

## ПОЛІТИЧНІ ІНСТИТУТИ ТА ПРОЦЕСИ

DOI 10.31558/2519-2949.2023.3.1

UDC 316.34

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5640-2605>

**Goncharuk-Cholach T. V., West Ukrainian National University**

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2623-5399>

**Chuhur R. Yu., West Ukrainian National University**

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5817-9782>

**Dzhugla N. V., West Ukrainian National University**

### PECULIARITIES OF INTERPRETING POWER THROUGH DOMINATION

*The article examines the problem of interpreting power by explaining its phenomenon through dominance, manifested in supremacy, the subject's monopoly on decision-making, as well as object control. In particular, attention is drawn to the fact that society cannot be without power as it resists anarchy, destruction, and the means by which political power exercises its will are authority, law and violence. It follows that, on the one hand, power is associated with coercion, force, and violence, and on the other, with consent, voluntary submission, and legitimacy. Special attention is paid to various differences in the image of political power, which imply the presence of two aspects in power relations: one consists in the compulsion to submit, and the other, on the contrary, in agreement with it.*

*An important problem that is also raised in the article is the identification of the close relationship between political power and violence, since it was born to solve the problems of security and state building and gradually acquired a monopoly on the use of violence, which became the most important tool of public administration. Also, in their research, the authors pay attention to various concepts of the interpretation of power, while special attention is paid to the Marxist doctrine of power and the influence of ideology on it.*

*The purpose of the study is to explore different approaches to understanding power through the prism of its influence on the processes of domination. Special emphasis is placed on the fact that today only a strong political power, guided by principles built on authority, influence and law, will be able to protect citizens and their interests. It is such a power that will be able to faithfully and legitimately make the right decisions and be responsible for their implementation.*

**Keywords:** *political power, domination, society, state, ideology, violence, hegemony*

**Statement of the problem in general terms.** Political power is a necessary regulator of the existence of society, which contributes to its development, unity, organisation and orderliness, and is always manifested in the bilateral interaction of subject and object. Political power is always manifested in relations of dependence with each other, imposing someone's will on someone else and submitting to it.

Political power implies supremacy, the subject's monopoly on decision-making and control of the object. Society cannot exist without power, as it opposes anarchy and destruction. The means by which political power exerts its will are authority, law and violence. These are the components of political power which are the subject of our study.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** The interpretation of power in different periods was explained by different thinkers, such as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, N. Machiavelli, Max Weber, S. Freud, M. Foucault, K. Marx, Louis Althusser, P. Bourdieu, T. Parsons, V. Pareto, Joseph Nye and others, since the problem of power is eternal, deep and stable. However, each era brings its own understanding of power, as this concept in the modern world acquires new colours, especially when it comes to this issue related to the problem of domination.

**The purpose of the article.** To systematise approaches to understanding power through the prism of its impact on the processes of domination.

**Presentation of the main research material.** An attempt to define the basic concept of power through the words "macht" and "herrschaft" organically fits into the very core of M. Weber's ideas about power. The first of them is translated as "power", as well as "might" or "strength", and it "means the ability to achieve the triumph of one's will within social relations, even in spite of resistance; and it does not matter what this ability is based on" [10, p. 415]. Summarising M. Weber's position, F. Choisel notes: "One of the most typical features of power is the overcoming of stated opposition; however, the existence of this type of opposition is not a common feature of all power relations: it does not mean an indisputable mark of identification" [8]. M. Weber's relational definition of power is quite broad, since it does not take into account either the grounds of power (e.g., mobilisation of resources) or the specifics of its exercise. More precisely, this understanding of power does not cover all its resources and means. That is why M. Weber himself defines this concept as "sociologically amorphous" [12, p.35].

A kind of refinement of this concept is the concept of "herrschaft", which is translated from German as "authority" or "domination". "Herrschaft", according to M. Weber, "means a chance to find people who are ready to obey an order of a certain content" [13, p.20]. In this sense, domination (authority) implies the consent of the one who obeys and the legitimacy of the one who commands. Both are interconnected. It is the consent of the governed that establishes legitimacy. Thus, legitimacy can be defined as "the quality of power, the consent of which is based not on coercion as the primary resource, but on the free consent of the population to the authority to which they are subjected". And vice versa, the legitimacy of power substantiates and confirms the consent of the population with it [3, p.49].

Political power and power in general have two faces. One is associated with coercion, force and violence, and the other with consent, voluntary submission and legitimacy. This difference in the image of political power implies the presence of two aspects in power relations: coercion and consent. This interpretation of power allows us to identify what causes subordination to power.

Political power is closely linked to violence. And this is not surprising. Political power was born to solve security and state-building problems and gradually acquired a monopoly on the use of violence. And this monopoly has become the most important instrument of state governance. The monopoly on physical violence, in particular, guaranteed and still guarantees today the respect of the citizens of this state for the rules and norms issued by the political power [4, p.87].

However, it would be wrong to claim that violence is the only, privileged or most effective means of political power. Nor would it be correct to view violence as an ordinary means of power. Historically, the most radical vision of the relationship between power and politics was offered by the adherents of Marxist doctrine. They have long believed that force, control and the use of the apparatus of violence underpin the subordination of people to the state, and that the maintenance of social and political order in modern society is based on the "primitive" violence of human domination and exploitation by man. For K. Marx and his followers, until the last third of the twentieth century, the state (political power) was seen as nothing more than an instrument of violence of one ruling class over other classes, whose purpose is mainly force and coercion [6, p.345]. According to Marxist ideas, the dynamics of history are rooted in the economy: the transformations of the economy itself (the nature of wealth and sources of profit) and the struggle of antagonistic classes lead to changes in society itself.

The politics we are talking about depends on economic relations, which, in turn, reflect the situation and the changing social class structure of society. Political changes (state, political regime or law) are a reflection, albeit sometimes with a certain delay, of changes in production relations. For example, monarchy politically ensures the dominance of landowners (aristocracy) in an agrarian economy, while democracy ensures the dominance of capital owners (bourgeoisie) in an industrial economy. Politics, ensuring the dominance of the ruling classes in exploitative societies, is largely focused on the implementation of the coercive function, which in the nineteenth century was mainly associated with the activities of punitive bodies represented by the police and army [2, p.38].

It was these two institutions that ensured the preservation of the "bourgeois-capitalist-democratic" public order in those years, carrying out repressions against the labour movement. At the same time, K. Marx attached great importance to ideology [6, p.402]. Already in the nineteenth century, Marxists were convinced that revolution was inevitable in Europe. However, this prediction was not fulfilled. Later, in the XX century, the best Marxist minds sought to find the reason for the defeat of the revolution in the developed countries of the West. For example, Antonio Gramsci, one of the founders of the Italian Communist Party, views the state and its activities from two angles. On the one hand, the state does indeed carry out the procedure of violence and coercion, thereby ensuring the "domination" of the ruling class, and on the other hand, the state

consistently works to unite all classes around the government. This means that the state not only coerces, but also does everything to convince people of the need to support it [8]. This second function A. Gramsci called hegemony, which is carried out through ideology, schools, mass media, and most of all through socialization institutions that participate in the formation of faith in the legitimacy of political power (the state, political regime, leaders, policy orientations, etc.) [5, p.269].

The Marxist thinker Louis Althusser made a significant contribution to defining the role of ideology. He made a significant contribution to the analysis of the relationship between superstructure and infrastructure, distinguishing between three levels – economic, legal-political and ideological-cultural. This made it possible to somewhat soften the economic determinism of Marx's theory and thus attract a large number of intellectuals to Marxism. This was also facilitated by the fact that L. Althusser did not associate political domination only with repressive measures [7, p.214]. Repressive indicates that the state apparatus in question "functions on the basis of violence", at least (repression, for example, administrative, can be expressed in non-physical forms of influence) [4, p.97].

The fundamental difference between ideological state apparatuses and repressive state apparatuses is as follows: the repressive state apparatus is "based on violence", while the ideological state apparatus is "based on ideology". We can clarify this distinction. We can say, indeed, that every state apparatus, whether it is repressive or ideological, "functions" simultaneously on the basis of violence and ideology, but with very significant differences, which are that the ideological state apparatus cannot be mixed with the repressive state apparatus [8].

The repressive apparatus of the state functions in conditions of predominant use of repression (including physical repression) and only secondarily – with the support of ideology. There is no completely repressive apparatus. For example: the army and police rely on ideology to ensure their own unity and reproduction, as well as on the "values" they spread externally. Similarly, the ideological apparatus of the state functions in conditions of predominant reliance on ideology, and only secondarily on repression... There is no purely ideological apparatus. Thus, the school and the church "teach" to methods related to sanctions, exclusion, selection, etc.... And so it is in the family... According to our understanding, no class can firmly hold state power" [4, p.102].

According to L. Althusser, violence and coercion, social and political order based on a certain form of domination, are "optimal" when they receive ideological support, which allows at least partially to save on the use of force and ensure the support of the political order by the citizens of the country, including those who are victims of this political order to one degree or another. L. Althusser's conclusion is unequivocal: since force alone is not enough to maintain the dominance of the ruling class, this class cannot firmly hold state power without exercising its hegemony over and within the ideological apparatuses of the state in society [7, p.267].

Another French political thinker, P. Bourdieu, continues to develop the above scheme of analysis. Bourdieu reveals the mechanisms by which violence is internalised by those to whom it is directed, and lifts the veil from real violence, which is a product of social domination. He introduces the concept of "symbolic violence" [1, p.56]. If, following K. Marx, P. Bourdieu retains the idea that social reality is a set of power relations between social groups that have historically been in a relationship of struggle with each other, he also uses M. Weber's approach to social reality as a set of relations of consciousness, and therefore this reality has a symbolic dimension [12, p.25]. According to P. Bourdieu, representations and language are involved in the construction of social reality, even if they do not express the whole of this reality. According to Bourdieu, it is necessary that the external social conditions in representations and even speeches are met in order for them to have an effective impact on reality, and these conditions are favourable to the reality previously inscribed in minds and institutions. This is exactly the case that he calls the "theory effect" [1, p.39].

The concept of symbolic violence is also worth mentioning here. The variety of forms of domination, at least the exclusive and continuous recourse to armed force (which, in turn, involves a symbolic dimension, must be legitimised, recognised as legitimate, i.e., acquire a positive meaning and become "natural"). Just as politicians accept the dominant order without being aware of its mechanisms and arbitrary nature. This dual process of recognition and ignorance is the principle of symbolic violence and is called the legitimisation of different types of domination.

Symbolic domination, according to Bourdieu, allows inequality to manifest itself as natural and justified. In this case, the inequality (of goods, conditions, chances, etc.) that structures society is legitimised, and with it the inequality of people's social destinies. The legitimisation of the social in the broadest sense of the word

conceals the social origin of inequality as such, which structures different social fields of society. It is not difficult to see that it is impossible to explain political commitment by force alone. In this regard, P. Bourdieu's approach is ambivalent. This is so because, considering symbolic violence as a spring of social domination, he recognises that force and coercion (pure, physical or explicit) are neither the primary basis of political order nor a manifestation or privileged means of political power. It does not matter that social actors feel deluded or simply deceive themselves into accepting the values and beliefs that power establishes and that perpetuate its dominance. The crux of the matter is that when people accept these values and beliefs, they do so voluntarily.

**Conclusions.** Thus, in today's complex and contradictory world, only a strong political power guided by principles based on authority, influence and law will be able to protect citizens and their interests. Such a government will be able to make the right decisions correctly and legitimately and be responsible for their implementation.

#### ***Bibliography:***

1. Bourdieu P. Reflexive Sociology. K.: Medusa, 2015. 224 c.
2. Goncharuk-Cholach T. V. Intentions of the study of social inequality and stratification from antiquity to the present. Gilea: scientific bulletin. 2020. Issue 157. C. 35-41.
3. Goncharuk-Cholach T., Hurik M., Dzhugla N. Localisation of policy in the context of modern scientific research. Gilea: scientific bulletin. 2022. Issues 167-168. C. 48-52.
4. Goncharuk-Cholach T., Dzhugla N. Political sociology: a textbook. Ternopil: TNEU "Economic Thought", 2018. 234 c.
5. Gramsci A., Lukacs D. Politics of education. How to govern the people. Kyiv, Dnipro: Batkivshchyna, 2020. 336 c.
6. History of economic doctrines: a textbook. Lviv: New World 2000, 2017. 436 c.
7. Althusser Louis On the Reproduction of Capital [1968 – 1980]. London: Verso, 2014. 345 s.
8. Elias N. Uber den Prozess der Zivilisation. Soziogenetische und psychogenetische Untersuchungen. Bd. I – II. Frankfurt am Maim. 1991.
9. Theodore R. S. Introduction: practice theory. The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory. Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2015. P. 10-23.
10. Weber M. Das antike Judentum. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie. Bd. III. S. 415.
11. Weber M. Die Protestantische Ethik II. Kritiken und Antikritiken. Hg. V. J. Winkelmann. Munchen und Hamburg. 1968.
12. Weber M. Protestantische Ethik und der "Geist" des Kapitalismus. Archiv fur Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik, 1904 – 1905, Bd. 20 – 21.

#### ***References:***

1. Burd'ye P. Refleksyivna sotsiologhiya. K.: Meduza, 2015. 224 s.
2. Intentsii doslidzhennya sotsial'noy nerivnosti ta stratyfikatsii vid antychnosti do s'ohodennya. Hileya: scientific visnyk. 2020. Vyp. 157. S. 35-41.
3. Honcharuk-Cholach T., Huryk M., Dzhuhla N. Localisation of policy in the context of such scientific research. Hileya: scientific visnyk. 2022. Vyp. 167-168. S. 48-52.
4. Honcharuk-Cholach T., Dzhuhla N. Political sociology: a practical guide. Ternopil': TNEU "Ekonomichna dumka", 2018. 234 s.
5. Hramshi A., Lukach D. Politykv nvuky. Yak keruvaty narodom. Kyiv, Dnipro: Bat'kivshchyna, 2020. 336 s.
6. History of economic vchen': A navchal'nyy posibnyk. Lviv: "New World – 2000", 2017. 436 s.
7. Althusser Louis On the Reproduction of Capital [1968 – 1980]. London: Verso, 2014. 345 s.
8. Elias N. Uber den Prozess der Zivilisation. Soziogenetische and psychogenetische Untersuchungen. Bd. I – II. Frankfurt am Maim. 1991.
9. Theodore R. S. Introduction: practice theory. The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory. Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2015. P. 10-23.
10. Weber M. Das antike Judentum. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie. Bd. III. S. 415.
11. Weber M. Die Protestantische Ethik II. Kritiken und Antikritiken. Hg. V. J. Winkelmann. Munchen und Hamburg. 1968.
12. Weber M. Protestantische Ethik und der "Geist" des Kapitalismus. Archiv fur Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik, 1904 – 1905, Bd. 20 – 21.

***Гончарук-Чолач Т. В., Чигур Р. Ю., Джугла Н. В. Особливості тлумачення влади через панування***

*У статті розглянуто проблему тлумачення влади через пояснення феномену панування. Визначено, що з одного боку, влада пов'язана з примусом, силою і насильством, а з іншого –*

зі згодою, добровільним підпорядкуванням і легітимністю. Показано, відмінності в образі політичної влади, які передбачають наявність двох аспектів у владних відносинах: примус до підпорядкування і згоду з ним. Виявлено тісний взаємозв'язок політичної влади з насильством, оскільки вона зароджувалася для вирішення проблем безпеки та державного будівництва і поступово набула монополії на використання насильства, яка стала найважливішим інструментом публічного управління. Досліджено різні концепції трактування влади, при цьому велику увагу приділено марксистському вченню влади і впливу ідеології на неї. Звертається увага на те, що суспільство не може бути без влади, оскільки воно протистоїть анархії, деструкції, а засобами реалізації своєї волі політичної влади є авторитет, закон і насильство. Звідси випливає, що, з одного боку, влада асоціюється з примусом, силою і насильством, а з іншого – зі згодою, добровільним підкоренням і легітимністю. Особливу увагу приділено різноманітним відмінностям в образі політичної влади, які передбачають наявність двох аспектів у владних відносинах: один полягає у примушеності до підкорення, а інший, навпаки, у згоді з ним. Важливою проблемою, яка також порушується в статті, є виявлення тісного взаємозв'язку між політичною владою та насильством, оскільки вона народилася для вирішення проблем безпеки та державного будівництва та поступово набула монополії на застосування насильства, яка стала найважливішим інструментом державного управління. Також у своїх дослідженнях автори звертають увагу на різні концепції трактування влади, при цьому особливу увагу приділяють марксистському вченню про владу та впливу на неї ідеології. Особливо наголошується на тому, що сьогодні лише сильна політична влада, яка керується принципами, побудованими на владі, впливі та законі, зможе захистити громадян та їхні інтереси. Саме така влада зможе чесно і законно приймати правильні рішення і відповідати за їх виконання.

**Ключові слова:** політична влада, панування, суспільство, держава, ідеологія, насильство, гегемонія.