guided by the order of their elements, first for the study of ideologies through the rules and then the *system of kinship*, social status and stratification of the individual. Levi-Strauss has completely agreed with the view of Boas that to create a model of a modern type of societies that have established a conscious idea of their structure, is considerably more difficult. Similarly to the 'phonology' of Ferdinand de Saussure, a paradox arises in which it is easier to detect the surface of the form, but not the deeper structure²⁶. It is therefore necessary to study two types of lines of society. Of course, such a reasoned scientific concept has been quickly established after the extensive research by Roland Barthes. Modern societies have also sacred mythological depths, regardless of their industrial character. The conscious policy is purely reflective. It functions at the level of social, legal consciousness, which hides a deeper social structure. This order is unable to define

²⁴ C. Lévi-Strauss, *Anthropologie Structurale*, P.U.F., Paris 1958, p. 305–306.

²⁵ See: C. Lévi-Strauss, *The Savage Mind*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1966.

²⁶ C. Lévi-Strauss, *Anthropologie Structurale*, op. cit., p. 27.

a fully explored social structure. Levi-Strauss gives preference to the unconscious as a series of independent consciousness and thus susceptible to structural modeling²⁷. Their efficacy is at their higher level when examining the cultural series, transforming the elements of one structure to another. Unconsciousness is a major criterion for making a social structure in the model. According to the logic of the structural study the social fact being unique to the human society is equal to the semiotic one. The structural methodology is aiming at different types of social structures, not a single social structure. As basic ones Levi-Strauss differentiates the structures of social communication and social subordination. In the general formulation of their investigation Levi-Strauss focuses on the problem of the subjective factor, supported on the site, so anthropology with the tools of communicative methodology as inferred relations in the character status. The scientific outlook of the structural study provides clarity on the future of social sciences and humanities, as they turn from science to other objects in science, research communications of different social systems, for example, legal, economic, etc. It can be deduced to the general objective of the common semiology – to be studied all systems of signs, circulating in the bosom of society. The architectural principle of a society is revealed in the structures of subordination. These structures have vertically marked all of the others. They have a dynamic character and are over-order, moreover, they provide links between all other structures. In their essence, their momentum is always a principle of asymmetrical social homeostasis. Moreover, they represent to us the qualitative feature of society that is explored. If they are moved out of its system, they are losing an important meaning because they are connected to the same group of relations. For example, attached to the normative paradigms in society, they define the range of a social system in a given period of time. In order to complete its logical political anthropology, Levi-Strauss resorts to the general conclusion of the anti-historicity of social structure. This hypothesis is consistently maintained in most of the publications of Levi-Strauss, but a large part of his works are focused on the basic *Structural anthropology* (1958). In order to be ‘cleaned’ the social structures from the consciousness in them, it is necessary the withdrawal of the basic epistemological trump card that takes the inner logic and sense in the terms: past, present and future, hence the problem of social progress and evolution. In multiple scientific controversy with Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, Levi-Strauss seeks to correct the structural and functional insight into the social sciences, which in turn is inconsistent with evolutionary. In his structural functionalism he explores the elements of the structure, not the structure itself as a system of relations. He looks at the history as inherent part in any sense of reality. Therefore, Levi-Strauss is firmly opposed to the claim that there is a ‘common history’. The French anthropologist regarded the historicity as a separate code of chronological structure. For example, he reiterates the natural sciences that have benefited from the historical method only in the genesis of its inception. Thus emerges the concept of a common history of extracting meaning continuity of diachron. The conventional evolutionary political classifications of society “savagery, barbarism, civilization” by Lewis Henry Morgan and progress “clan, slavery, feudalism, capitalism and socialism”

²⁷ Ibidem, p. 249.

by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels have lost their sense for the structural approach. Thus it would be much easier to understand such a contemporary phenomena as the economic success of one of the most ancient cultures – China – having a history of any relationship in the structure, but no history structure itself. According to the structural typology of societies Levi-Strauss offers two possible models of political principles. Societies with a strong grip – ‘hot’ and societies with weak – ‘cold’. The cold societies are very primitive cultures on which is focused the initial research aim of the anthropology. They are cyclical societies that are operating on the basis of the mechanical principle. All kinds of communication and exchange a mythological, economic, kinship, are mechanical models of their social structure. Their political organization operates on the principle of cohesion. All important decisions are taken only jointly. These societies are ahistorical. Their rationalization is possible only through their mythology, because their political reality is existing only through the semiotic code. Mainly the heuristic importance of the political anthropology of societies has a structure called hot. These are the modern or industrial cultures. Their political structure operates only on the principle of distinction, which runs chronologically through the general picture of the political struggles, as for individual societies as well as for international relations. These societies operate only when there is a difference and a conflict. They have a ‘hot’ internal structure that is ensuring their homeostasis. The contribution of Levi-Strauss is not limited to the theory of structuralism, he formed an important part of the methodology of political anthropology.

Reconstructors

Max Weber’s models are essential for the reconstructural version of the political anthropology. He establishes a three-member kind of typology for the domination “charismatic, traditional, rational-bureaucratic”. For Weber, the domination is just an isolated case of power, but the social fabric is made up of asymmetrical relations, which are ensured by the political legitimacy through homeostasis. Weber has enriched the political anthropology with his researches on the ideal type of a society by his fundamental work *Economy and Society* (1919).²⁸ His studies are essential for both the sociology and the political sciences. Max Weber has discovered the genesis of political relations in the sacred and religious depths of the Western European societies. According to him, standing in the dominance of Western culture are the ideologies of Lutheranism and Calvinism. The religion appears to be a paradigm of political relations, which subsequently proves its’ capitalist’s economy in Weber’s *religionssoziologie*. His researches review the West Enlightenment tradition of revising the concept of mind and turn it into practical categories of political relations. His study *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1905) is presenting a critical look towards the traditional concept of the policy that is imposed by the positivism of Auguste Comte²⁹. Weber’s project of historical sociology of domination is close to that

²⁸ See: M. Weber, *Economy and Society*, University of California Press, Berkeley 1978.

²⁹ See: M. Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Routledge Classics, New York 2001.

of the political anthropology. His typology introduces critical concepts through which a model for the study of political relations is built. Weber has associated with religious power in their research program religionwissenschaft, that the political legitimacy of a society are predetermined by religious, moral, ethical and legal normative patterns. So the rule is consisting of cultural factors and legitimate violence. According to the rule Weber's study reveals a fact, forming a sphere through social classes, classes and hierarchies. In this sense, he believes that the cultural sciences and the general historical process are understandable only in the context of narrative value. For Weber the research facility introduces common types, etc., which are essentially the models that are applicable to the historical and social facts. To justify these ideal types, Weber explores a society through its organization as a social action and conflicts that are scopes of life and production. They are the most important segments of the organization and they are sharing values and values through work. This is essentially the economic life, along with institutions that establish the political space of a culture. The scientific explanations related to modern standards and relations are representing a particular characteristic as a model. The familiar characteristic in the social experience of the Western civilization is the modern economic and political relations. They have made the transition from traditional to industrial and technological practices. Besides, the alteration in the principles of labor is modifying the trade and exchange in general, at this point we might say that the economy is not separated from the management and policy. Weber's ideal type is viewed as an Utopian model. It is accessible through thinking and is necessary for reproducing and understanding the historical experience. The process, which creates ideal types, and collects debris such as composing political archaeologists. This is the methodological foundation of the sociology of the rule adopted by the political anthropology.

The French political researcher Michel Foucault adds religious and political nuances in Weber's thesis that the European civilization was established the religious institution as a political dominant over the human. This is the power of the Christian Church. Only in this religious culture there is a ritual that is called confession and it is designed to reveal the human soul. Thus a tradition of the sacred power in the Western European societies merged with or at least generated ideas in the Enlightenment, to reach the modern market economy and modern state. The Western civilization is built on the basis of these relations of power. They have created the idea of freedom, equality and fairness. Foucault is one of the most important researchers of power in the XX century. A part of his aim in all these works is the new technology of power from the XVII century. Foucault's theory of "power-knowledge" (*savoir-pouvoir*) is contrary to the classical legitimizing political thought, which is used to explain the modern state³⁰. In essence, the theory of Foucault rejects the thesis of a center of power. The power is hidden deeply in the structure of society and it is not a separate reality. Hypothetical center of power is dispersed across multiple localized outbreaks of domination and conflicts that build the social fabric. These hot spots are multi-layered and have their own logic and history, but the domination in them is disciplinary both as a practice exercise, and theories of rationalization. The modern

³⁰ See: M. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, Random House, New York 1975.

formula of the total power yields an absolute sense in the everyday life of most ordinary human contact and interaction, and its goal is not repression, but its efficiency and reproducibility. This could not be done without connecting the power to knowledge. This opens a new way of “domestication” of the modern man, similar to sado-masochistic games where the rules are actually habits, and the repression is only a mental fiction. According to Foucault, it has arisen from the characteristic of Western religious cultures pastoral power “the salvation of the people in the other world”³¹. As an aim of this new form of government appears not the man himself, but his integrity, including health, mind, soul and his secrets. Foucault calls this integrity corporeality. During the seventeenth century the new practice of power is in its genesis. Along with the emergence of the modern state also arose and the “individualized techniques” and “totalizing procedures”. The entire technology of modern power is concentrated in the individualization of the subjects. It defines their identity and role that they must recognize and be recognized by the others. Thus the total goal of the power is achieved, the forming of the subject through knowledge and truth³². The diagram of modern power reveals a general link between the administration and prosecution of the knowledge in various hot spots and power cells in the family, administration, school, prison, hospital. The principles of modern constitutionalism for free enterprise initiative, entrepreneurship and freedom of speech and press meet the needs of network points “political anatomy” that is essentially building the political structures. Of main importance in Foucault’s researches is technology itself and the practice of the exercise of power “exists only as an action” in various micro zones, which have found place in the modern state. Thus the relations of power become functions of “actions above the actions”. In the meantime they are not centered on the extreme (death), but on the infinity of life, and the possible control. The man, who is residing in the area of power, is given without alternatively to his dependence on the actions that are possible in this field of subjectivity. Foucault has called the power techniques – procedures for “human dog training”. This study of power relations became a major target for political anthropology. Thereby establishing relative links in the social fabric and shaping the political network of hot spots and “power cells” by the pressure and resistance in the community. Each of them has a different character: it was composed locally on itself through the invisible genealogy. With Foucault the politico-anthropological study of the power acquires the general task to define all possible types of cultural relations, including those that lie outside of the scientific subject of political science. For the political archeology Foucault brings a fundamentally new concept with the new meaning of power as “power relations”. In the modern societies the power is interfering with the strict meaning of control (manageability), which is connected to the relationships between forms of knowledge and diagrams of forces. They have settled unconditionally into the permanent articulation of modern discourse and are a political arena for a variety of recipes. Foucault’s paradoxical discovery connects in genetic link knowledge and power, while the result of this fact lies

³¹ See: M. Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78*, Palgrave MacMillan, Houndmills, Basingstoke 2007.

³² See: M. Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, Pantheon, New York 1970.

in the industrial creativity, technological, economic and cultural productivity of the nineteenth century. The scientific discourses produced in modern cultures, acquire the status of truth. This knowledge is defined in different disciplinary aspects. The main purpose, which is interpreted by the scientific discourse, is its absorption, origin, production and reproduction. The two strategic positions of the modern political structure and power relations are connected to the discipline of the body – ‘anatomypolicy’, which is developed during the seventeenth centuries, and the regulation of the population – ‘biopolicy’ during the XVIII century. The corporeality of the human is included in the production of fertility, migration, mortality, health, longevity, sports, while it reaches to sexuality itself. Thus, the most discrete area of human and in the meantime the most external one for the political science, becomes necessary for ‘biopolicy’ and ‘anatomypolicy’. The general deployment of ‘power-knowledge’ reaches beyond any doubt the most discrete points of the society, and thus is closed and dispersed in it. The purpose of the modern power is not the pursuit of the pleasure itself, but the control over it. The positive sides of it are in those hot spots of the ‘power-knowledge’ (*savoir-pouvoir*): university, clinic, prison with all other derivatives of power relations.

The modality of the *power relations* in the modern times becomes impossible outside the *structures of knowledge*. The modes of power are constituted in the historical development of society as a discourse. The model of power is extended to “out” policy areas such as human sciences, and studies them in this way of modeling archived through discourses of power. The rigidity of political facts is only the surface of the endless network of knowledge which have multiplicity property. The essence of power is expressed in the dynamic persistence of divergent forces, providing different practices in society. The Fukolian conclusion is that only in the modern societies there is power, which is constituted in the immanent function of knowledge. The reconstructor’s version of *political anthropology* becomes one of the most modern approaches to research of *the archaeology of power experience*.

Bibliography

- Balandier G., *Anthropologie politique*, P.U.F., Paris 1967.
- Boas F., *Race, Language and Culture*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1995.
- Cassirer E., *An Essay on Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture*, Yale University Press, New Haven 1951.
- Clastres P., *La société contre l’Etat*, Minuit, Paris 1974.
- Darwin C., *Origin of Species*, Cambridge University Press, New York 1981.
- Durkheim E., *Les Formes élémentaires de la Vie Religieuse*, P.U.F., Paris 1991.
- Durkheim E., *Montesquieu and Rousseau: forerunners of sociology*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan 1960.
- Engels F., *The Origin of Family, Private Property and the State*, Resistance Books, Newtown 2004.

- Foucault M., *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, Random House, New York 1975.
- Foucault M., *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78*, Palgrave MacMillan, Houndmills, Basingstoke 2007.
- Foucault M., *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, Pantheon, New York 1970.
- Frazer J., *The Golden Bough*, Wordsworth, London 1993.
- Kant I., *Political Writings*, Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought, New York 1995.
- Lévi-Strauss C., *Anthropologie Structurale*, Paris 1956.
- Lévi-Strauss C., *The Savage Mind*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1966.
- Machiavelli N., *The Prince and the Discourses*, Modern Library, New York 1950.
- Malinowski B., *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays*, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois 1948.
- Montesquieu C.-L., *The spirit of the Laws*, Hafner, New York 1962.
- Myres J.L., *The Influence of Anthropology on the Course of Political Science*, University of California Press, Berkeley 1916.
- Nietzsche F., *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Dover Publications, New York 1999.
- Radcliffe-Brown A.R., *Structure and Function in Primitive Society*, New York 1952.
- Rouland N., *L'anthropologie Juridique*, P.U.F., Paris 1990.
- Rousseau J.-J., *The Social Contract and Discourses*, E.P. Dutton, New York 1950.
- Sartre J.-P., *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*, Philosophical Library, New York 1956.
- Spengler O., *The Decline of the West. Form and Actuality*, Alfred A Knopf, New York 1926.
- Tylor E.B., *Anthropology: an introduction to the study of man and civilization*, D Appleton and Company, New York 1896.
- Weber M., *Economy and Society*, University of California Press, Berkeley 1978.
- Weber M., *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Routledge Classics, New York 2001.
- Weber M., *The Sociology of Religion*, Beacon Press, Boston 1963.