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Studying power and its impact in urban communities is well known in western sociology as “community power studies”. The start of this scientific field dates back to the 1920s in USA. In carrying out these studies most researchers prefer to use the term community (social or urban) instead of town or territorial community, since what they prefer has a broader meaning and does not imply ideas about the geographical aspects of the place or the spatial state structures. On the other hand, this approach affirms as a goal of the scientific research the socio-political processes and the relations in the particular area.

The aim of this paper is to present the basic forms of power that exist within the boundaries of an urban community, as well as the particularities of civil relations ensuing from the variety of these forms. The forms of power are much more studied in smaller social groups. The urban community is a big formation of people, i.e. another form of community which raises specific methodological issues and here an answer will be sought to some of them.

Power in social space

Power in urban communities is regarded important for two reasons. First, they happen to be typical forms of coexistence of people where the spectre of power acts varies considerably, while the ensuing social relations are demonstrated in all forms. Thus the conclusions concerning the processes in urban communities can easily be extrapolated in regard to power in the whole system of society. The second reason is, that despite the significant role of politics formed by the high centres of power in society and state, political life in places of residence does lie within the complementary acts of regional or urban political systems only. Often there act big groups of people, influential social organisations and institutions, and the consequences of this activity often influence social life as a whole.

In trying to define the phenomenon of power within the limits of a particular social space, researchers often use two concepts together – authority and power. It was even John Locke who wrote about their interdependence – authority and power make people obey the law! The way authority is understood is generally oriented to acknowledging particular merits or social importance of the respective person1. Many

Researchers view authority as an addition to the phenomenon of power itself. This results in the necessity to make a clear differentiation between power and authority from a cognitive point of view. Power is the direct influence on the object aimed at overpowering it; whereas authority is something different — it has indirect, implied influence, even though with a similar purpose. The availability of power and authority in unity means that we have power in action. This is important because dual power has authority in practice only if its organs and institutions function in accordance with laws, while the decisions made by these organs can be implemented and are implemented. The dyad considered is definitively influenced by the hierarchy of social positions which the subjects of power or the bearers of authority already have. Yet, the link works also vice versa — the hierarchy achieved by a particular individual or social group within the system of social relations is rather the result of the existing power and authority.

Through the link power — authority there acts one of the basic classifications of power. In it the first type of power is defined as "power of influence". It exists as a consequence of the ability of a person or social group to have an impact on others’ behavior by way of the particularities of his social identity, worths, the merits achieved up to this moment and so on. In theory this type of power does not refer to a particular subject. The power of influence exists institutionally beyond the individual or the group that exerts it, so to say «sui generis». Most often in social practice the source of influence is a particular social value that the subordinates, in their self-conscience or behavior, associate with the qualities of the particular subject of power.

The second type of power is defined as "functional power". The most significant characteristic features are its orientation to and the impact on the media (the subject). Usually political or managerial power in general is accepted to be of the functional type, yet, by all means it needs to have fixed legal grounds and responsibility in order to be put into practice. We only remind here that in regard to the types of power impact, Max Weber speaks about charismatic power (based on exceptional qualities possessed by those who have power), traditional power (based on their own influence that institutions have) and legal power (which is a result from the applicable constitution and legislation). Every study of the various forms of power in the urban community raises first the major question — how the dychotomy “power — authority” is implemented practically with the subjects, through whom these forms are realized. If we refer to Emile Durkheim who was the first to analyse both concepts in parallel, we would realize his explicitness — the bearer of power is the state, while those that bear authority are social groups. This idea has its origin in an argument defended stoically by Durkheim who claims that political power needs to have pluralism. He thinks that power underpins society. However, he does not associate this with the bearer of power itself, i.e. its subject. Instead, he associates it with relations in society that are generated by power. That is why Durkheim assumes that the multitude and variety of the forms of power attribute a pluralistic feature to the phenomenon. Thus, social relations are ensured.

with collectiveness together with the ensuing communal solidarity. Without the latter a society would not be able to exist as a unified bound wholeness. It is accepted that power has direct link and impact on this type of social situations.4

I think that in their relations with power people in a place of residence are led mostly by their own interests which is relevant for a particular individual, as well as for social groups. One’s interest in power happens to be quite a contradictory phenomenon and it is exactly the authority that exerts the necessary compensatory impact. It was again Emile Durkheim who gave the idea that through power it is possible to work for putting limits to one’s claims which can reach size and levels big enough to eventually turn out harmful for the community. This is particularly relevant for the big urban communities where social relations in population are not that tight and absorbing for the individual. However, a measure is necessary also for supporting collectiveness, so that it doesn’t stand in the way of individuals’ interests in the urban community. If this was achieved, an individual would not strive to achieve his own goals only while living in the community. He would realise that his activity is an instrument, a means for achieving superior - let us call them social and community, goals. Thus, one achieves solid personal self-evaluation of one’s own significance.5

The answers to the question in what way social power exists and which its most spread forms are have been thoroughly worked out in the theoretical study, which has already acquired classical significance, by John French and Bertrand Ravon “The bases of social power” (1959). In their book the two researchers classify powerful (power) relations as a peculiar type of social relations that are necessary and available in every social environment. French and Ravon’s theory offers the most widely known classification of the types or forms of power (old Greek “form” and “type” sound identical – “morphe”). They all exist in relation to various forms of sources of influence – norm, award, sanction, impact, knowledge. Thus, there originate their adequate forms of power: legitimate, awarding, coercive, referential and expert ones. In studying power in urban communities the heterogeneous character of these forms allows one to use the approach that is typical for sociology – the search for logical links between elements of reality with different nature and origin.

French and Ravon are psychologists, however, they think that it is good to work out the theoretical bases of social power and social impact through psychology, as well as through sociology and political sciences. In both researchers’ opinion power and social impact in a community prove everybody’s interdependence within these boundaries, so that this community is able to exist and function. Changing any element can lead to a change in any of the remaining ones or even the whole. “The superiority of power”, as French and Ravon render it, are the rights and powers that the subject of power is able to apply in his relations with the other party.6

---

4 Durkheim E. Suicide. A Study in Sociology, New York, 1951, p. 36.
In practice French and Ravon’s studies prove the availability of all forms of power within small social groups. Probing the forms that they work out into big social communities and groups of people like the urban ones, demands one to make certain methodological clarifications. Firstly, in my attempt here I accept that power in urban community is also an ability to influence the people who are in a state of dependence on those who are in power. I accept that this ability is not always put into practice. A mayor or another activist of local power has a considerable potential to influence population. However, in their everyday life they use only part of this potential.

Secondly, despite the circumstance that the aims of power depend on its subject, it seems to me that this dependence is not present always and in every single moment, in a linear pattern at that. Thus, for example, a colleague, a neighbour or a friend often has power through their authority so that they influence the opinion of a certain individual in case the individual is dependent on them or because he relies on them.

Thirdly, I share the argument that in the urban community power is always present on all levels of social relations, as well as between them. Here one has in mind the plentiful existing formal and informal levels of social relations among members of the population in the place of residence that result from the roles through which people are involved in the various social organisations for communal life.

In 1982 Paul Hersey and Ken Blanchard set the grounds for two more forms of power, namely: information and communication ones. This is further development of the five classic forms under the influence of the new social conditions and mainly the innovations in information technologies. Seeking common characteristic features of the seven forms of power in respect to the sources that generate them, leads to their differentiation into two groups. I think that the common genesis of the first group of forms is the position from which the impact of power is exerted, that of the second group are the qualities of the individual or the group itself as subjects of power. There are grounds to speak also of a second classification of power, namely: according to the official means used for imposing it. Thus, these are the functions of the respective social organisation and its managerial influence. In practice, the impact of power is almost never limited to a single source. Very often exerting power relies on both types of sources simultaneously, through which there is applied even more strength of the impact on people that is sought.

An interesting theoretical product is brought in when combining in a common, so called “quadruple model of power” the two classifications of the phenomenon pointed out above – the one according to the sources of power (the post-wise and the personal power – see the upper part of the model) and the one according to the means of power (the functional one and the power of influence – see the lower part of the model). In the four quadrants of the model all seven forms of power can be placed, as long as they simultaneously bear the characteristic features of both classifications of the types of power.

---

In the centre of the model are placed the four social phenomena that are directly linked to power in the place of living. As in most sociological interactions in social life, they are a condition for and, at the same time, a consequence of power. Public conscience and public opinion are the subjective ingredient/result of the interactions, while the social identification and especially social behaviour turn out to be the projecton of power in the life of every individual or group in the place of living.

**Typology of the forms of power characteristic of the urban community**

The basis of power in a place of residence are the relations between population and specialised institutions of public authority. This type of formal relations defines the variety of existing forms of the phenomenon and their effect on the life of the urban community. In this analysis it is important to prioritatively have in mind the three forms that ensure the existence of the **power in position** (see the left side of the model). The legal influence of institutions in power in the living place is based on A's (the institution) rights or authority to require socially responsible attitude, e.i. obedience, on behalf of B (the population or parts of it). Studies show that legal power is most often determined by three groups of factors. The first one being the values ensuing from the
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available culture of social life in the place of living and society. The second group are traditions and the prevailing attitude to social structures. Of considerable importance here is the subordination of relations and the social hierarchy in the place of residence that is formed in this respect. If the citizen B or the group accepts an employee’s job and influence in the institution A, this means that they accept his legal power. As a matter of fact, this is actually acceptance not of the personality or the personal power of the employee, it is rather an acceptance of his position instead, one that comes from his post. The third group of factors are the authorities of the legally appointed representatives of the institutions. Yet, here one needs to clarify that A’s influence is legal representation, not the personal will of its respective representative. This representative has been given rights by someone or by a managerial level to which he himself has been subordinate in obeying A.

Just like in small social groups, which has been successfully studied by French and Ravon, there is power in the urban community that is based on expected award given for obedience. This is a side of the power of formal institutions through which social management of the territory is put into practice. In such cases A ensures or has promised to provide B with the goods that B needs and strives to obtain. At the same time, we discover also influence of power that is based on A’s impact on B through sanctions, penalties or a threat for similar actions.

I also accept the forms of personal power (see the right side of the model) as typical for life in the urban community. The influence of certain people as personalities over the remaining ones in a community is not always linked to the existence of their formal positions in the life of the place or to material resources which they have access to. What these people possess and makes them influential is their personal power. It has its source of existence in the unique characteristics of human individuality that build the personality of the bearer of this specific power. In this line of thought respect and admiration that they invoke in others are of particular importance, as well as the impressive competence of these people. Such, for example, is one’s understanding about the influence of expert power. As long as A accepts B as an expert in a particular professional field or in the social management in the place of living, influence is based on B’s belief that A has special abilities without which B cannot make competent decisions concerning his own behavior or his mutual life with others.

Types of power in the community and social relations emerging on this ground

The seven forms of power in the urban community can be successfully presented and figured out by way of revealing the interaction between two scientific aspects which every form contains. It is exactly the social and legal element that they have. The community itself is the bearer of the social and the traditional, whereas institutions of local and state authority happen to be the ones representing the formal, legal element of power in the place of living. In each of the forms of power in the urban community the ratio between common and formal has its peculiarities and exerts in a different way its influence on relations among people in regard to power in their coexistence.
The social projection that gives an idea of the interaction mentioned, appears to have major differences in every form of power.

1. LEGITIMATE (REGULATORY) POWER

People’s collective activities require that they cooperate all the time not only in small social groups but within broader limits as well. This is of particular importance for the urban way of life. The common goals and social control that keep them require that one’s behavior in the community must happen within the boundaries of the norms, accepted by everyone. The power that comes from this situation is defined as legitimate. Its most important characteristic feature in every place of residence is that it is based on normative pressure on people that is to be revealed as a consequence of the strong institutionalization of their mutual life. For Max Weber power is an ability to stimulate the subordinate to perceive and fulfil regulations irrespective of the resistance against them.

In other words, this is how an attitude to power is formed - one suggesting that power is legal, morally accepted and respected. From a sociological point of view the development of being legitimate in respect to public power is an important indicator of what maturity level and organisation life in the living place has achieved. As for the judicial side of being legitimate, it is another aspect. It is accepted that the concept «legitimacy» comes from the Latin word «legitimus» with which most often characteristic features of power are demonstrated, such as acceptance by people, tolerance, even justice according to the public opinion. Here the most important side of the concept are the links of the institutions of power with law. I mean, what exactly gives the right to these organs to exert power in the living places within the country, as well as to exert, when necessary, coercion over population.

The political and public-and-legal functions of local power are one of the most interesting topics for sociological studies and analysis of power on local level. The reason for this is that the actions of local-power institutions are directly linked to the emergence and assertion of interests within the urban community. For sociological knowledge in every system studied, the social factor is the most important one for its existence and functioning.

As for the place of residence this importance is predetermined by the circumstance that the interests of human community in it is a basis both for all social phenomena, and for the administrative-and-territorial structure and management of a particular town, municipality and state as a whole. The lasting presence of people on a particular territory makes it not so much part of the national territory, but rather a social space where social communal life takes place. The population in a place of residence is not a homogeneous social aggregation. For sociology of communities the size of population in a particular place of residence or bigger territorial structures is not important. From a public-and-legal point of view, however, the size of the population is important with the fact that certain social roles depend on the number of people –

roles related to power such as the number of people in institutions of local power, administrative-and-territorial regions of the country, financial relations with central authorities and a number of economic and social managerial realities locationwise. On the ground of his civil rights and obligations every inhabitant of a respective town can take part in various ways in the public life of his urban community. Yet, from sociological aspect, it is not individuals and social groups’ rights and obligations to power and their fellow citizens that come to the fore when studying places of living, it is rather the issues concerning their interests.

Sociology of communities pays particular attention to the circumstance that the link between local power and population is facilitated by people’s interests. It is here that a major serious issue comes to the fore. It is widely accepted that institutions of local power are a social means through which interests of the people living on the territory of the community can be asserted and defended.

The fact that the legal norms which these institutions in power need to obey are obligatory, basically aims at creating order in people’s communal life life, as well as synchronizing their interests. In regulating relations in towns in regard to power, which this synchronization aims at, there arise objective and subjective reasons for conflicts of various depth and intensity. It is true that overcoming these conflicts is known both to legal regulations and the traditions of the urban community. However, it is here that the issue arises! In particular situations legal theory has difficulty in dealing with the concept «interest». For people in law interest cannot exist outside or against law. In this sense they even use explanations like «legal interests». Thus, a serious contradiction arises that refers exactly to the legitimacy of local power. Does this mean that breaking the law on behalf of a particular representative of local power or even organ of governance is something against the interests of all people? The law strives to regulate the rights and obligations of population in general, which should presuppose that legal norms apply the same for everyone. Yet, it is a fact that very often this does not appeal to part of the whole population and it becomes active in fighting for their own favor. If, on this ground, a legal argument occurs, things become very complicated. It is not only civil discipline and conscienctiousness that can guarantee the absence of social conflicts, which most certainly will affect the legitimacy of local power. To what extent in similar stitions is the legal interpretation prevalent that one can speak about interest only when authorities seek a positive answer by way of certain actions? Probably Prof. Sivkov is right that we cannot speak about the interest of local power that is contradictory to urban communities or population as a whole. Yet, he is right only from a jurisdictional point of view, since, in my opinion, in a similar situation, from a sociological point of view, there is a paradox. Therefore, one would think that in public power an issue might arise concerning a certain incompatibility between rights (as a lawful norm) and people’s interests. Thus, interests can be accepted.

11 See Сивков, Цв., Участие на гражданите в местната власт, С., СУ “Св. Кл. Охридски”, 2000, с. 76-102.
12 Сивков, Цв. Общината, С. Сиби, 2002, с. 177.
as a normative continuity of rights; as an existing, though unguaranteed public opportunity for protecting people’s interests from outside on behalf of local authorities. I think that concerning this type of power the conclusion is not only adequate, it is also especially relevant for the sphere of the current local self-governance in Bulgaria and, at the same time, it is not sufficiently clarified.

Legitimate power individual-wise is something different. This form of power, when the subject of interaction is a particular individual, is a result from their position in the organisation. Most often the basis of this type of power is the social hierarchy, a cultural norm or organisational structure. An individual’s legitimate power from the point of view of their position, is a constituent of the contents of every single role of theirs in the life of the community.

Legitimate power has a characteristic feature that its bearer always has to have in mind. If he loses his job or position, this form of power disappears immediately. The ground for this is that people in the place of living are influenced by the power and opportunities of the position, rather than the subject that acts through it. Besides, legitimate power is limited to situations in which others accept that the bearer of the power has the right to exert influence. In this manner, if the head of the police department in the town orders the population not to break the territory where his subordinates prevent crimes, the crowd will most probably obey. Yet, this person’s words will hardly be accepted with similar readiness, if he tries to advise his fellow citizens on what to buy or where to invest their own money.

2. THE POWER OF GIVING AWARDS

This power is based on the ability of the person in power to reward such type of behavior of his subordinates that he desires. From a psychological point of view it is easy to explain, since one obeys others because in this way he can obtain something pleasant or needed. From a sociological aspect, this happens to be an exchange of behavior against reward. According to George Homans’s theory of exchange it is very possible for a social act to occur, if the person who makes it is rewarded more often. In case that this stimulus (the reward) has already been used and is familiar, the act of the person in power is simply a worthy thing for the doer, since the worth achieved is also an award, just as if punishment is avoided.

In an urban community the award-giving power is partly a result from the legitimate power of institutions. It is the institutions in power that in practice have the tools of the award-giving power. And this is demonstrated in their rights to give honors, awards, honor people with titles, change the payment package they give to people employed in organs of power or support citizens financially and materially.

An issue with award-giving power is that this type of stimuli for social activity or of subordination are formally defined and the person who appoints those cannot make any changes. On the other hand, to make excesses in the number and frequency of people awarded does not help to strengthen one’s position of power either. The positive effect of award-giving power is that it influences people by prompting them

\[15\] Фотев, Г., История на социологията, т. ІІ, С. Труд, 2002, с. 482.
what their behavior is expected to be, thus preventing negative results. Award-giving power motivates mostly those who work in a social organisation. This aspect of power-wise relations is especially important for governing a town. It can be implemented as a whole strategy for social management. The sense of justice and duty fulfilled on behalf of authorities for the urban community is a factor of significant importance for people’s coexistence.

However, one needs to understand very well the reverse reflection, too. The award-giving power can turn into a source of conflicts, if rewarding is used as a single exchange value of power against people’s subordination.

3. COERCIVE (SANCTION-GIVING) POWER

Coercive influence is there when the possessor of power is able to exert influence over others through using punishment and/or threat. Coercive power is an addition to legitimate power since it is based on a specific ability of the person in power. Namely: the ability to sanction (punish) or to prevent someone from obtaining an award. What underpins sanction-giving power is the fear of force (coercion) or sanction. For this reason it is accepted that in this type of power its strength is determined by the degree of threat that can be instigated and, respectively, one’s readiness to obey this threat.

Awards and penalties are powerful motivational tools in social life. After all, those with power feel much more comfortable when they give awards than when they have to punish. It is well realised that sanction, as a tool of governance, can easily cause dissatisfaction within the subordinate, together with various negative consequences concerning his personal or social life. Threats and punishments are common tools of coercion. They associate with depriving one of privileges, of rights even or with imposing obligations that are not desired by the subordinate, irrespective of whether the subordinate is an individual or a group of people. Sanction is the last step in imposing power. This is explained with the circumstance that coercive power is too close to forceful impact and coercion, which is sometimes hard to distinguish. In a town one cannot even think of lasting sanctions of negative impact and especially in broad social aspects; even though, historically, various strategies of power are known, based completely on force and coercion. For this reason, in power over population only individual sanctions are relevant, in case, at that, it is undisputedly proven that lawful limits are broken.

From the point of view of society, sanction is accepted only if it has prohibitory or preventive character, but not as a consecutive act of retribution. In social governance this turns out to be quite a sensitive moment. A threat for punishment is socially bearable when based on generally accepted order, which is, actually, the essence of coercive power. As a matter of fact, people do not react to the sanction itself, it is its strictness that affects them and puts them in condition of inequality among the rest. When such type of inequality exists, be it emotional or social, it is considered unacceptable since in practice it causes the effect which is sanctioned.

In the second part of the model the forms of power include those through which personal power manifests itself. These are, namely: referential power, expert one, information one and the power of social communicaiton.
4. REFERENTIAL POWER

Referential power is the one of attraction. Referential influence is there when its subject is liked by others. Such people have abilities or personal qualities that are liked or desired by others.

Referential power is strong for two reasons. The first is the fact that this type of power results from the subordinate’s wish to identify himself with the referent’s power. Social and individual comparison is decisive for the influence to exist. Put into practice through the mechanism of personal influence, this power captures the subrodinate’s conscience, thus having a serious impact on his thoughts and behavior. It is not by chance that people claim charismatic personalities mostly have referential power. To accept such a personality as a factor for general change creates trust in their abilities, since they make others feel fine and have confidence in their support. The second reason is that in communal life everyone may happen to be liked by others irrespective of his social position. Thus, for example, friendly interpersonal relations in a town often make it possible for informal relations among people to spread also within the limits of the official social organisation of life.

The issues concerning referential power result from the fact that influence is achieved fairly easy, if there is a suitable bearer of the personal qualities that society finds worthy. In this line of thought, acquired power does not lead to responsibilities because its subject seems to effortlessly receive the chance to influence, without any obligations. The lack of decency and honesty may lead to abuse.

Referential power in the urban community has clearer manifestation in real-time situations. I have in mind the phenomenon when respectfulness appears and acts. This is quite a dynamic phenomenon and usually peaks exactly in situations when everyone has the opportunity to act, while the decision is reached or the goal achieved only through mutual efforts or together. Then one needs a center, an example, an impulse or a leader who can give manifestation to the influence of authority. The strength of referential power in the urban community depends on how strongly every single individual within these limits identifies himself with the rest, which in turn, is a consequence of the level of collective conscience in people’s coexistence.

5. EXPERT POWER

Expert power is one of authority and professional competence. An expert is an individual who has specific information and skills that can result in organisational values. Everyone is influenced by expertise as a personal quality, even if it concerns only a particular act with which others are outclassed. The expert receives social recognition based on abilities proven in practice. It is this preponderence that causes respect and exerts the influence of power. The expert’s social value lies in the fact that in mutual life they are difficult to find a substitute for.

From an individual’s point of view, a characteristic feature of expert power is that with time it is multiplied, since the expert’s knowledge, experience and skills become more solid. Authority in expert power is actually a proven ability to exert influence. Yet, there is another important thing – the social environment. One acquires authority not only when having particular feature or qualities, one does it because
there are people around who have the need, give their trust and acknowledge these qualities of his as valuable for the community. Which means that there is no such thing as authority in general, it is something that can exist in practice.

Expert power is a valuable asset for every individual who has taken a socially responsible position. Expert power is a good base for social cooperation because an individual or a group of people who own this tool for impact are quickly accepted by others as partners or consultants. In the long run, it is not the personality that is important for someone who seeks the position of power, it is rather the expert’s knowledge and his right to solve the problem of the person who expects it.

6. POWER OF INFORMATION AND SOCIAL COMMUNICATION

Information is a means through which there can be established positional and personal power as well. Every subject that is in power or governs others relies on information. It is gained through various channels. The one who has social position to realise one’s power in practice, relies mainly on the official channels, part of which he creates himself. In personal power these channels are numerous, they include informal ones, too. Most important in using information power is the chance to control the flow of information and its accuracy. In any social organisation it is the person who has the most credible information who holds the most favorable position in using the power of this information.

Social communication among people is also accepted as a factor of power. At that, it is of no particular importance whether the social relation is bilateral, i.e. interpersonal type of communication or of the type individual – a group of people. Both types of communication are typical for the social organisation, which means they are such for life in the community as well. Relations go along not only horizontally or vertically in the social structures or groups in a particular town, they occur outside its limits as well.

Conclusion

The existence of power in all social interactions makes it a source of various social relations. Two types of these relations are of particular importance for the link between local authority and the interests of population. These are people’s social behavior in the living place and their public opinion. What unites these is the verbal character of their origin and manifestation. People’s social behavior in a living place is their most important social role that presupposes the various forms of power there. The exchange of information among people brings life to public opinion. This opinion is an especially powerful instrument for impact on individual and collective behavior in the community. And one knows that influence is the basic mechanism of power.
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Abstract

The publication presents an attempt at approbating different forms of power, typical of the small social groups, to the system of social relations constituting a big community, such as that of the settlement. With the help of two classification schemes on the origin of the different kinds of power in the relations between people, there are given the principal characteristics of seven of the forms of power in the settlement. There are sought natural connections and consequences between the population and the institutions of power. There are shown issues and situations, which are typical of the rise and development of power relations in the functioning of the settlement, as the most typical form of social life.