



Revista de Derecho

ISSN: 0121-8697

rderecho@uninorte.edu.co

Universidad del Norte

Colombia

Álvarez Ramírez, Leonardo Yovany

Possibility in a self-organized system: an alternative to the study of politics

Revista de Derecho, núm. 40, julio-diciembre, 2013, pp. 283-296

Universidad del Norte

Barranquilla, Colombia

Available in: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=85131028011>

- How to cite
- Complete issue
- More information about this article
- Journal's homepage in redalyc.org

redalyc.org

Scientific Information System

Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America, the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal

Non-profit academic project, developed under the open access initiative

Possibility in a self-organized system: an alternative to the study of politics

La posibilidad en el sistema autoorganizado:
una alternativa al estudio de lo político

Leonardo Yovany Álvarez Ramírez*

Universitaria de Investigación y Desarrollo-UDI- (Colombia)

* Psicólogo Universidad Antonio Nariño. Especialista en Desarrollo intelectual y educación. Universidad Autónoma de Bucaramanga. Docente investigador Facultad de Psicología Universitaria de Investigación y Desarrollo –UDI-. Grupo de investigación UDIPSI. Calle 9 No. 23-55. Bucaramanga-Colombia. *leonardoalvarez64@gmail.com*

Resumen

Esta revisión de tema plantea que los objetos de estudio tradicionales de la Ciencia Política han enfatizado en el Estado, sus relaciones con la sociedad y la distribución del poder en el interior de cada uno, para explicar el modelo de Gobierno y Administración Pública, en el marco de la deliberación, la reflexión y toma de decisiones. Se sigue un método hermenéutico para el análisis de diferentes teorías al respecto, a partir de lo cual se plantea que la Ciencia Política debería enfocar su objeto de estudio en la inclusión de conceptos basados en el sistema autoorganizado, incorporando en la teorización las propiedades de contradicción, paradoja, borrosidad, impredecibilidad, las cuales interpretan que la posibilidad y la probabilidad son generadores de realidad política y organización social, redefiniendo así los conceptos de gobierno y gobernanza.

Palabras clave: Pléctica, política, empirismo, poder, autoorganización, gobierno.

Abstract

This work posits that the used Political Science objects of study, have done an emphasis in State and society relationships and the power inside one each other, to explain the government and public administration based on reflection, deliberation and making decision process. A hermeneutical method is followed in order to analyze the different theories as concerned, concluding that Political Science should focus its object of study beyond them to include the self-organized system concepts, embodying in theorization, the contradiction, paradox, blurring, unpredictability, possibility and probability as determinants of political reality and social organization redefining the concepts of government and governance.

Keywords: Plectis, politics, empirism, power, self-organization, government.

Fecha de recepción: 20 de marzo de 2012

Fecha de aceptación: 21 de marzo de 2013

1. THE UNITS FOR STUDYING THE POLITICS: FROM EMPIRISM, POWER AND GROUPS, TO THE POSSIBILITY INTO A SELF ORGANIZED SYSTEM

The basis of Politics could be found in ancient times, in outstanding thinkers like Platoon (428-348 b.C) and Aristotle (384-322 b.C), and after them, and before the nineteen century, in some authors like Hobbes, Hume and Spinoza, who established a stamp on the reflection about it. At the beginning, the ideas about Politics were leaded by arguments based on philosophy, anthropology, theology and moral; the interest on those reflections was finding practical solutions to immediate daily life problems of citizens. This focus turned out to be insufficient to respond to an every time more complex social, institutional, economical and judicial reality and, at the same time, to govern and manage public affairs.

When the natural science focus and its methodology appears on stage, political phenomena began to be approached in a very different way than before. Empirical laws began to be applied to understand politics in a factual way, different from that, based on speculation and intellectual craftsmanship; on this way, a new paradigm was brought to politics in modern times (Colomer, 1990) and the interest in it began to go beyond, not only to the simple immediate solution of daily life society problems, but to the theoretical comprehension model (Durkheim,1953), so that, Political Science claimed the natural law as its core of study, around 1900.

Empirism in politics

However, with the appearance of Maquiavelo, in modern times, the study of politics acquired autonomy and its object then, becomes into the power of the State (Colomer, 1993) and its bond with society. This relationship was born because the society developed its processes into an unrulred extra-statal dimension and into a low self-sufficiency ability to handle by itself, requiring higher official intervention (Bretch, 1974). This new approach of politics gives a special place to the scientific study of human behavior and its laws, in order to understand the society

and its functioning and governance (Walzer, 1982). Montesquieu, in *Illustration*, did likewise, giving emphasis to psychological laws, based on pain and pleasure, attraction and aversion, and took all those ideas to state a politics theory. In the middle of the renaissance, the peak of nature laws to study an object scientifically was very important because this way, the empirical data, the evidence and the public observation of phenomena were the stamp of reliability, something different from all those prior discourses based on celestial law or the human being creation (Vallespín, 1990). This recategorization of politics left the gap open to state a new purpose for politics in 1920-1940 based on empiricism, in evidence, and in measurement (Bentley, 1908; Merriam, 1934).

But the empirical laws of the human behavior in political science moved from State to the group and its dynamics inside the society. Therefore, Connections between politics and psychology were important to understand the politics (Laswell, 1936). The social influence of groups became into unit for study and reflection, the power and conformity, also, began to be studied (Brunner, 1979). As seen, the new object of study for political science is redefined (Burnham, 1941; Easton, 1965) and studied by empirical means, those based on control, prediction and handling, so that, ideology became into a past way to know about political science object of Study (Easton, 1991; Bell, Edwards & Wagner, 1969).

A new focus to explain politics based on groups and its dynamics

However, a high price had to be paid by political science with those changes because of the restrictions to answer to the demands of the immediate social problems and the urgent needs of transformation (gender discrimination, wars, environmental problems, inequity, poorness), they demanded a factual State with power to give answers to the every day life challenges and requirements of groups and society, so that, political science had a new problem to solve in order to reframe its object of study emerging from the study of organizations, rules and interaction manners within social tension and conflict (Weber, 1964) as much to the governors as to governed ones. The reason of State be-

came in object of study for modern political thinking and its relation with democratic reasoning (society) for organizing, and governing. As derived from prior ideas, contemporary political science takes a new route to study its object, leaving aside the pretension for objectivation and empirism, and moves to study the tensions and dynamisms of society inside the framework of the relations between State and Society (Michelman, 1986). The groups were studied again, the political parties, the governants, the leaders and phenomena such as bureaucracy and coalition (Baumann, 1998). Again, the influence is retaken to be an object to be a reflected concern.

Other theories and the changes in the object of study

However, the affairs on social responsibility of the State and application of human rights in the social life brought the justice theory to the discussion about politics (Rawls, 1993), as well as the comunitarianism (Sandel, 2009). On the other hand, the statements on social justice (Young, 1996), the rescue of the individual autonomy, began to be analyzed from the political science perspective, redefining its objects of study, and, at the same time, remarking the new frontiers between State and society. Self-fulfillment, self-determination, distributive justice, personal abilities development, participation, equality in opportunities, power, influence, and economic benefits, were then the subjects to be studied by political science (Green, 1985), as well as the common wealth and the capacity of individuals to make decisions in political affairs, deliberative democracy, representative democracy (Michelman, 1986; Grady, 1993). This way, the subjects of political science widened the field for study because probabilistic matters were added (Brunner, 1979).

Meanwhile new issues were added to the reflections in political science, some important topics were left aside, such as the reflection about the definition of reality and the nature of social relations, which constituted the basis to understand the political fact.

Facts, decisions and probability as possible unit of study in politics

In this order of ideas, the study of the group and societal dynamics and State decisions, as autonomous determinants of the social reality, were the main restrictions to political science because it focused its observations only on the immediate reality as determinant of social reality. Also, it left aside the study of the probability in the consummation of the decisions about the destiny of communities, societies and nations (Tortosa, 2006). It is, political science left aside the reflection about how the social reality is determined and by who it is done in last instance, and concentrates in the factual and immediate and concrete everyday life problems.

In first place, it is necessary to state that the social, economic and political orders have an organization, laws for functioning, actors, actions, products or results from the actions, but many questions surround this conception. For example, the concerns about the determiners of this organization, the decision-making process, the agreements and reasons or objectives to organize the functioning system, the management, control, planning, and doing in these orders, the power and its distribution and observance by participants, and the conditions to play the conferred role inside a probabilistic and possibility reality become into a privileged affairs.

Traditional social theory based on social group influence as determinant in the decision making process, the interests as cause for decisions in economy, politics and society began to be re assessed as determinants on reality because of the blurred nature of the facts, showed by surrounding environment.

Public decisions become to be analyzed into a new perspective because, they are about a contradictory reality and they are blurred themselves because of the coexistence of mixture of factors that contributes to do partially comprehended an object to be perceived and whose appearance in changing, fluctuant, unpredictable in many ways because of the phenomenon itself, the observers, the observed ones and the in-

teractions among them, that's to say, public reality and public decision are based on constituted "missing" defined by the uncompleting nature of reality itself: justice and impunity; control and negligence; effectiveness and ineffectiveness; legality and justice in daily life facts, social responsibility and silence and unresponsibility, profitable resources laws and public overspend, long life unsolved problems to now a days cut edged technological life .

This blurring in the facts in reality supposes other elements to be explained beyond the traditional naïve cynicism derived from prior theoretical units' theorization and new categories of study could be proposed from another perspective on regard to the main factors implied in a paradox, which is present every time in the decision making of public affairs and in the reality which feed those decisions processes.

The reason that justifies all the paradox is because of the continuity that it gives to the "missing" in the interpretation of the objects in the reality which on the decision in public affairs is done. This way, the traditional explanation of the public reality implies a visibilization of those elements which constitute the "missing" component in it.

Political language known by mass media reproduces these cynicism categories when explaining the facts showing stable a reality which is unstable, becoming the appearance into fixed faced fact about which many properties, qualities, causes relationships are given by certain and real being actually unreal. These handlings in information influence public administration and decision making processes in societies where a new reality is done and where the history is written, actually from an uncertain state of things and peoples.

Society actually lives where probabilities exists, where things are not exactly knew because of the "missing" that constitute them: Possibility and probability are the context of public making decision and they are the components to rethink the public affairs.

2. POSSIBLE DETERMINANTS IN ORDER TO BE STUDIED IN POLITICS

Politics and government are then the science of possibility, the probability in arrangements, permutations and combinations each second occur, and varies inter connectedly: Inert and living organisms take part in politics as well; politics decides about that vinculates them, not only on social reality because of the people and society lives with another organisms in the environment.

If the “missing” is the cause for blurring reality and characterize the political fact, the determiners of it in public administration are beyond the social influence and and group interests, they actually are in the self-organizing public reality that generates the flow of the possibilities in a particular context to decide about common affairs in society.

An individual and groups’ role in a possibility and probability system

The School of Frankfurt stated that emancipation and domination were the dialectical extremes producers of different forms of social life. It posits that the groups determines the movements in society and it supposes that they show the way to change, to advance, to transformation and revolution of the state of things, but this kind of version is reduced because of the real limited capability of the groups to decide about many affairs in many contexts due to the changeable conditions in possibilities and probabilities to success they have in a given moment. Consensus inside the groups depends on the interpretation of the public reality in a partial way each time : Synthesis and combination in an changeable and blurring contexts are the laws which guide the possibilities and probabilities in a unstable systems as society is and all of its elements are in an unstable movement every time and everywhere making the state of thing undefinable and ungaranteeable about the results of the making decision processes (Retamal, 2007), not exactly as it was stated by Newton many decades ago when explaining the big objects in the tridimensional space. This way, many public projects

forgotten, laws ignored and neglected or silenced, many claims unattended in anonymity, many processes interrupted without apparent reasons, public performances in the mid of the realization are the reality of public life manifestations, they are the evidences of the change in the possibility system with its own rhythm, time, magnitude, intensity, maturity, order, beyond the survival in many cases, paradoxically; just right there where the dissonance fact appears, where the wrong public decision takes place, right there where the ununderstandable occurs. Right here is the object and the spot where the Political science needs to interpret the social reality, right there where the decision are almost impossible to understand from a traditional or conventional point of view conditioning, inhibiting, and subjugating the immediate reality (Tortosa,2006). It means that the immediate reality is just an expression of implicit public reality where the social order is actually existing.

Principles in a self-organization system and politics object of study

In summary, political context is a circumscription where man acts just with some little and limited autonomy, because the public reality is a context full of paradoxical meanings and inside the paradox exists the explanation for society Affairs and for the making-decision processes in public administration.

Simplicity and complexity are wider than it and what determines human beings and societies is all those that is hidden in their lives and interactions, all those implicit but not explicit, all those that overpass the appearance because of that, it exists beyond the immediate (Retamal,2007). From the prior perspective, the concept of political system is expanded acquiring new dimensions and properties, those of the complexity systems, more than the simple systems known like those stated by Bertalanffy (Bertalanffy,1975) and later, by Parsons (Parsons,1968). As it is seen, the empirism becomes absolute and very simple to explain uniquely the object of political science (Goldhamer,Shills, 1939; Morgenthau,1948;Dahl,1974).

Individuals and groups determination of reality is probabilistic and secondary to possibilities

A complex reality, like social reality is, has a self organization device with wide power as explained before with properties like: Ubiquity, omnipotence, omniscience, these properties do not take a specific body, they are everywhere and every time, not only in some countries or the multinationals or international organizations (Tortosa, 2006). The power here mentioned is not that commonly stated by Rivadeneyra(Rivadeneyra,2004), as a visible and invisible entity, but a visible one, at all levels of social relationships commanding the reality and its facts, its decisions, it is, the power so conceived and not exactly like an arcane in the ancient times in primitive societies it has shadowed sectors (Brunner,1979) but an actual, non-mystical and non-strange force defined , neither an entity that establishes languages to mimetize and act with evidence, it uses rites and appearances, celebrations, emblems, symbols and demand a jurisdiction to itself and special manners to be bonded with it . Human self-determination is just probabilistic; the nature of this power in reality is not by coercion and remuneration (Tortosa, 2006), therefore a political analysis cannot afford to take a closer look to these elements.

A traditional framework for politics

Easton (Easton, 1965) posits a model of political system where there are environments called intrasocietal and other called extra societal (international society).The intrasocietal environment was divided into several systems: Ecology, biology, personality or individuality and the society. The extra societal was divided into economical, political, and social international. At the same time, Easton divided the intrasocietal systems into: Cultural, social, economic, demographic and other subsystems, and the international political systems of the extra societal environment, he dived into individual political systems like UNO and other subsystems. Finally, he divided secondly the extra societal environment into: International culture, international society, economy, demography and other international subsystems.

A transocietal focus

This model being wider left out the reality as discussed before, but it could be enriched and adjusted by adding some additional environment that may be called: transocietal, cross to the both others, it would be the organizer of the actions and decisions, the combinations, the order itself: the “missing”, that probable, that possible into a given context and not repeatable and never explicit at all, therefore, unpredictable and ambiguous (GellMann, 1996; Prigogine, 1990).

The two levels: Macro politics and micro politics should be redefined so that, trans-politics emerges. Easton model outstand the self-determination among groups, governors and society leaving aside aspects of the power which are located in a different order beyond and right over the immediate reality. It may be stated that Easton model in politics may be inscribed in that called by Tortosa like: the community based on the reality, that is to say, believing that solutions emerge from the sensible study about reality as it is perceived, thinking about it such as directly accessible object as stated by empirism, but the inaccessibility is the counter propose in public administration for the common affairs in society because of the blurring nature of its products. That is, the making- decision processes are not in the immediate social order as stated by some authors (Steinhmo,Thelen,1992).

Androdeterminist models emphasize the societies and politician decisions, the effects of social influence of groups to move the changes, but they leave aside that politics agenda does not move without that power explained, because those decisions are not into their hands, that power about which is known sometimes a little as Brunner told.

Political science need to take into consideration these aspects about complex reality to give more responses to political phenomenon, going forward plectics (GellMann, 1995), joining the simple and complex forms of the social reality and the decisions that build its facts.

REFERENCES

- Bauman, Z. (1998). Globalisation: The Human Consequences. *Political Geography*, 20, (1), 117-119.
- Bell, R., Edwards, D. & Wagner, R. (1969). *Political Power: a Reader in theory and Research*. London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Bentley, A. (1908). *the Process of Government* (pp. 240-262). Boston: Nabu Press.
- Bertalanffy, L. (1975). *Perspectives on General Systems Theory*. Scientific-Philosophical Studies. In E. Taschdjian (Ed.). New York: George Braziller.
- Burnham, J. (1941). *The Managerial Revolution*. New York: John Day.
- Bretch, A. (1974). Metodología de la teoría política. En *Enciclopedia Internacional de las Ciencias Sociales*. Madrid: Aguilar.
- Brunner, J. (1979). *La concepción autoritaria del mundo* (pp. 1- 10). Santiago: FLACSO.
- Burnham, J. (1941). *The Managerial Revolution*. New York: John Day.
- Colomer, J. (1990). La política como Ciencia. En R. Cortarelo & J. Paniagua, *Introducción a la Ciencia Política* (5ª ed.) (pp. 15-54). Madrid: UNED.
- Colomer, J. (1993). Los clásicos, desde la perspectiva de la ciencia política. En H. Riezu, J. Martínez & E. Robles (Eds.), *Historia y pensamiento político. Identidad y perspectivas de la historia de las ideas políticas*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- Dahl, R. (1974). Poder. En *Encyclopedia Internacional de las Ciencias Sociales* (pp. 293-301). Madrid: Aguilar.
- Durkheim, E. (1953). *Montesquieu et Rousseau, précurseurs de la sociologie*. Paris: PUF. Traducción española: Montesquieu y Rousseau, precursores de la sociología. Madrid: Tecnos, 2000.
- Easton, D. (1965). *A Framework for political Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Easton, D. (1991). Political Science in the United States: past and present. In D. Easton, J. Gunell & L. Graziano (Eds.), *The Development of Political science*. London: Routhledge.
- Gell Mann, M. (1995). *El Quark y el jaguar*. Barcelona: Matemas.

- Gell Mann, M. (1996). *Plética*. La tercera cultura. Barcelona: Tusquets.
- Goldhamer, H. & Shills, E. (1939). Types of power and status. *American Journal of Sociology*, 45, 171-181.
- Grady, R. (1993). *Restoring Real Representation*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Green, P. (1985). *Retrieving Democracy*. Totowa, N. J.: Rowman and Allendheld.
- Laswell, H. (1936). *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How?* New York: MacGraw-Hill.
- Merriam, Ch. (1934). *Political Power*. New York: Collier Books.
- Michelman, F. (1986). Traces of self-government. *Harvard Law Review*, 100, 1-311.
- Morgenthau, H. (1968). *La lucha por el poder y la paz*. Buenos Aires: Sudamericana.
- Parsons, T. (1968). *La estructura de la acción social*. Madrid: Guadarrama.
- Prigogine, I. (1990). The Behavior of Matter under Nonequilibrium Conditions: Fundamental Aspects and Applications. Progress Report for Period August 15, 1989 - April 14, 1990, Center for Studies in Statistical Mechanics at the University of Texas-Austin, United States Department of Energy-Office of Energy Research .
- Rawls, J. (1993). *Political liberalism*. New York: Columbia.
- Retamal, Ch. (2007). La conceptualización moderna del poder vista desde el cinismo clásico. Reflexiones sobre "El dedo de Diógenes". *Revista de Filosofía*, 63, 127-136.
- Rivadeneira, J. (2004). El poder. *Revista venezolana de análisis de coyuntura*, 10 (1), 295.
- Sandel, M. (2009). *El liberalismo y los límites de la justicia*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Steinmo, S. & Thelen, K. 1992. Historical Institutionalism in comparative politics. In S. Steinmo, K. Thelen & F. Longstreth (Eds.), *Structuring Politics. Historical Institutionalism in comparative Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tortosa, J. (2006). Sobre el carácter humano del poder mundial. *Polis*, 13, 127-130. Santiago de Chile.

- Vallespín, F. (1990). Estado y Teoría política moderna. En Id (Ed.), *Historia de la Teoría política*, 2. Madrid: Alianza.
- Walzer, M. (1982). *Spheres of justice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Weber, M. (1964). *Economía y sociedad*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Young, I. (1996). Political Theory: An overview. In R. Goodin & H. Klingemann (Eds.), *A New Hand book of Political Science*. New York: OUP.