

MANIPULATIVE PRACTICES IN THE AREA OF SOCIO-POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS OF MODERN SOCIETY: THEORETICAL - METHODOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Olga Olegovna Volchkova, Kazan Federal University

Anton Sergeevich Krasnov, Kazan Federal University

Michail Leonidovich Tuzov, Kazan Federal University

ABSTRACT

The study of manipulative practices in the field of socio-political institutions enables the researcher to identify the determinants of formation and development of a particular institution, to explore the features of transformation of the causes of successful or unsuccessful completion of a social process. The study covers the theoretical basis of the study of manipulative practices in the field of socio-political institutions of modern society. The case study of the manipulation phenomenon is carried out by the authors in the framework of classical socio-political approach. This paper analyzes the established definitions and the most famous interpretations of the manipulative practices in the humanitarian researches, indicates the historical and contemporary examples of public implementation of the manipulative practices. It should be noted that a special attention is paid to the study of institutional manipulations in the political sphere. The research advantages include the differentiation of such concepts as "manipulation", "manipulative behavior", "manipulative practices", the representation of the author's determination of the socio-political phenomenon of manipulation, as well as the identification of the characteristics and types of political manipulation.

Keywords: manipulation, manipulative behavior, social and political manipulation, political system, institutional manipulation, social practice.

INTRODUCTION

In the modern social discourse, the concepts of "manipulation" and "manipulative behavior" have a negative emotional coloring, along with a completely neutral mechanistic interpretation. The word "manipulation" is derived from the Latin word manus - hand and ple - fill, and has been initially interpreted as "control via dexterity and skill" and has been referred to the economic and technical spheres of life of the society. In a figurative sense, it means a clever trick, artifice, manipulation of facts to achieve an unseemly goal. Currently, the term "manipulation" has predominantly negative connotation.

Defining the manipulation, Professor E.L. Dotsenko indicates a negative meaning of this social phenomenon. He defines the manipulation as actions aimed at snatching control of another person, winding him/her round finger, which are made so skillfully that the person has an impression that he/she controls his/her actions.

The meaning of the term "manipulation" depends on its application field. Increasingly, such terminology as "manipulation", "manipulative behavior" is used in the social and political sciences, such as political science, conflict studies, and sociology. It should be noted that it

prevails portable and negative meaning with regard to the political life of the society, which is extremely difficult to neutralize.

In the Soviet social science, the manipulation phenomenon has been studied in the framework of the issue of political propaganda. Many works of such famous theorists as P. Gurevich, Yu. Sherkovin were devoted to the issues of political propaganda. In Europe and the USA, the manipulation phenomenon is discussed in detail by such researchers as G. Lasswel, M.E. McCombs and others.

The case study of the manipulation phenomenon can be divided into two areas. The first area explores the intro-personal component of the manipulation process. The researchers working in this direction, focus their attention on the fact that only a particular individual or group of individuals may be considered as an object of manipulation, in addition, they are based on the unilateral manipulation concept, that is, they claim that only one party is the winner and the second one loses completely as a result of the manipulative actions.

The second trend received the code name of socially-oriented or political manipulation study. In the frameworks of the second trend it is investigated the specificity of power relations, possibility of public opinion management, manipulation of international relations, and many other aspects of the political life of the society. The political study of the manipulation phenomenon involves the ability to define the specific personalized actors and the political institutions, political movements and political organizations as the manipulation subjects and objects. The study of manipulative practices in the social and political reality seems the most appropriate in the framework of this approach to the authors.

In the frameworks of this approach to the manipulation phenomenon, there are different definitions of the term. For example, the term "manipulation" is used as the definition of "political fraud in the implementation of state power", "varieties of exercising power, in which its holder influences the behavior of others, without revealing the nature of the behavior, which he/she expects of them", "impact on society by the hidden mechanisms and resources to achieve the desired". In his book "Manipulation of Consciousness" S.G. In his book "Consciousness Manipulation" Kara-Murza defines the manipulation as a latent influence of the subject on the object, a fact of which should not be seen by the object itself.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research object is the manipulation phenomenon in the socio-political reality. The research subject is the characteristics and patterns of implementation of the manipulative practices in the contemporary social space. Driven by the methodological grounds of the neoinstitutional approach, the study includes a theoretical analysis of definition of the manipulation phenomenon, the constituent elements and the forms of political manipulation. The comparative analysis is implemented by the authors under the parameters of differences of the definitions and theoretical interpretations of the manipulation phenomenon, and as the main methodological paradigm in the distinguishing and studying the main forms of institutional manipulations.

RESULTS

Having analyzed the definitions of such concept as "manipulation" in the framework of the socio-political approach, we have formulated the following definitions. The manipulation (in the broad sense) is a hidden impact, as a result of which the manipulation subject receives the

one-sided advantages, while the manipulation object remains in a state of equilibrium or loses some benefit, while being in the illusion of independence of decisions made by him/her. In a narrow sense, the manipulation should be understood as a hidden non-verbal action, as a result of which the manipulation subject gains the actions performance by the object, giving benefit to the subject.

Also it remains important the issue of delimitation of such concepts as "manipulation" and "manipulative behavior". Conceptually, two these concepts have the same meaning, but in our opinion, the "manipulation" should be understood as the individual acts of influence and hidden influence, while the term "manipulative behavior" refers to the length of this process, its repeated nature and duration of a latent influence by the subject on the object. The manipulation is a complex, lengthy and very specific process of interaction between the subject and the object concerning a specific, meaningful item (problems, things, scope of relations) for the purposes of the manipulator.

The definition of such concept as "political manipulation" narrows the concept in the application area of the term, while expanding the ambiguity and variability of its interpretation. The political manipulation is a complex socio-political phenomenon, structured on a variety of grounds, which is a dynamic and contradictory process. The political manipulation is only possible, if we are talking about the political actors, political system elements of the state. The political manipulation is different from the influence of political power by the lack of direct reference and a threat of sanctions.

The term "political manipulation" is most often used in the political science literature to refer to the regular inoculation of social and political myths, illusory ideas, supporting certain values and norms, perceived mainly on faith without rational or critical thinking, in the social consciousness by the subject of power. And in this case, the subject of political power may be represented by both a single individual and a group of individuals - the party, movement, and even the whole apparatus of the state. Because William Riker gives examples of manipulation carried out by different policy subjects in his book "The Art of Political Manipulation".

Many election campaigns of the USA presidential candidates, state governors are a clear example of political manipulation. The image of the candidate, which is inoculated into the public consciousness, is not true, it is complemented by the necessary details - specific socio-political rhetoric, false biography facts, distinctive gestures, etc. - to increase the popularity among the public. As an example of public manipulation, Riker gives the myths created by the state apparatus of the USSR and the USA in the middle of the 50-60s in the XX century. The myths are understood as an illusory picture of the world, a particular perception of certain phenomena.

Thus, the load-carrying structures of the manipulation system of public consciousness in the USSR were the myths about private property as a major source of social and political damage; about the inevitability of the capitalism collapse and the decadent West; about the leading role of the working class and the Communist Party. In the USA, according to the opinion of Herbert Schiller, which he expresses in his book "The Consciousness Manipulators", the main myths have been the myths about a greedy selfish American with a constant thirst for money-making; about faith in the neutrality and accountability of the USA mass media and the USA government authorities.

Based on the characteristics of manipulative actions, as well as the analysis of historical facts, we can make a conclusion that the political manipulation is a hidden control of political

consciousness and behavior of people in order to force them to act in the interests of the manipulators, the imposition of the manipulator's will in the form of hidden influence.

DISCUSSION

The political manipulation phenomenon is a great challenge for the researchers and policy analysts. The problem is in the definition of the concept of "political manipulation"; another big problem is its detection and empirical identification. The manipulation is a huge challenge for the analysis of political events, taking into account public opinion and building the statistical data, precisely because of its hidden influence. In our opinion, it is appropriate to classify the political manipulation phenomenon from the point of view of the subject of political power. But it should be clarified that the subject of manipulation can be represented only by a political actor, who really has the political power, resources, the ability to influence on the agenda and the actions of other political actors, as well as on the society as a whole and its individual members or population groups. According to such a classification, we can distinguish: the political leader manipulations, the political party manipulations, the public authorities manipulations and the manipulations of parapolitical and social organizations and movements.

In recent years, the western political science literature has started to use another term - the institutional manipulations. In general sense, this definition refers to the totality of the manipulative practices carried out in the framework of political institutions. The very concept of "political institution" is often narrowed down to the concept of "state", however, this concept is much wider.

The term "institution" (from the Latin "institutum") means the initiation, law, postulate. Max Weber wrote that "the state is a refined political institution, is a community of people whose behavior is based on the rational initiations". E. Durkheim believed that the political institutions, on the one hand, represented some ideal images in the form of customs and beliefs, and on the other hand, these customs and stereotypes were realized in the practical work of social organizations of different times and peoples. Until the XX century the administrative institutions and legal norms were called the "political institutions" under the influence of the law school ruling.

In his book "Political Institutions" Josep Colomer writes that the political institutions are the formal rules of the game in relation to the major issues of political life of the country. William Riyer also considered the individual choice of a political player as an embodiment of activity of the political institutions. By defining the political institutions as a set of rules, Riyer investigated how a different institutional design could have an impact on the preferences and strategies of the players, as well as to create the opportunities for manipulative actions.

The institutional manipulations in the broad sense are the manipulations of the system of political institutions. The institutional manipulation can be defined as such by several roles of a political institution: as the subject, object and mechanism. The practices of institutional manipulation, in which the political institution serves as the subject of manipulation, are much less common. In this case we are faced with a variety of institutional conflict, when the institute-organization manipulates the institute-norm. More often the institute-organization becomes a victim of manipulation desire of political actors (politicians, parties, social movements, etc.), at the disposal of which the institution occurs. The institutional manipulations are primarily the prerogative of the ruling elite as the political actors shall have sufficient resources and mechanisms of action to implement them.

CONCLUSION

The political manipulations are a complex, controversial phenomenon, at the study of which it shall be taken into account both the formal and informal aspects of functioning of the political institutions. The differentiation of such concepts as "manipulation" and "manipulative behavior" is necessary for the classification of socio-political action on the duration and significance. The institutional manipulations are the manipulating practices in the sphere of institutions.

The study of manipulative practices in the field of political institutions enables the researcher to identify the causes and factors of transformation of the political system; to develop of a successful or unsuccessful completion of the political process; to compare the effectiveness of functioning of the political institutions; to reveal a subjective role of political actors in the policy of the state. In addition to the theoretical, the study of manipulative practices has an applied significance, as their classification and identification of specific features provide the opportunity to study the mechanisms of implementation of political manipulations in the public authorities and to use the lessons learned to prevent the manipulative actions in the future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

Dotsenko E. L. (2000). Manipulation Psychology: Phenomena, Mechanisms and Protection . Pp: 214.

Gurevich P. S. (1983). Social, M: "Mysl", Pp: 175.

Sherkovin Yu.A. (1973). Psychological Problems of Mass Information Processes. M.: "Mysl", Pp: 215.

Lasswell H.D. (1948). The structure and function of communication in society. Harper and Brothers, NY. Pp: 117-129

McCombs, M.E., D.L.Shaw. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public opinion quarterly*, 36, 176-187.

Neufeldt. V.E. (1988). Webster's New World Dictionary, NY. Pp: 74.

Kara-Murza S.G. (2002). Consciousness Manipulation. EKSMO Press. Pp: 832.

Riker W. H. The art of political manipulation [Electronic Resource] – Access mode: <http://yalepress.yale.edu/book.asp?isbn=0300035926>.

Shiller H. (1980). The Consciousness Manipulators. "Mysl", Pp: 125.

Weber M. (1990). Selected Works. Pp: 647.

Colomer, J.M. (2016). Political institutions. Democracy and social choice. [Electronic Resource] – Access mode: http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1081&context=josep_colomer, free. – Checked: September 10.

Riuer, W.H. (1980). Implications from the Disequilibrium of Majority Rule for the Study of Institutions. *American Political Science Review*, 74, 432–460.

Hallowell, J.H. (2007). The moral Foundation of Democracy. Indianapolis, Pp: 57-67.