

THE ONTOLOGICAL FOUNDATION OF DEONTIC POWER

Mr. RAVI KUMAR¹, DR. ASHOKA KUMAR TARAI²

¹Research Scholar, School Of Philosophy and Culture, Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University, Katra, J&K, India.

²Assistant Professor, Gangadhar Meher University Sambalpur, Odisha, India.

E-mail:¹ 17dpc002@smvdu.ac.in

Received: 11.03.2020 Revised: 12.04.2020 Accepted: 28.05.2020

ABSTRACT: The objective(s) of the paper is to present the ontological foundation of deontic power which is considered to be central to the function of any social object. It also argues that the so-called power is so vulnerable to the endurance of social reality. Power is defined in different notions in the words of Foucault and Searle. Both were targeted the ontological foundation of power that how it relates to human beings in social reality. The paper also shows the construction of deontic power with the effect of status function through collective participation. The description of the power relations becomes evident in how it is to be utilized by dominant to powerless. Another issue that tackles in this part is the construction of power/rules by the governing agency that did not construct with a collective approach. There is also a focus on the notion of social power and domination that can be understood in terms of collective intentionality.

Key words: power; deontology; status function; ontological; reality

I. DEONTIC POWERS AND RELATED CONCEPTS

Power in general understanding is the force, ability, etc. but in the philosophy of language; the concept of power is different. In this part, the power has been identified as a specific form that goes with human beings in social and institutional reality. This notion is said to be a deontic power because of some rules and obligations. The power is explained in concerned with the general and with the political sphere. The first thing about the concept of power is that it is not only referred to the relation with human beings. In other sense like the president of the United States has certain powers defined by the constitution; my car engine has a certain amount of power measured as a horsepower. So, the notion of power is the source of capacity that is being used or exercised. Power is not obtained naturally but it is obtained in the form of collective acceptance or collective intentionality. In society, several people resided but all these are not capable of the same abilities. Human beings did not make their status themselves; it is a construction of the majority of individuals. Power is always expressed in its exercise. We can't mention that power is seen; it facilitates through the status achiever.

Power has also the form of intentionality. It can be understood by an instance like that when someone enters in the room and smells so bad. By looking at their intention, everyone sitting in the room will leave. It is the process of exercise of agent power through which everyone influences based on one individual. It can be exercised based on judgments, predictions that how this notion of power becomes meaningless. So, it is very rightly defined that power is an ability or capacity but the exercise of power is always defined as an intentional act. The intentionality will also at its highest influence.

In my opinion, domination could be an explicit reasonably social power that allows an agent to extract some reasonable power or surplus like an agent or group of agents. In this process, domination is not said to be a powerful force or relation, however, it is defined as a notion wherever subordinates and superordinates actively participate with the constitutive rules. The status function would be considered as an essential aspect in formulating the power relation as deontic power among human beings in social reality.

Power is categorized into four distinctive platforms that are described as under the following heads:

1. **Positive power:** Positive power implies that every action of the human beings is based on the notion of exercise through the medium of power. Positive deontic power implies that a person is authorized to perform their

task and he/she has power for facilitating that task. Like a vice-chancellor of any university has the power to frame rules and regulations but those frameworks are constructed with the collective acceptance of all higher authorities.

2. **Negative Power:** Negative deontic power implies that the person is obligated to perform and that is the reason for doing something. In this description, there is an important statement that power is always in the hands of superior in every institution and it is based on them that how they utilized these powers on the maximum. Like in a political sphere, it is not fixed that every ruling individual has safeguarded the rights of human beings. Sometimes the ruler has used their source of power in a negative influence and that criterion has to be referred to as a negative influence.

3. **Conditional Power:** This sort of power refers to the basis of condition. It implies that power relations are generally referred to the medium of conditions. Human beings in their survival performed every task in one or other condition. The main description in this part shows that the conditional power can be employed only if the person has to obtain that sort of status. The status function is very important in this kind of relation. When a person gets his/her status; they will follow the conditions for using their powers. Like a vice-chancellor has several powers but it is only if a person achieved the status of vice- chancellor. So, to facilitate power; one must be reached through the notion of condition.

4. **Disjunctive Power:** This idea of power implies that when a person achieves their status; he can assess the powers that they have. It does not lead to the condition for assessing power. Like the teacher has its status in their educational institution and they can assess their powers without any hesitation. This case is employed everywhere in social reality and it is not limited. So, this description implies that when an individual obtains their status; they can positively access their deontological powers.

1.1 Formulation of deontic power and their related concepts

There is a need to know these important descriptions for denying the notion of powers as to how it becomes fixed. Let us understand these terms as in brief description:

- i. **Status Functions:** Status functions are those functions that are performed formally. These functions are to be analyzed as like the role of a student, role of professor, the role of president or many others. Status here implies the category of a person for whom they referred. The main point about the status function is that it cannot run separately; it is the role of others to construct the status. Like a student who has its status through their educational institution, the president occupies their status through the electoral process. One cannot perform any task without its status. All these status functions have through collective recognition in which one ought to perform their task necessarily.
- ii. **Collective Intentionality:** Collective intentionality is defined as the basis for status function. It is necessary to describe the relation of collective intentionality with the status function. The reason for this description would be based on the notion that how status functions can intend. It is observed that human beings have their status in one form or the other form. All these statuses as a like student, professor, driver, vice-chancellor, president, etc. are constructed by collective recognition. Whatever the status of an individual; it is to be constructed by one or many. So, status function and collective intentionality are following the relation for their collective acceptance to construct the status of an individual.
- iii. **Deontic Powers:** As in previous steps, there highlights the relation of status function with collective intentionality but it more accumulates in the presence of deontic powers that is inherited in the notion of deontology. The important description of deontic powers is that it has both positive and negative impressions. The positive deontic power holds the idea of *rights* whereas the negative deontic powers imply *obligations*. So, deontic power includes rights, duties, obligations, requirements, permissions, authorizations, entitlements and various others. Searle defines that human beings are very much dominated in their livelihood due to some fixed rules. It can be more understood by an instance that – a president who has various powers to perform in the state but all these powers are manifested in the safeguard of the society. The presidential powers are based on rights, duties, obligations, norms, etc so that no one in the social reality criticizes them. But if the president has negatively used its power; that is not for human sustain than it becomes a notion of negative deontic power. Thus, power is that in which all their norms are based on the one or other condition for performance and that will be called deontic power.

There exists a very deep relation between deontology, rationality and, freedom. All these terms are dependent on each other for their existence in institutional reality. The basic function of human society is that it contains a notion of deontology. The question arises in this debate is why deontology is so important for institutional reality? The answer to this question is will be very debating because it refers to the denoting of various rules, obligations, decision-making, etc. The reply to this question in the first part is that deontology in the society will be essential for various formulations of structures. It holds the control on every aspect of human beings either it is formal or informal. The main notion behind the first answer is that there is no free will in the deontologist way. So, the assumption in this is that without free will; the structures of private property, voting in elections, going to cocktail parties and giving lectures in the university are meaningless. So, in the first part, the structures do not have a point.

In comparison to the next part of the answer, they define that creatures have to be free will and rationality. The system believes that if human beings have the freedom of conscience, they will follow automatically the inclinations. This system believes in the desire independent reasons for acting. Like in a restaurant, I have a desire independent reason to pay the bill. In making any statement, I have a desire of independent reason for speaking the truth. Thus, the function of deontology occurs in a double relation i.e. in the earlier part; they believe in the notion that if there would be deontology, than free will be negated and in the later part; they believe that human beings have the conscious rational behavior for following the rules and regulations. So, if there are no conscious free agents; then there is no substantial deontology. The function of deontology will have a double relation based on desire independent and desire dependent. One has to be the conscious rational power to obey rules and follow the deontologist method. This is the real feature of deontology in the institutional reality through which conscious agents work as their status functions and developed the notion of rule-following.

- iv. **Desire Independent reasons for action:** Action would be treated as also the process of deontology. The status function accumulates much importance in every description because through it; one will make their role in social order. The status function of thief would have their role for making another property to him. All these imply that human beings have their institutions of each property. In this description, the focus is on the idea of the reason for action that how one becomes obliged to perform the task. It can be more understood through an instance like in a highway; there is a condition that no vehicle will be allowed to move back in a bridge after 10:00 am. The reason for this implies that if one violates the rule; he will be punished. But the fact that implies here is the desire independent reasons for action. If one goes to the highway after 10:00 am; we cannot move back as it is obligated by rules and regulations. Thus, the notion of desire independent reason for action would be based on the criteria that one has to follow the fixed rule with fixed action.
- v. **Constitutive rules:** Rules here implies that they are constructed based one or another direction. Human beings carry themselves a several functions that would be based on the status. The rule of driving the right side in the United States refers to the rule that is fixed and has approved. Constitutive rule implies not only in a limited sphere but it accumulates in all spheres of life. The rule of chess, the rule of cricket, etc all imply some criteria that accumulate the notion of status function with deontology. So, rules are fixed as it refers to constitutive rules.
- vi. **Institutional facts¹:** Searle in his book, *“The Construction of Social Reality”* (1995) defines Institutional Facts as logically before to objects. He defined that language is the base of all our social acts. He also described the various institutions like marriage, property; money, etc. are all very closely linked with language. All these institutions in society or social order are the notions of linguistic expressions. The Institutional facts as based on the language. He said that the creation of various institutions i.e. property, money, government, marriage, etc. requires the constitutive rules for its existence. Like Narendra Modi is the Prime Minister of India, the Vice-Chancellor of University, a piece of paper i.e. Rs.500. All functions of these areas have formed their status. Like the function of knives, the car has its physical function as well as a physical structure but with human being not the case is that they have the form of status i.e. status function based on various virtues. Like Prime Minister of India, Vice-Chancellor of University etc has performed its functions in virtue of collective recognition. Some like private property, the licensed driver has its own function i.e. all are bind to follow the deontology – (duties, rules, and obligation).

Some conditions might be based on the reason that how power can be assembled in various phases. Let us understand power as an intention or unintentional process-

- i. The first notion is about the concept of power that one has the power others in respect to action. The action might be the base for the performance of power. Like A has power over B concerning action C if only A has an intentional attitude in this regard.
- ii. The notion of power is also to be exercised based on illocutionary speech acts. In this process, there occurred the notion of directives. In this description, the speaker follows the conditions of promise, order, opinion, etc. Like in a criminal case, the court has forwarded their order to punishment because the court occupies a power and that power is constructed based on legal laws, rules, and regulations and also for safeguards of the humanity. Thus, the declaration function is too acquired in this way. The sentence for punishment is the notion of declaration that was given a status function as a judge in the court.
- iii. The concept of power is logically tied with the concept of intentional exercise of power. Whatever the person, they have their ability to intention. Intention plays a very significant role in the case of deontic power. Every act of an individual will construct through an intentional state of mind. Intentional states exercise in the conscious state of mind. This process is also confined to be intentionality constraint.
- iv. The last criteria for the influence of power may also understand on the ground that powers are also to be utilized based on laws. Like a policeman who is present and also having a gun cannot use on anyone without any kind of confusion. The reason for this is based on the condition that if he used a weapon without reason, he might

¹Smith and Searle.,(2003).pp.285-309.

go to the custody i.e. he can't use it against law. So, the power of policemen is also to be handed in the hands of some authority. Thus, power is not that source throughout which one influences and exercises on the weaker.

The two notions about the power of the agent are - (i) the agent of the power signifies that they do want to do something or otherwise would not want to do. (ii) The agent has the only option to do. Thus, the agent has to do their task efficiently as the source of the power manifested to the exercise. Power can exercise but not involved in acting against desires and inclinations. The notion of power is to be understood in this instance as when I make a promise to someone for the fulfillment of their wish; then they imposed a deontic power to me because I have promised to fulfill their wish. This makes a binding reason for me for doing that I promised. This notion is a case of power relations. But deontic powers are different from this case; it acquires based on reasons for action. So, deontic power is also categorized as negative and positive. Negative deontic power implies that the person is obligated to perform and that is the reason for doing something. Positive deontic power implies that a person is authorized to perform their task and he/she has power for that. Power has also the form of intentionality. It can be understood by an instance like that when someone enters in the room and smells so bad. By looking at their intention, everyone sitting in the room will leave. It is the process of exercise of agent power through which everyone influences based on one individual. It can be exercised based on judgments, predictions that how this notion of power becomes meaningless. So, it is very rightly defined that power is an ability or capacity but the exercise of power is always defined as an intentional act. The intentionality will also at its highest influence.

The exercise of power is also being measured in degrees. Political powers are to be analyzed based on their involvement in political approaches. Taking an instance, many leaders lack leadership qualities and many others who have leadership qualities are not leaders because they are all out of power. The notion of is to be analyzed based on intention or unintentional. Like the people who designed and marketed professional football on national television in the United States had no intention irrespective of some sort of American practices. Their intention was only to make money by having large viewers. One another important example is that a professor delivers a lecture to their students without any kind of intention among them. They did not take any kind of intention among their students either they learn their lectures or not. Their influence on the students would lead to an unintentional influence among them. So, a professor did not use power to their students to learn a lecture because they talked them unintentionally. Thus, power influences if it is imitated by intention.

So, power in this description focuses that it is constructed by collective recognition and through this, the status function of an individual approves. Every status function is constructed with the medium of declaration. Thus, the important condition for exercising the power is only in the institutions and that will be treated as institutional facts. It is seen that in the human social world, every task would be performed with one or another deontic power. The reason for this principle is that no moral actions are performed. Morality didn't lie in the usage of deontic power.

II. THE NATURE OF ONTOLOGICAL FOUNDATION AND SOCIAL REALITIES (OBJECTS, INSTITUTIONS, SOCIAL FACTS):

The ontological foundation of human social reality lies in the elements of objects, institutions as well as institutional facts. Every social institution has its unique function in which they laid upon the facts that how it is to be constructed. Human beings develop their intentions among various possibilities throughout which one plays its role in institutions in relation to the objects. The role of men in social reality lies about another only based on their one or other personal causes. It is not difficult to mention here that no single person will reside in society with their some benefit. Human beings always utilize those resources through which they obtain benefits from another. The notion of power in an ontological sense implies the relation of being with social reality. The nature of the ontological foundation in relation to the social reality develops different forms of intentions through which one follows the deontic rules either in the form of conditional or disjunctive.

To understand this description about the nature of ontological foundation, it is necessary to highlight these three claims as according to Searle: the first claim as it mentioned in his book, '*Making the social world – The structure of human civilization*' refers that in human social reality, all functions are to be performed with the medium of linguistic expressions. In a social world, there exist several institutions that occupy with various institutional facts. It is the human institutional reality that constructs the logico-linguistic operation that implies the role of language as a basic necessity for all purposes. The important point in this part refers to the logical implications of human institutional reality. As Searle defines in his book that without language; one cannot develop any kind of relation in human institutional reality. So, the logico-linguistic operation becomes a mandatory principle in human civilization. The existence of human beings merely depends on the notion of linguistic expressions. Every institution has its existence and its existence becomes dependent on the various institutional facts. For instance, as the vice-chancellor has also connected with the institution and that institution would be as a university. So in

human institutional reality, there is an amount of logico-linguistic fact that dealt with human civilization. Another claim that approached in the ontological foundation is considered as a status function declaration. In the status function, the significant position of the human being is its status. This status is not confined to be universal but it is a particular entity that holds with the capable. The ontological foundation lies that the nature of human being is always interconnected with reality. The status achiever would be referred to as the capable of deontic power. Here, the status and power are very inter-connected terms that develop the notion of status function with deontic power. It implies that a person who obtains a status would have a source of deontic power. Like a professor in a university has its status and he can perform various functions as based on its powers. So, power is considered as a significant notion that is confined to the desired person and that status function would have a number of deontic powers but those deontic powers are also to utilized in fixed rules and limitations. The status function would have obtained by every individual as they are student, professor, vice-chancellor, president, etc. The third claim implies that there is a diversity and complexity of human civilization. It holds the view that logico-linguistic operation is the recursive function that interconnects with the number of subject matters. In this part, Searle mentioned that language is the basic function that connected with objects very logically. Human beings have their number of approaches in the social reality that are connected with objects, institutions and based on institutional facts. So, institutional reality lies in the relation of objects with language and human beings.

III. ONTOLOGICAL FOUNDATION AND DEONTIC POWER

Language and Reality (social reality) are the two terms that occupy a prominent place for their relationship in this social world. Human beings in this social world develop various forms of the relationship among the community members. All these relationships between one to another follows the role of social ontology. In the present paper, the role of language in social existence in relation to social reality is highlighted. In this aspect, the society has their distinct norms, values, rules, etc. Language according to various thinkers is the leading phenomenon in the social world. Language, however, defined in various notions as it has its different understanding in linguistic as well as there is a number of regional languages. Language in this social world creates a relation between the objects (physical entities) among human beings. Various authors have suggested different viewpoints on language as necessary criteria. However, some believe that language as the power of expressing our opinions/sharing expressions. Some also described the creation of language.

Language and Institutional reality are considered a significant description of the functions of human life. In this part, the description is about the notion of language that has both the capacity and ability to formulate and generate new ideas with various distinct features. It is observed that every institution is to be run with some rules and regulations and that idea is defined to be deontic powers. Deontic here refers to the rules, obligations, etc. So, whatever the institution; they must have the deontic power. All the institutions have their institutional facts throughout which they perform various obligations/rules. The significant deontic powers are considered as *rights, duties, authorizations, requirements, permissions, certifications*, etc. Through these rules/powers, one must have also the notion for an obligation to the rules as by ought, should, can, must, etc. One of the main notion that highlighted by Searle is '*Deontology*'.

IV. POWER: FOUCAULT AND SEARLE

The idea of power is understood in simple terms as the ability, efficiency and all our acts but here the concept is different. In the philosophical point of view, power is manifested in its exercise and it can have the source of rationality. Here, we are analyzing the idea of power according to Paul-Michel Foucault, generally known as Michel Foucault, was a French philosopher, historian of ideas, social theorist, and literary critic.

4.1 Power according to Foucault

Foucault's theories primarily address the relationship between power and knowledge², and how they are used as a form of social control through societal institutions. According to Foucault's understanding, power is based on knowledge and makes use of knowledge; on the other hand, power reproduces knowledge by shaping it following its anonymous intentions. Power creates its fields of exercise through information. The problem of power was of great important work in Foucault's philosophy. He defined that power is essentially something that institutions have in one way or the other. The main aim of his work that how power operates in day to day interactions among people with institutions. The central problem that he consider as the

² Foucault (1980). p.98.

relationship between individuals, groups, institutions, and society. He observes that the power is understood or analyzed in action with the medium of institutions. In this aspect, he calls it - "the analysis of power".

Foucault thinks that it is wrong to define that power as something that the various institutions are having and use very dominantly or oppressively against the members of the society. So, he is trying to explore that power is something that constructs the relationship among the individuals and the institutions. Usually, in layman's point of view, power is defined as the capacity of a person or group to impose his will power over the powerless i.e. it demonstrates forcibly against the powerless. But in Foucault's point of view, power is not something that can be owned but it is something that acts and manifests in a certain way. It is more said to be a situation or conditional than possession. So, he defined the notion of power as something which circulates in the form of a chain. It is a strategic idea that forwards from one individual to another and they can exercise their power with resistance. It has a feature of ubiquitous occurrence in every society to maintain any type of relation between the members of society. Therefore, Foucault defines power as coextensive with resistance that includes the productive, producing positive effects and ubiquitous features to maintain the condition for any type of relationship. That is why he says "where there is power there is resistance". He calls this power as the basic productive feature for making social relations successful. For Foucault, the state is not the only agency that forwards power but it is the medium through which individuals build a system of relationship that works in a political system.

He also forwards the notion of discipline in which he mentions that every individual should possess the discipline. But this discipline should not facilitate without power relations. Power relations are very much required in every institution either it is school, college, hospital, university or any institution. He said every effort of the individual should be disciplined or self-disciplined. Discipline is considered to be a productive feature for every existing institution. Another fact that he accumulates is the notion of discipline acts through controlling acts. It means that all our acts should be performed in a disciplined way. Thus, power relations according to him are between parents and children, between lovers, between employers and employees. The State is not said to be a superhuman agent. In his concluding remarks, he mentions that the relations between individuals and society without assuming that the individual is powerless compared to institutions, groups or the state. He does not minimize the restrictions imposed on the human beings but he thinks that the notion of power is not concentrated but it is spread to the whole society.

The description of the idea of power according to Foucault refers that the relationship between individuals with the society but these relationships should be managed in power based relation. So according to him, social relations are maintained only if there exist power-based relations in terms of discipline, resistance, and production. This description allows us to observe it at work in each human interaction and thus to see how resistance always shows up. Power is a necessary and regular element for human relationships.

4.2 Power according to Searle

As we understood earlier the concept of power in general sense and Foucault's point of view, it is clear that the notion of power will build up in all spheres of human existence. Both philosophers are focusing that how this power generates in the relationship of human beings. In this regard, the essence of power is based on the relation of human beings.

According to John Searle, we human beings are very much rational and develop their relationships based on rationality. We cannot survive our status without the notion of power. It is not difficult to mention here that power becomes positive and negative but at the same time, it might be conditional how it occurs. In the earlier discussion, we understood power as an essence for the maintenance of behavior in the social reality as it is a general understanding of it. Searle in his work mentioned the deontic power in spite of the term power. The term deontic is said to be more disciplined than the term power. He says every act of human beings should be deontic based and they all are bounded with one or many obligations, duties, rules, etc. The real meaning of deontic powers is considered as *rights, duties, authorizations, requirements, permissions, certifications*, etc. This description would not be created uniquely but it is the composition of the number of elements as status function, collective acceptance, etc. The major concern about the deontic power³ according to Searle is that it has constructed through collective acceptance and that has to be bound in the number of elements. Like a vice-chancellor of the university has several powers and they can use it as they like but in form of deontic power; it has to follow certain norms, rules, behavior, rights, duties, obligations, permissions, etc. In this part, we are focusing on the real nature of power that how it utilizes for the maximum. Human beings generally did not think for universality welfare; they consider their self-fulfillment more important. A dominant always tries to violate the powerless. But in Searle's

³ Searle (2010), pp.145.

theory of deontic power, rules are manifested as a universal acceptance. The state has the maxims for every individual right. Thus, Searle argues that deontic powers are constructed with collective acceptance as we (human beings) actively choose the ruler or any superior agent for the rule. The role of deontic powers according to him would be much based on the status function that the individual gets from the social occurrence.

Thus both the philosophers Foucault and Searle have forward their arguments about power as necessary criteria for every social reality. Foucault mentioned that power is considered as necessary for managing the relationships among human beings. He also much focuses on the notion of discipline, resistance, and production while Searle defines power as deontic that is manifested with certain rules, regulations, permissions, certifications, etc. He says that human beings achieve their status with collective recognition and should not violate their powers against the other social residents.

V. SHOWING THE VULNERABILITIES OF DEONTIC POWER

Power is that kind of phenomenon throughout which one always wants to exercise it in one or another way. Human beings more or less believe in the system of power state. We intend that we (social beings) are always following the desire dependent notion. The deontic power is always carried out by those who are recognized with collective recognition. In this paper, the assumption is not about to forcibly criticize the deontic power or its exercise but the criteria that would for deontic power are very vulnerable and will not perform in a moral point of view. There several circumstances through which human beings require their status for assembling the power in one form or another. The important element that is most significant in this article is showing the vulnerability of deontic power that why this power becomes the hurdle in realistic approaches.

The idea or medium of power has been criticized due to its utilization through negative effects in social reality. Take an instance as, during elections, we (human beings) vote for their leader. In this process, we are participating very actively through collective acceptance. So through the election, the leader has been elected with collective recognition. This system has been followed on every ground; it is not a particular process for achieving the status. The status of an individual always constructs with the collective acceptance or collective recognition. The leader now obtains all powers through the election and implies the social reality where applicable. But those powers are not in minimum but it assembles as them powers. It might be positive or negative. However, these powers are already constructed for every eligible leader. This is the procedure for making their status in the social reality but our approach is apart from this description.

In this paper, the attempt is to focus on why these power-holders make their own rule(s) even without collective recognition? It is commonly observed that every dominant try to violate others. It is only with the effect of power. The important issue that tackles in this paper is the construction of power with collective acceptance but these power holders make the number of rules or have changed the existing rules without collective acceptance. They can frame their own rules whatever they wish. The significant fact behind this notion is that the person who leads the powerful approach will dominantly create their maxims. They didn't think for the masses; they work for self-empowerment. This is the case of political mode for utilization of power but the case is the same in all areas of human beings during their existence. The work also explores the relation of power with the linguistic operation that language is considered only the medium for sharing the notion of power towards others. This power will not tackle as in degrees; it is through exercise. The idea of power is quite debating because it includes every act that deals with social practices. It is either in-home, educational institutions or in any profession. The source of power is understood in engine capacity as in horsepower, the power in sports, etc.

The level of consciousness will deliberately depend on the notion of cognition that how one deals with reality. In this description, we want to express the institutional reality based on the conscious power that robots/machines don't have. Machines are designed for particular or limited purposes. They didn't know the full idea of targets. It is constructed to facilitate the sources that are resourceful for the creator or user. Robots are only meant for fulfilling promises that will essential in representation. But the question arises that how these unconscious robots make statements, giving orders and keeping promises. Now, the assumption occurs that is there any kind of deontology exists among these robots in institutional reality. So, promises are considered as conscious state mind that robots didn't have. An important example is like when robots short of fuel, they go to the fuel provider and exchange counters for fuel. But they didn't use their conscious level due to non-availability of conscious power. They don't use the option of buying or selling because there is no sense of property rights, duties or obligations involved. It is completely a mechanistic resource. Like in a restaurant, we must pay a bill at the counter but the deontic power among the robots didn't have. Robots and human beings have so difference from the conscious level. The earlier will be based on orders as it mechanistic and the later is a presupposition cognition power. So, unconscious robots have no institutions. The basic notion behind all the circumstances is that human beings and machines have too difference because of their level of understanding. Another notion is that it is not mentioned

that robots didn't know the level of knowledge. They know right and wrong but the only criteria that are negated; the notion of conscious. So, consciousness is a prior notion of human beings performing various tasks either it is promising or obligating.

It is observed that every ruler has the ability of power and that power is considered to be their right as they are gained by collective recognition. In the modern political era, every individual wants to be freedom in every aspect irrespective of others. The debate here focuses that the rationality of human beings believes in the area of *desire dependent*. No one likes to follow the notion of *desire independent*. So, the problem of power is categorized on the various grounds that how it becomes sufficient for maximum. Deontology holds the view that every aspect of the human being is controlled in the hands of superior or another ruling party. Powers are considered as the explanation of performing tasks in social reality. Human beings are considered as the most important entities in the social reality because of the collective facts that existed in the social world. In this part, we are focusing on the element of social structure that how it can be constructed? Social structures are the composition of collective intentionality typically in the form of collective recognition. Collective recognition is not a unique part of the society; it holds with the assumption that it constructs of assignment and status function. Human beings are referred to the notion that every individual its particular status function and their capability would lead to the collective institutional function. Every individual has its logical form of declaration and that declaration is confined to be the collective acceptance or recognition. So, the notion of representation is confined to be the logical assumption through which they constructed a logical form of declaration. In this part of the description, Searle argued that we cannot know the structure of the institution unless we know the level of consciousness. It can be also clarified through an instance of sati pratha. In this process, a widow has to also sacrifice herself with their husband's funeral. This was performed in the ancient era. Now in comparison with the modern period, there is no such rule or we can say that there is nothing any type of power that exists in the social reality. The reason behind this is that it is a violation of human rights. So, the important element in this instance is that the rule that was in the past has to be changed. Thus, power is to be changed based on different circumstances.

Both Bentham and Mill were considered as important theorists and social reformers. They defined that happiness should be in maximum numbers. On various grounds, both the viewers mentioned that rules are necessary conditions for beneficial results of all. A rule for general occupies more beneficial results irrespective of individual actions. This suggests that we should not perform individual actions that curtail the feature of equality.

In spite of this paradox, rule utilitarianism possesses its appeal, and its focus on moral rules can sound quite reasonable. The rule utilitarian approach to morality can be illustrated by considering the rules of the road. If we are devising a code for drivers, we can adopt either open-ended rules like "drive safely" or specific rules like "stop at red lights," "do not travel more than 30 miles per hour in residential areas," "do not drive when drunk," etc. The rule "drive safely", like the act utilitarian principle, is a very general rule that leaves it up to individuals to determine what the best way to drive in each circumstance is. More specific rules that require stopping at lights, forbid going faster than 30 miles per hour or prohibit driving while drunk does not give drivers the judgment to judge what is best to do. They simply tell drivers what to do or not do while driving.

The reason why a more rigid rule-based system leads to greater overall utility is that people are notoriously bad at judging what is the best thing to do while driving a car. Having specific rules maximizes utility by limiting driver's optional judgments and thereby decreasing how drivers may endanger themselves and others.

VI. CONCLUSION

In the end, it is not difficult to argue that rules are the necessary importance in the social reality but these rules would not be fixed as permanent. Deontic powers can be changed in different circumstances. The rules are changed due to their various effects as it is not beneficial for society if rules are having a negative effect, if rules are constructed for individual basis and many others that have minimal effect in the social reality. The occurrence of social orders is the collective recognition that is to be approved with collective acceptance. Every dominant authority is to be constructed or manifested by the collective achievement. They have to follow the welfare processes for social order but if in effect; they not perform such tasks efficiently than the rules will also evaluate. In this process, the notion of status function will also important. The rules are controlled in the hands of dominant and that dominance has an individual status function. The achievement of status function is collective recognition. So, every task is based on action. The status of achiever should be very positive in their approaches.

VII. REFERENCES

- [1] Anscombe, G. E. (1958). *Philosophical Investigations*. 108 Cowley Road, Oxford, OX4 1JF, UK: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- [2] Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with Words*. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.
- [3] BARRY SMITH, J. S. (2003). *The Construction of Social Reality*. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* , 285-309.
- [4] Chomsky, N. (2006). *Language and Mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Clack, R. J. (1972). *Bertrand Russell's Philosophy of Language*. Netherlands: Springer.
- [6] Clark H.H., C. E. (1977). *Psychology and Language: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- [7] David Woodruff Smith, R. M. (1982). *Husserl and Intentionality*. Boston: D.Reidel Publishing Company.
- [8] Dummett, M. (1973). *Frege: Philosophy of Language*. Harper and Row.
- [9] Fiedler, K. (2008). *Language: A toolbox for sharing and Influencing Social Reality*. Sage Publications , 38-47.
- [10] G.Furth, H. (1966). *Thinking without language: Psychological implications of deafness*. New York: US:Free Press.
- [11] Gode, A., Herder, J. G., Moran, J. H., & Rousseau, J.-J. (1986). *On the Origin of Language*. University of Chicago Press.
- [12] Goodwin, D. F. (2011). *Theory of Language The representational function of language Karl Buhler*. Philadelphia PA 19118-0519. USA: John Benjamins North America.
- [13] Gordon, N. (1999). *Foucault's Subject: An Ontological Reading*. University of Chicago Press , 395-414.
- [14] Heller, K. J. (1996). *Power, Subjectification and Resistance in Foucault*. The Johns Hopkins University Press , 78-110.
- [15] Hindriks, F. A. (2003). *The New Role of the Constitutive Rule*. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* , 185-208.
- [16] Innis, R. E. (1982). *Karl Buhler Semiotic Foundations of Language Theory*. New York: Plenum Press.
- [17] Jones, C., & Porter, R. (1994). *Reassessing Foucault Power, Medicine and the body*. London: Routledge.
- [18] Lebow, R. N. (2017). *Max Weber and International Relations*. United Kingdom: University Printing House, Cambridge.
- [19] Marjorie, R. G. (1926). *The Language and Thought of the Child: Jean Piaget*. New York: Routledge.
- [20] Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2000). *Hilgards Introduction to Psychology*. Harcourt Brace.
- [21] Raimo Tuomela, W. B. (1999). *Collective Acceptance and Collective Social Notions*. Springer , 175-205.
- [22] Russell, B. (1938). *Power A new Social Analysis*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- [23] Searle, J. R. (1983). *Intentionality: An essay in the philosophy of mind*. United States of America: Cambridge University Press.
- [24] Searle, J. R. (2008). *Language and Social Ontology*. Springer , 443-459.
- [25] Searle, J. R. (2010). *Making the social World- The structure of Human civilization*. USA: OUP.
- [26] Searle, J. R. (1995). *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York: The Free Press.
- [27] Searle, J. R. (1971). *The Philosophy of Language*. London: Oxford University Press.
- [28] Singh, I., & Peccei, J. S. (1999). *Language, Society and Power*. London: Routledge.
- [29] Siobhan Chapman, C. R. (2009). *Key Ideas in Linguistics and the Philosophy of Language*. 22 George Square, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [30] Stern, D. G. (1995). *Wittgenstein on Mind and Language*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- [31] Tew, J. (2002). *Social Theory, Power and Practice*. New York: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.