Human nature and nature of power

Naturaleza humana y naturaleza del poder

Z.Z. IBRAGIMOVA
ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8648-6096
zulfiya.Ibragimova@kpfu.ru
Kazan Federal University, Russian Federation

M.S. RAISOVICH
ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5428-1093
murtazin.salawat2013@yandex.ru
Kazan Federal University, Russian Federation

ABSTRACT

The resource to the phenomena of human nature and power nature is dictated in a way by the belief that there is much more than only correlation and proportionality between them: these are two forms of sociality. Power still carries out a crucial function in society: it helps a person orient himself in life and defend off all metamorphoses and distortions of power. The ontological status of two phenomena is possible when true sociality is achieved, that is what we call humanity. The main methods used in writing this article are the method of historical and logical unity and the method of comparative analysis.

Keywords: Human Nature, Nature of Power, Philosophy, Relations of Power.

RESUMEN

El recurso a los fenómenos de la naturaleza humana está dictado en cierto modo por la creencia de que hay mucho más que solo correlación y proporcionalidad entre ellos: estas son dos formas de socialidad. El poder aún cumple una función crucial en la sociedad: ayuda a una persona a orientarse en la vida y a defenderse de todas las metamorfosis. El estado ontológico de dos fenómenos es posible cuando se logra la verdadera socialidad, lo que llamamos humanidad. Los principales métodos utilizados para escribir el artículo son el método histórico, la unidad lógica y el método de análisis comparativo.

Palabras clave: Filosofía, Naturaleza del Poder, Naturaleza Humana, Relaciones de Poder.

INTRODUCTION

The study of human nature is connected with the search for historical-philosophical and socio-historical premises that tell us convincingly about the need to consider that the nature of power already existed in the writings of Plato and Aristotle. One can rightly argue that the correlation between man and power is not only random, but it is also a systematic vision of developed forms of sociality. But the understanding of "power" (its varieties) basically adds up to political power. The general meaning of all definitions comes to a "specific management tool used to achieve set goals" (Foreman: 2018). It is quite understandable that all definitions concentrate primarily on the political equivalent of power, while power is understood much more broadly as possession, submission, influence, etc. This is important in the understanding of the raised problem: the nature of mastery, possession, submission, impact, etc. aimed at people, social groups, classes. The literature also points out to other aspects: "The main thing in understanding power ... is not its socio-psychological aspect (of course, it is important per se) but its actual social essence" (Lasswell: 2017).

According to Aristotle and Plato, power and politics are almost two identical hypostases of ancient social life. The syncretism of these two phenomena determines the conventionality of dividing the subject under our consideration into human nature and the nature of power. This was determined by history that the government initially needed a restriction imposed on the state. But the state also gained its power over man. Thus, the problem of "holding the balance", which R. Guardini writes about, arises with the emergence of the phenomenon of power, it is inherent in the very power (Maxcy: 2003, pp. 51-89). What will become a serious problem (a rationalistic aspect of power) for the New Age and a tragedy for the 20th century has its origins in antiquity.

The formation of man, citizen becomes possible only in the conditions of the state, the exercise of power. The historical types of Paideia contain the meaning of the unity of the creation of state and man. The correlation, proportionality of the nature of power and the nature of man is an expression of the problem of the unified nature of man and power. But we are interested not just in human nature, but in the aspect of man's choice and mastery of his own nature, or rather, the non-obviousness of our being ready to choose and master our own nature (Ibragimova: 2016).

The nature of man and the nature of power are reflected in various philosophical concepts. One of the most audacious views of the 20th century is the concept of M. Foucault, who, however, did not hide his skeptical attitude to the ideas of human nature. The reason for this is the insufficient theoretical status of the designated phenomenon. However, M. Foucault views power as a universal fundamental phenomenon that permeates all levels of social life in which a person seeks self-fulfillment. Power, relations of power are objective, but still vulnerable to the actions of subjects. And unlike ancient understanding, these structures are not always desirable for society, sometimes leveled against man. Loyalty to relations of power does not always coincide with the ideals of the person as a citizen. Of course, for M. Foucault, the concept of the nature of power seems more convincing and justified than human nature.

1. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The method of historical and logical unity was used in the article to realize the historical nature of the categories of human nature and the nature of power. The subject of the study was considered in historical dynamics, starting with the philosophical teachings of antiquity, delving into some subsequent stages in order to understand the prerequisites for the formation of categories. Using this method made it possible to fixate on the relationship of categories and the specific nature of modern interaction. The method of comparative analysis was relevant for this paper since the subject of research was immediately defined. A comparison of the two phenomena was made in order to identify common ontological foundations during which the general nature of the emergence of power and self-fulfillment of man through the relations of power was determined.

At the same time, this method was partially realized as segmentation, and, specifically, human nature was considered not only as a holistic object but also as a separate problem block. For example, the paper raised the question of the ambiguity of not only human nature but also the ambiguity of the very possibility of man's mastering his own nature.

2 .RESULTS

What is the place of philosophy in the relationship between man, society and power? Can man come to what can be called an unbiased look at his nature and the nature of power without the admixture of the influence of power structures (through ideologies of different kinds) through philosophy?

On the one hand, philosophy often appears as an area to be free from ideological prejudices, and from the prejudices of "common sense", which ideology often hides under. B. Russell writes about this key feature in his work *The Problems of Philosophy*: the philosophical view of the world ceases to divide it into "friends and enemies" and clears the view from the veil of prejudice and biased opinions (Smith: 2015). Such a narrative of philosophy can also be found in the text of A. Bergson's speech to the students of Clermont-Ferrand Lyceum entitled *Courtesy*: a philosophy being purified of human passions is a source of genuine politeness as mutual respect and understanding (Ciment: 2015). This idea can be extended to the problem of man's knowledge of himself and to the knowledge of the nature of power: philosophy, being out from human passions, philosophy allows a person to look at himself and power from the point of view of a disinterested subject. An example of the opposite: a libertarian or an anarchist will look very differently at the problem of power than a proponent of authoritarianism (the former will take an extremely negative view of it, and the latter – on the contrary, see it as a guarantor of preserving the true essence of man and society).

And the point is not only the differentness of these views but for the purposes pursued by them: these goals do not allow the possibility of changing one's point of view or even doubting it. If we set ourselves philosophical tasks (clarification of certain positions, their foundations and, most importantly, comprehension of the truth), and not political ones (related to increasing the degree of influence of our ideology on others), then we will have to be ready, even if only temporarily, abandon the idea of the absolute truth and necessity of our political attitudes, or, in the words of phenomenology, "take them off the table" or conduct a "phenomenological reduction", which E. Husserl considered to be as a necessary step just to make science and philosophy the most unbiased and objective in its foundations (Husserl: 2013). Or, in the words of the concept of the same name, to be "intellectually virtuous" also implies a desire for objectivity, respect for the opinions of opponents, reasonable firmness in upholding one's interests, as well as the ability to abandon one's point of view if circumstances so require (Barris: 2018). Through such a "purification" of our view, we will theoretically be able to reach a greater degree of communication between representatives of different points of view on these issues and thereby begin to work together to clarify the nature of man and the nature of power (Horvath: 2018).

In the course of this kind of research, the question inevitably arises of the practical feasibility of realizing such an "unbiased" view of something, of trying to see the very essence of the phenomenon under consideration. However, the issue is highly contentious in the question of the nature of power and the nature of man since these entities have become woven together not only with each other but also with the political, social and economic conditions surrounding the person. For example, from the point of view of antipsychiatry (which, in turn, has grown on the basis of Marxism and existentialism), the family plays a key role in formulating certain ideological principles of a person (Vlasova: 2014). That is, man from his birth is included in the system of relations of power and is influenced by certain ideological principles, which, in the future, will somehow prevent him from looking at the world (especially the social one) objectively: either he will accept them or accept categorically opposite views as a protest against them.

However, even in the case of the given example of antipsychiatry, it would be quite appropriate to ask

whether its view of the family, as well as the problem of relations of power, is unbiased? Or is it dictated by the principles of Marxist ideology, in the framework of which, the attitude to the institution of the family is very negative? The same applies to assess the balance of relations of power and human nature: from the point of view of antipsychiatrists, schizophrenia is a person's reaction to these balance (the contradictions between his true nature and relations of power in society) and the way out of this system of relations of power. However, this idea is based on the conviction of the fundamental difference between human nature and relations of power: madmen are the few ones who saw the light and for whom this abyss was an eye-opener. However, the proponents of traditionalism or meritocracy would not agree with such a judgment of relations of power. At the same time, both of them are clearly biased in their beliefs, and this bias will be very difficult to overcome. Moreover, even if the very assessment of the influence of the family and the environment of the child on his or her views (negative or positive) is disputed, this influence cannot be denied, especially in the matter of cognizing the nature of man and the nature of power.

That is, on the one hand, we cannot be impartial: these issues about the nature of man and the nature of power are for everyone personally, and we all live within the framework of a kind of relations of power, as well as surrounded by people who, like us, in essence, represent a realized and realizing concept of a person (in his work *Existentialism is Humanism,* Sartre writes about the special responsibility of a person to others for choosing this concept) (Sartre: 2007). Some concepts seem unacceptable to us, and in this case, power seems to us to be a blessing that can help us eliminate these concepts inappropriate for us (for example, "political perfectionists" insist on this). Or vice versa, we want to protect our own concept of man from encroachment from the outside. And then power (families, states, traditions, capital, etc.) will be in our opinion a true incarnation of evil, oppression, etc.

But, at the same time, there is a definite way out of this situation, namely, V.V. Bibikhin in his work The World offers us (Bibikhin: 1995), namely, the acceptance of the fact that in society there will always be different (and sometimes even fundamentally different) in relation to us. According to V.V. Bibikhin, for example, this otherness is the key to the strength of society, since societies of the same, from his point of view, are short-lived. In the context of the problem of cognizing the nature of man and the nature of power, we must come to terms with the fact that there are those who do not share our point of view on these issues. And the one who defends or condemns relations of power is not an "enemy" for us, but only the one who can enrich our point of view and contribute to a greater clarification of these difficult issues.

CONCLUSION

The task of differentiating the phenomena of human nature and nature of power, as well as searching for common ontological foundations, was realized only as a project of methodological understanding. This was partly due to the straightforward, and therefore the categorical (clear) designation of the subject of study. This is not a situation of dilemma, but of unity. The attempts to understand the nature of power have led us to recognize the existence of many definitions, which suggests an analogy with the definition of man or human nature. But in the case of the latter, a contradiction is emphasized: on the one hand, the existence of different interpretations of this phenomenon, on the other hand, a syncretic existence with the nature of power. According to the concept of M. Foucault, relations of power permeate the life of society, creating a completely natural situation of control over all aspects of life: "the peculiarity of modern power is that it is a "disciplinary power" that depersonalizes a person and turns him into an object of study and the impact of disciplines – criminology, psychiatry, medicine, social sciences" (Wilson: 2012).

But a certain select problem of human nature continues to be the subject of discussion: "Our concept of human nature, of course, is limited (it is partially determined socially), it is limited by our own peculiar vices and the scopes of the mental culture in which we live". M. Foucault prefers political relations in society, while N. Chomsky, being much more optimistic about human nature, defines two major tasks:

There are two intellectual tasks: the task that I have already mentioned is to try to develop a certain vision of future fair society, to create a humanitarian theory of society, based, if possible, on a solid idea of the essence of human nature. That is the first task. The second task is to clearly understand the nature of power, oppression, intimidation, and destruction in our own society (Foucault: 2002, p. 384).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BARRIS, J (2018). *"*Deep Disagreement and the virtues of argumentative and epistemic incapacity*"*. *Informal Logic*, *38*(3), pp. 369-408.

BIBIKHIN, VV (1995). The World. Tomsk: Vodoley. p. 144.}

CIMENT, J (2015). World Terrorism: An Encyclopedia of Political Violence from Ancient Times to the Post. Routledge.

FOREMAN, P (2018). Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Inclusive Education. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*.

FOUCAULT, M. (2002). "On Human Nature". Justice versus Power. Intellectuals and Power: Selected Political Papers, Speeches, and Interviews, Translated from French by S. C. Ofertas, edited by V.P. Vizgin and B.M. Skuratov. Moscow: Praxis. p. 384.

HUSSERL, E (2013). Cartesian meditations*:* An introduction to phenomenology. Springer Science & Business Media.

HORVATH, A, & SZAKOLCZAI, A (2018). "Political Anthropology". *Sage Handbook of Political Sociology, London: Sage, especially*, pp.195-198.

IBRAGIMOVA, ZZ (2016). "On the Non-Obviousness of Our Readiness for Freedom as a Condition for Mastering Our Own Nature". *Scientific Notes of Kazan University*. Series Humanities. Vol. 158, Book pp.1154-1163.

LASSWELL, HD (2017). Power and society*:* A framework for political inquiry. Routledge.

MAXCY, SJ (2003). "Pragmatic threads in mixed methods research in the social sciences: The search for multiple modes of inquiry and the end of the philosophy of formalism". *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*, pp. 51-89.

SARTRE, JP (2007). Existentialism is a Humanism. Yale University Press.

SMITH, PK, & MAGEE, JC (2015). "The interpersonal nature of power and status". *Current opinion in behavioral sciences*, *3*, pp. 152-156.

VLASOVA, OA (2014). Anti-Psychiatry: Social Theory and Social Practice [Antipsikhiatriya: sotsial'naya teoriya I sotsial'naya praktika]. Moscow, Higher School of Economics Publ. p. 432.

WILSON, EO (2012). On human nature. Harvard University Press.

BIODATA

Z.Z. IBRAGIMOVA: Zulfiya Zaytunovna Ibragimova. He graduated from school of Philosophy from Kazan (Volga) Federal University in 1994. He is Doctor of Philosophy of the Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications. He got philosopher in 1983-1988 from Kazan State University named after V.I. Ulyanov-Lenin, Faculty of History, Department of Scientific Communism, Philosophy. He is Teacher of Scientific Communism.

M.S. RAISOVICH: Murtazin Salavat Raisovich. His date of birth is 05/27/1995. He is training in Kazan Federal University, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, full-time, course 2, group 13. 1-710 and in KFU, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications / Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, full-time, course 4, group 13. 1-300.