Chapter 1 : Political Realism in International Relations (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Feminist Questions, Marx's Method and the Theorisation of "Love Power". Anna G. Jónasdóttir - - In Anna G. Jónasdóttir & Kathleen B. Jones (eds.), The Political Interests of Gender Revisited: Redoing Theory and Research with a Feminist Face.

Without political awareness and skill, we face the inevitable prospect of becoming immersed in bureaucratic infighting, parochial politics and destructive power struggles, which greatly retard organizational initiative, innovation, morale and performance Kotter Making organizations more innovative, responsive and responsible requires focusing on a number of leadership, power and influence issues. These issues are critical in coping with the strategic environment with all its VUCA characteristics, and strategic leader performance requirements in that environment. The issues influence developing teams at the strategic level, as well as managing organizational processes linked to values and ethics, organizational culture, visioning and the management of change. Implementing strategic or adaptive change in the face of formidable resistance. Fostering entrepreneurial and creative behavior despite strong opposition. Gaining resources and support from bosses whose personal agendas might include organizationally harmful political games. Avoiding destructive adversarial relationships with others whose help and cooperation are paramount to your success, but who are outside your chain of command and your direct control, and who may suspect your motives. Building and developing effective teams in an internal environment where the natural tendency is to conflict with each other and engage in "turf battles". Avoiding becoming a victim or casualty of destructive power struggles. Avoiding the numerous traps that generate power misuses and ultimately power loss. Fostering organizational excellence, innovation and creativity, and not getting mired in bureaucratic politics or dysfunctional power conflicts. This chapter will not by itself change your view or way of acquiring power and effectively exercising influence. It does provide an opportunity to think differently about power, politics and influence, and it can refocus your attention on organizational issues and problems. The significant questions are: What means do they use to gain it? How much do they exercise it? He further states, "Power is the basic energy needed to initiate and sustain action or, to put it another way, the capacity to translate intention into reality and sustain it. Power is the opportunity to build, to create, to nudge history in a different direction. If power involves the employment of stored influence by which events, ac- tions and behaviors are affected, then politics involves the exercise of power to get something done, as well as to enhance and protect the vested interests of individuals or groups. Thus, the use of organizational politics suggests that political activity is used to overcome resistance and implies a conscious effort to organize activity to challenge opposition in a priority decision situation. The preceding discussion indicates that the concepts of power and organizational politics are related. Thus, in this chapter, we define organizational politics as the use of power, with power viewed as a source of potential energy to manage relationships. The political frame is an excellent tool for examining the concept of organizational politics and makes a number of assumptions about organizations and what motivates both their actions and the actions of their decision makers. Through a negotiation process, members combine forces to produce common objectives and agreed upon ways to utilize resources thus aggregating their power. Power bases are developed that can accomplish more than individual forces alone. There are enduring differences among individuals and groups in values, preferences, beliefs, information, and perception of reality. Such differences change slowly, if at all. Most of the important decisions in organizations involve allocation of scarce resources: Scarcity exacerbates political behavior. In government at present, the competition is for personnel spaces and funding. Mission is the means to gain both, because resources tend to follow mission. For this reason, the Services compete for strategic mission e. The two dominant political parties also attempt to present the American public with different views of what is significant. Because of scarce resources and enduring differences, conflict is central to organizational dynamics and power is the most important resource. Conflict is more likely in under-bounded systems less regulation and control. In an over-bounded system with power concentrated at the top e. Jefferies makes the point that organizations play the political game within the broader governmental context, but those individuals also play politics within

organizations. So both influences are at work. And power is key in both cases, because it confers the ability both to allocate resources- in itself a way to increase power-and to consolidate power by bringing others with similar goals and objectives into the inner decision making core. Organizational goals and decisions emerge from bargaining, negotiating, and jockeying for position among members of different coalitions. Bolman and Deal offer the space shuttle program as an example of a strategic effort backed by a complex coalition consisting of NASA, contractors, Congress, the White House, the military, the media, and even portions of the public. The difficulty in the Challenger disaster was that different members of the coalition were in disagreement about how to balance technical and political concerns. These became increasingly salient as the enormously expensive shuttle program encountered one delay after another for safety-related technical reasons. At the time of the Challenger shuttle disaster, both Thiokol and NASA were under increasing pressure to produce on schedule at programmed cost. The decision to launch on that fateful day was made when political forces overcame technical considerations. The five propositions of the political frame do not attribute organizational politics to negative, dysfunctional or aggrandizing behavior. They assert that organization diversity, interdependence, resource scarcity, and power dynamics will inevitably generate political forces, regardless of the players. Organizational politics cannot be eliminated or fantasized away. Leaders, however, with a healthy power motive can learn to understand and manage political processes. Power is attractive because it confers the ability to influence decisions, about who gets what resources, what goals are pursued, what philosophy the organization adopts, what actions are taken, who succeeds and who fails. Power also gives a sense of control over outcomes, and may in fact convey such enhanced control. Particularly as decision issues become more complex and outcomes become more uncertain, power becomes more attractive as a tool for reducing uncertainty. Power and the ability to use it are essential to effective leadership. Strategic leaders who are uncomfortable with either the presence of great power in others or its use by themselves are probably going to fail their organizations at some point. The critical issue is why the leader seeks power and how it is used. Some see power as a tool to enhance their ability to facilitate the work of their organizations and groups. Others value power for its own sake, and exercise power for the personal satisfaction it brings. There can be good and bad in both cases. Power competition exists at two levels. Individuals compete for power within agencies and organizations; agencies and organizations compete for power within the broader governmental context. The mechanics of power competition are much the same. In both cases, power accrues when an individual or an organization achieves control of a scarce commodity that others need. And in both cases, the operations are essentially political. Even when compelling physical force is the means, the mechanism is political. The scarce commodity is the means of inflicting harm on others. So dictators, by hook or by crook, gain a monopoly on the means for inflicting harm on others. During the course of the Cold War, the massive build-up of armaments was aimed at maintaining a "balance of forces" so as to prevent intimidation by either side. Even after Glasnost, the level of armaments on both sides was carefully negotiated so as to preclude imbalance that might tempt one side or the other toward risky moves. Power competition within an organization or agency is generally for resources- personnel spaces or funding, or both, in governmental agencies. And the basis for the competition can be constructive as well as destructive. If the top-level leadership is wise and capable, the basis for competition can be defined as meritorious performance of either individual or group. In that case, performance becomes the basis for determining who accumulates power. The process is still political, but it is also constructive because the organization as a whole benefits. So, the political process can be either destructive or constructive, depending on the resource to be accumulated, the means by which the competitors seek to accumulate it, and the value that accrues to all competitors by virtue of the competition. Of course, competition based on performance, if conducted at such an extreme that human values or key norms governing competition are violated, may substantially hurt the organization in the long term. However, internal politics can also be detrimental in ways not readily apparent. Sub-units within agencies may develop objectives and goals at odds with those of the agency. For example, a given "desk" owes its stature in its own agency to the constituency needs it serves. An extremely important constituency is the nation it represents within its own agency and with which it deals. The "desk" therefore may find it valuable to promote the needs of that constituency over the needs of the agency by "selling" important

positions or programs that benefit the constituency-thereby unwittingly becoming co-opted and increasingly vulnerable to manipulation by that constituency. Organizations also play a political game. Influence increases autonomy freedom to control own assets ; organizational morale the ability to maintain cohesion and effectiveness ; essence sanctity of essential tasks and functions ; roles and missions exclusion of options that would challenge these ; and budgets increased roles and missions will always favor larger budgets Jefferies. To increase their own influence, agencies in government and other organizations will provide information, recommend options, and execute directives in ways that enhance their own self interest. Jefferies illustrates with the decision to send a U-2 reconnaissance aircraft to overfly the Cuban missile sites. The decision to send the U-2 was actually made 10 days before the flight occurred, but the implementation was delayed by the CIA-USAF struggle for the mission. The USAF was concerned that the pilot be in uniform to avoid repetition of the Gary Powers crisis if the aircraft was shot down. The total mission delay came from five days to make the decision and five days to train an Air Force pilot to fly CIA U-2s. Because key leaders who form the centralized circle at the top of the policy making apparatus have different viewpoints, particularly with something as uncertain as strategic policy, they are obligated to fight for what they consider right. Thus, decision making is not a unitary process, but also "a process of individuals in politics reacting to their own perceptions of national, organizational, and personal goals" Jefferies Because the scope and scale are too great for one person to master, the president must persuade in order to develop the consensus required for broad support of decision outcomes. Those who wind up executing must be product champions for these decisions, or they are not likely to implement them. The president is also open to persuasion, because the various branches or agencies may also build power bases outside government or outside the executive branch. By definition, rational processes are different from political processes. Rational decisions rest heavily on analytic process. An analytic process can be defined as one in which there are agreed-upon methods for generating alternative solutions to problems, and for assigning values to the benefits and costs expected from each of the alternatives. The essence of rational process is the belief that, "All good persons, given the same information, will come to the same conclusion. The rapid expansion of electronic mail systems that permits anyone in an organization to address anyone else probably rests on a rationality premise-that transcending organizational channels by allowing all members to address directly even the highest official will give that official more complete information and thus enable higher quality decisions. This is very difficult for some people to understand especially those with narcissistic power needs and maturity issues. There is also a trust assumption:

Chapter 2 : Power (social and political) - Wikipedia

Love power and political interests has 3 ratings and 0 reviews: Published by University of Ã–rebro, pages, Hardcover.

Not all social power, however, involves alternative interests. When we persuade another to do something we want because we have made their interest clear to them, this is a form of power. You have not generated an alternative interest; you have clarified his interests to him. We not only persuade people to do or not to do something, but we may persuade them about what is true or false, right or wrong, good or bad, beautiful or ugly. Persuasion may cause another to change their mind, or their preferences among interests, to, say, go to college rather than join the army. The basis of persuasive ability is intellectual. Expertise, logic, intelligence, knowledge, verbal and numerical fluency surely play a role in convincing others of the correctness of our view. Of course, conformity with the evidential norms governing the interests in question is also required. Even an ordained minister can hardly expect to persuade a scientist about the revealed truth of an empirical proposition. Psychologically, persuasion focuses on the interests of another. Recall that an interest is an attitude plus its strength to be manifest. Persuasion, then, works on the cognitive connection between situation, want, and goal, as they are linked to each other and to other attitudes, in order to change the strength of an attitude. The goal of one attitude may persuasively be shown more instrumental to a higher goal than other attitudes "College graduates earn a higher lifetime income than non college graduates" or a particular goal can be argued to be gratified through another attitude "Join the army and see the world". Or attitudes may be brought to life by stimulating the relevant underlying needs. Let me call this ability to persuade another intellectual power. This power is a capability to persuade a person into believing or doing something. Another form of power, beloved of political scientists, similarly affects interests. Authority is often defined relative to a position, such as that of policeman, judge, boss, and so on. One obeys the request or command because it is thought proper--legitimate. The notion of legitimacy is important, for authority is more than balanced power; it is directed power which can be employed legitimately only in channels defined by the norms of the group. A person holding such authority is commissioned; he does not simply have the right to rule or govern--he is obliged to. Thus, authority emerges as a transformation of power in a process called "legitimation". For a drowning person to yell to me for help is legitimate, and I would respond with as much help as I could give. In this situation, he has authority, as does a reader asking that I refrain from disturbing him in a library. It is legitimate for a recognized scholar of classical Greek to demand the evidence for a critical comment I may have made on Plato, and I am obligated by my own values to respond. A mathematician not by position, but by training asking for the derivation of my theorem has the legitimate power to do so. Thus, authority is not only associated with a role but with a situation a drowning person, a library. However, these senses of authority are still independent of the individual. Regardless of who is the police officer or the judge or the drowning person, his request is authoritative. However, authority can also inhere in the individual who because of his particular attainments or image can make legitimate requests or even commands. Consider the charismatic leader. His power comes from promising others a better future which evidently only he can achieve. He connects with the superordinate goals of others and holds out in his person their gratification. His commands are therefore just and proper routes to his, and thus their, success. Of course, such a person soon has an official role as head of a group, party, or government. But this should not mask the source of primary authority that is in the leader and not his position. We thus have three kinds of authority: Since they share a similar basis in legitimacy, they are aspects of authoritative power. Later I will emphasize a particular aspect, as for example in defining class in relation to authoritative roles. However, the more general concept of authoritative power should be seen as encompassing these three kinds and will suffice for my immediate purposes. As described, then, authoritative power is a capability to use legitimacy to convince a person to do something. Psychologically, authority works through the superego. Because of that cluster of attitudes defining what is right and wrong, good and bad, in a moral or ethical sense, we feel that the person should be giving us commands or making requests, and that we have an obligation to obey. Authoritative power thus comprises two interests. One, which may be positive or negative, is that commanded or requested. The other is

the moral or ethic which endows the command or request with legitimacy. Note the difference from bargaining, coercion, and persuasion. Persuasion involves changing the salience of an interest wholly through generating a re-evaluation of its constituents and relationship to other interests; coercion involves two alternative negative interests; bargaining two positive interests. In persuasion and authority, a negative interest may be involved. In authority, one may be commanded to do something undesirable, but will do it anyway because one believes he should. Thus, the prison warden obeys the command to execute the prisoner sentenced to death. Everyone knows we can coerce others. We can use authority. And we can persuade, as too many forget. But what about power of love, perhaps one of the strongest and most prevalent social powers known? All experience it, our literature, poetry, and art manifest its many aspects, but few social scientists have given it scientific status as a power. Yet, when someone you love asks you to do something, you do so not because of persuasion or legitimacy or bargaining or coercion, but because your loved one asks. You want to do whatever helps the other; together you form a whole and whatever interests the other, interests yourself. Two selves are united into one so that an expressed interest--an "I want. Thus, the basis of love power is no other than love itself: It is no stimulation of a need alone, such as sex or security or protectiveness, no simple triggering of superego, no posing of alternative interest, no changing salience in an interest. It is simply love. Altruistic power is then a capability to use love to induce a person into doing something. Now, such power is not necessarily restricted to a person loved by the other. Indeed, such interests are a basic force in social relations that serve as the basis for reform movements, ideologies, politics, and conflict. The person who labors long for a welfare bill, who suffers through deprivations to promote communism, who gives up all he owns to be a missionary in Africa, who demonstrates against the Vietnam War, or who goes to prison to protest a bad law may act from altruism, a basic integrative feeling--a love--for humanity. This love, and not aggression, is one of the roots of mass conflict. It is because people want to do good that they sometimes fight others en masse, and not because they are selfish or evil. For now, however, I simply wish to point out that this love for others is a source of power. Those seeking power for themselves or their ideas can tap this love through a political formula: Whether it be freedom, equality, justice, a communist utopia, democracy, Christianity, Islam, the welfare state, a minimum wage, eliminating tax loopholes, or foreign aid, the formula promises to improve our lot. He who wields the formula then can affect the interest of those who share its vision. We do not exist simply to manifest our selves. We also live to help others. As Adler noted decades ago, our self-esteem, our drive for perfection and completion, is not wholly selfish and egoistic. In the healthy individual it is bound up with a social interest Adler, , with a goal of an ideal community, with a love that reaches out to unite with others. The one who controls the formula for achieving this has altruistic power. For to serve his own ends or satisfy his own vision, he can intentionally induce within others love-based interests. Indeed, what force can never do, what is beyond coercion, and what cannot be bartered away can be affected by love: Love, then, in the service of a higher cause or another person, is the seat of inductive interests: From where does this love come? One of our fundamental needs is protectiveness, the need to help others and protect them. But love is not just a need that is gratified and temporarily satiated. It involves the total self, the gestalt, structure, and process that combine the dynamic psychological field. It manifests itself through the reaching out, the integrating with another, the uniting of selves. It involves the total field. This makes love so fundamentally basic and so powerful, wholly capturing the life--the soul--of a person. A person in love cannot be distracted; a person working for humanity cannot be deflected. Social power, however, may be oriented to another self, invisibly. It may operate offstage, setting the lights, determining the scenery, and selecting the play. Power over perception is also an ingredient in social interaction. It is manifested by the person who does not tell another bad news, who employs symbols to project status e. Indeed, this power is developed to a high degree in the fine arts and theater, where the goal is to create a specific situation influencing the perception, interests, and emotions of viewers in a particular way. Then, of course, there is democratic politics, where the success of a politician and his policies depend in part on the image projected. Not only through manipulating the situation, but also through actual control over opportunities does one affect another. Parents may avoid sending their children to a particular school for fear of the kind of group they may encounter; provide them with piano and art lessons to broaden their opportunities; and send them to college to ensure their later

success. Administrators may set the rules of administrative appeal or hearings, which effectively load the dice in his favor. He who sets the rules has power over the process. Citizens may work to decrease the potentiality for fraud and bribery by new election campaign laws.

Chapter 3 : Power and Authority: Definition, Nature and Theory

*Love power and political interests: Towards a theory of patriarchy in contemporary western societies (Orebro studies) [Anna G. Jonasdottir] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

He taught and practiced law in Frankfurt before emigrating to the United States in , after several interim years in Switzerland and Spain. On moving to New York, Morgenthau separated from his wife, who remained in Chicago partly because of medical issues. He is reported to have twice tried to initiate plans to start a new relationship while in New York, once with the political philosopher Hannah Arendt , [9] and a second time with Ethel Person d. Morgenthau died on July 19, , shortly after being admitted to Lenox Hill Hospital in New York with a perforated ulcer. In an autobiographical essay written near the end of his life, Morgenthau related that,although he had looked forward to meeting Schmitt during a visit to Berlin, the meeting went badly and Morgenthau left thinking that he had been in the presence of in his own words , "the demonic". Foundations of a Theory of Norms. It has not been translated into English. Kelsen was among the strongest critics of Carl Schmitt. Kelsen and Morgenthau became lifelong colleagues even after both emigrated from Europe to take their respective academic positions in the United States. In , Morgenthau published a second book in French, La notion du "politique", which was translated into English and published in as The Concept of the Political. The questions driving the inquiry are: For Morgenthau, the end goal of any legal system in this context is to "ensure justice and peace. In Morgenthau set out a research program for legal functionalism in the article "Positivism, Functionalism, and International Law". This school of thought holds that nation-states are the main actors in international relations and that the main concern of the field is the study of power. Morgenthau emphasized the importance of "the national interest", and in Politics Among Nations he wrote that "the main signpost that helps political realism to find its way through the landscape of international politics is the concept of interest defined in terms of power. Starting with the second edition of Politics Among Nations, Morgenthau included a section in the opening chapter called "Six Principles of Political Realism". Political realism believes that politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature. Political realism avoids reinterpreting reality to fit the policy. A good foreign policy minimizes risks and maximizes benefits. Realism recognizes that the determining kind of interest varies depending on the political and cultural context in which foreign policy, not to be confused with a theory of international politics, is made. It does not give "interest defined as power" a meaning that is fixed once and for all. Political realism is aware of the moral significance of political action. It is also aware of the tension between the moral command and the requirements of successful political action. Realism maintains that universal moral principles must be filtered through the concrete circumstances of time and place, because they cannot be applied to the actions of states in their abstract universal formulation. Dissent on the Vietnam War[edit] Morgenthau was a consultant for the Kennedy administration from to Morgenthau was a strong supporter of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. When Johnson became President, Morgenthau became much more vocal in his dissent concerning American participation in the Vietnam war, [34] for which he was dismissed as a consultant to the Johnson administration in Aside from his writing of Politics Among Nations, Morgenthau continued with a prolific writing career and published the three volume collection of his writings in Morgenthau dedicated the book to Hans Kelsen , "who has taught us through his example how to speak Truth to Power. Servant or Master, was dedicated to his colleague Reinhold Niebuhr and published in Love and Power," where Morgenthau engaged some of the themes that Niebuhr and the theologian Paul Tillich were addressing. The number of book reviews he wrote approached nearly a hundred, and included almost three dozen book reviews for The New York Review of Books alone. The second phase of the discussion of his writings and contributions to the study of international politics and international law was between and the one hundred year commemoration of his birth that took place in The third phase of the reception of his writings is between the centenary commemoration and the present, which shows a vibrant discussion of his continuing influence. Schmitt had become a leading juristic voice for the rising National Socialist movement in Germany and Morgenthau came to see their positions as incommensurable. He wrote in this connection about Kissinger

and his role in the Nixon administration. Christoph Rohde published a biography of Morgenthau in , still available only in German. Bush Administration in the context of the Iraq war. University of Chicago Press. A Look Into the American Future ed. Co-published with a separate text by David Hein. The Concept of the Political ; orig. Morgenthau Page" at Google Sites.

Chapter 4 : Political Feasibility: Interests and Power - Oxford Handbooks

Get this from a library! Love power and political interests: towards a theory of patriarchy in contemporary western societies. [Anna G. JÃ³nasdÃ³ttir.].

Coercive control Coercive power is the application of negative influences. It includes the ability to demote or to withhold other rewards. The desire for valued rewards or the fear of having them withheld that ensures the obedience of those under power. Coercive power tends to be the most obvious but least effective form of power as it builds resentment and resistance from the people who experience it. Threats and punishment are common tools of coercion. Implying or threatening that someone will be fired, demoted, denied privileges, or given undesirable assignments â€" these are characteristics of using coercive power. Extensive use of coercive power is rarely appropriate in an organizational setting, and relying on these forms of power alone will result in a very cold, impoverished style of leadership. Andersen in "Close encounters: Power is a perception in a sense that some people can have objective power, but still have trouble influencing others. People who use power cues and act powerfully and proactively tend to be perceived as powerful by others. Power as a Relational Concept: Power exists in relationships. Partners in close and satisfying relationships often influence each other at different times in various arenas. Power as Resource Based: Power usually represents a struggle over resources. The more scarce and valued resources are, the more intense and protracted are power struggles. The scarcity hypothesis indicates that people have the most power when the resources they possess are hard to come by or are in high demand. The person with less to lose has greater power in the relationship. Dependence power indicates that those who are dependent on their relationship or partner are less powerful, especially if they know their partner is uncommitted and might leave them. According to interdependence theory, quality of alternatives refers to the types of relationships and opportunities people could have if they were not in their current relationship. The principle of least interest suggests that if a difference exists in the intensity of positive feelings between partners, the partner who feels the most positive is at a power disadvantage. Power as Enabling or Disabling: Power can be enabling or disabling. Research[citation needed] has been shown that people are more likely to have an enduring influence on others when they engage in dominant behavior that reflects social skill rather than intimidation. People who communicate through self-confidence and expressive, composed behavior tend to be successful in achieving their goals and maintaining good relationships. Power can be disabling when it leads to destructive patterns of communication. This can lead to the chilling effect where the less powerful person often hesitates to communicate dissatisfaction, and the demand withdrawal pattern which is when one person makes demands and the other becomes defensive and withdraws mawasha, Both effects have negative consequences for relational satisfaction. Power as a Prerogative: The prerogative principle states that the partner with more power can make and break the rules. Powerful people can violate norms, break relational rules, and manage interactions without as much penalty as powerless people. In addition, the more powerful person has the prerogative to manage both verbal and nonverbal interactions. They can initiate conversations, change topics, interrupt others, initiate touch, and end discussions more easily than less powerful people. See expressions of dominance. Rational choice framework[edit] Game theory , with its foundations in the Walrasian theory of rational choice , is increasingly used in various disciplines to help analyze power relationships. One rational choice definition of power is given by Keith Dowding in his book Power. In this setting we can differentiate between: This framework can be used to model a wide range of social interactions where actors have the ability to exert power over others. Cultural hegemony[edit] In the Marxist tradition, the Italian writer Antonio Gramsci elaborated the role of ideology in creating a cultural hegemony , which becomes a means of bolstering the power of capitalism and of the nation-state. The back end, the beast, represented the more classic, material image of power, power through coercion, through brute force, be it physical or economic. In Russia, this power was lacking, allowing for a revolution. However, in Western Europe, specifically in Italy , capitalism had succeeded in exercising consensual power, convincing the working classes that their interests were the same as those of capitalists. In this way revolution had been avoided. While Gramsci stresses the

significance of ideology in power structures, Marxist-feminist writers such as Michele Barrett stress the role of ideologies in extolling the virtues of family life. In wartime it is accepted that women perform masculine tasks, while after the war the roles are easily reversed. Therefore, according to Barrett, the destruction of capitalist economic relations is necessary but not sufficient for the liberation of women. He shows that power over an individual can be amplified by the presence of a group. Foucault[edit] For Michel Foucault , the real power will always rely on the ignorance of its agents. No single human, group nor single actor runs the dispositif machine or apparatus but power is dispersed through the apparatus as efficiently and silently as possible, ensuring its agents to do whatever is necessary. This milieu both artificial and natural appears as a target of intervention for power according to Foucault which is radically different from the previous notions on sovereignty, territory and disciplinary space inter woven into from a social and political relations which function as a species biological species. He writes, "A body is docile that may be subjected, used, transformed and improved. Instead of using corporeal punishment in order to convince people to adhere to the laws of the day, Foucault says power becomes internalized during this period. Instead of watching someone be drawn and quartered in a public space, political power is exerted on individuals in a way that compels them to obey laws and rules on their own - without this show of force. He builds on the ideas of Jeremy Bentham regarding the Panopticon in which prison inmates are compelled to behave and control themselves because they might be in the view of the prison guard. The physical shape of the Panopticon creates a situation in which the prison guard need not be present for this to happen, because the mere possibility of the presence of the guard compels the prisoners to behave. Foucault takes this theory and makes it generalize to everyday life. He claims that this kind of surveillance is constant in modern society, and the populous at large enacts it. She also cites diet, exercise, and skin care, among other processes, as sites in which the feminine body is made docile. Clegg[edit] Stewart Clegg proposes another three-dimensional model with his "circuits of power" [15] theory. This model likens the production and organizing of power to an electric circuit board consisting of three distinct interacting circuits: These circuits operate at three levels, two are macro and one is micro. The episodic circuit is the micro level and is constituted of irregular exercise of power as agents address feelings, communication, conflict, and resistance in day-to-day interrelations. The outcomes of the episodic circuit are both positive and negative. The dispositional circuit is constituted of macro level rules of practice and socially constructed meanings that inform member relations and legitimate authority. The facilitative circuit is constituted of macro level technology, environmental contingencies, job design, and networks, which empower or disempower and thus punish or reward, agency in the episodic circuit. All three independent circuits interact at "obligatory passage points" which are channels for empowerment or disempowerment. Galbraith[edit] JK Galbraith summarizes the types of power as being "condign" based on force , "compensatory" through the use of various resources or "conditioned" the result of persuasion , and their sources as "personality" individuals , "property" their material resources and "organizational" whoever sits at the top of an organisational power structure. Thus a political regime maintains power because people accept and obey its dictates, laws and policies. For Sharp, political power, the power of any state — regardless of its particular structural organization — ultimately derives from the subjects of the state. If subjects do not obey, leaders have no power. Rejecting instructive power is possible — rejecting destructive power is not. By using this distinction, proportions of power can be analyzed in a more sophisticated way, helping to sufficiently reflect on matters of responsibility. The theory analyzes the culture of the powerful. The powerful comprise those people in society with easy access to resources, those who can exercise power without considering their actions. The unmarked category can form the identifying mark of the powerful. The unmarked category becomes the standard against which to measure everything else. One can often overlook unmarked categories. Whiteness forms an unmarked category not commonly visible to the powerful, as they often fall within this category. The unmarked category becomes the norm, with the other categories relegated to deviant status. Social groups can apply this view of power to race, gender , and disability without modification: The thought of Friedrich Nietzsche underlies much 20th century analysis of power. Some schools of psychology , notably that associated with Alfred Adler , place power dynamics at the core of their theory where orthodox Freudians might place sexuality. Psychological research[edit] Recent experimental psychology suggests that the more power one has, the less one takes on the

perspective of others, implying that the powerful have less empathy. Adam Galinsky , along with several coauthors, found that when those who are reminded of their powerlessness are instructed to draw Es on their forehead, they are 3 times more likely to draw them such that they are legible to others than those who are reminded of their power. In one example, powerful people turned off an irritatingly close fan twice as much as less powerful people. Researchers have documented the bystander effect: Empathy gap "Power is defined as a possibility to influence others. Having power or not having power can cause a number of psychological consequences. It leads to strategic versus social responsibilities. It was concluded[by whom? Being strategic can also mean to defend when one is opposed or to hurt the decision-maker. These studies compared behavior done in different power given[clarification needed] situations. The recipient has no choice of rejecting the offer. The behavior observed was that the person offering the proposal would act less strategically than would the one offering in the ultimatum game. Self-serving also occurred and a lot of pro-social behavior was observed. Coercive power Abusive power and control or controlling behaviour or coercive control is the way that abusers gain and maintain power and control over a victim for an abusive purpose such as psychological , physical , sexual , or financial abuse. The abuse can be for various reasons such as personal gain, personal gratification , psychological projection , devaluation , envy or just for the sake of it as the abuser may simply enjoy exercising power and control. Controlling abusers may use multiple tactics to exert power and control over their victims. The tactics themselves are psychologically and sometimes physically abusive.

Chapter 5 : ' The Power of Love' not a political movie, says director - Entertainment - The Jakarta Post

Love Power and Political Interests: Towards a Theory of Patriarchy in Contemporary Western Societies Jónasdóttir, Anna G. Örebro University, School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences.

Definition, Nature and Theory Article shared by: Power and authority are perhaps the most vital aspects of all organisations in general and political organisations in particular. Power is related to taking of decisions and for the implementation of those decisions. No organisation, whatever may its nature be, can do its duty or achieve objectives without power. Robert Dahl in many of his works has defined power and analysed its various aspects. In his A Preface to Democratic Theory Dahl calls power a type of relationship in respect of capability and control. Take a very simple example. There are two men—A and B. If A possesses the capability to control B then it will be assumed that A has the power. So power involves a successful attempt to do something which he could not do otherwise. In any society there are diverse interests and all are alike. When there are conflicts among them one interest proceeds to dominate over the other and the interest which prevails upon the other the former may be called powerful interest. Karl Deutsch says that power means the ability to be involved in conflict, to resolve it and to remove the obstacles. Though Deutsch defines the concept in the background of international politics, its relevance to national politics is, however, undeniable. In domestic politics or pluralistic societies there are many competing groups and all struggle to capture power or to influence. The group which succeeds finally will be called powerful. Raphael Problems of Political Philosophy has analysed power from various aspects. He believes that generally power means the ability. Raphael is of opinion that the English word power is derived from these two words and naturally power may be used to mean ability and hence his definition of power is specific kind of ability. Let us quote him: Some political scientists want to mean that there is a special type of power which may be designated as political power. For example, Alan Ball feels that power may generally be used in political sense. Leslie Lipson The Great Issues of Politics thinks that power is nothing but the ability to achieve results through concerted action. Thus, power means the capacity to make decisions binding and ability to discharge responsibilities and perform certain functions. From the definitions of power noted above we can get certain features and the first such feature is it is used in relational sense. When there is only one actor or element the issue of power does not arise. It is because power implies ability to influence or control others or to get things done by others. Naturally power relates to the relationship or interaction between two or among more than two elements or actors. So power is always viewed in the background of relationship. In any pluralist society there are numerous groups and they all compete among themselves at various levels to capture political power or to influence the agencies who exercise their influence. Hence it is observed that power is not concentrated at any particular centre. Again, all the centres of power do claim to have equal or almost equal amount of power. In other words, there is an unequal distribution of power like an unequal distribution of wealth. Thirdly, in a class-society there are diverse interests and each power centre represents a particular interest. This point may further be explained. In any capitalist society there are several classes, both major and minor, and each class strives for the realisation of its own interests which are generally economic. But there may be political interests. However, the conflicts among the classes sometimes lead to the other conflicts and this is the general characteristic of capitalist society. But the advocates of the capitalist system argue that this conflict does not create an atmosphere of class struggle. There are processes of peaceful resolution of all conflicts. At least Talcott Parsons and many sociologists think so. According to these persons the capitalist system is so structured that the conflicts do not create any impasse. Fourthly, MacIver is of opinion that power is a conditional concept. Power, MacIver says, is an ability to command service from others. But this ability, he continues, depends in some measure upon certain conditions and if the conditions are not fulfilled properly power cannot function. Power is not something which is permanently fixed. It is subject to change and it has source. If the source dries up power generation or enhancement will stop. Again, mere existence of sources cannot cause the rise of power. The holder of power must have the ability to use or utilise the sources of power. All these conditions establish the fact that power is conditional. Fifthly, power used in political science

is a very complex notion. How it is used, what consequences it produces, how it is to be achieved-all are in real sense complex. No simple analysis can unearth the various aspects of power. Different people use different terms to denote power. Corporatist Theory of Power: Definition of Corporatist Theory: In recent years political scientists are taking and showing added interest about corporatist character of power. A corporatist theory denotes that in a capitalist society there are many classes and groups and an organic unity and class harmony among them are essential among them all and this is essential for the proper functioning of society as well as for its betterment. On experience it has been found that up to the Second World War pluralism was enormously encouraged because it was thought that through the competition society will get the scope of rapid development. But in the seventies of the last century the feeling traversed along a different path. Harmony and unity were stressed as key to power as well as to progress. Corporatist theory thus stresses that the diverse elements of society are to be unified into one body. This will form one corpus or the word Corporatism. Corporatism is nothing but the unification of various diverse elements of pluralist society into one body or corpus. The main purpose is to make a powerful organisation. Corporatist theory of power does not take pluralism as harmful for social progress, because pluralism invites competition and division and this finally weakens the society. Pluralism envisages division in interests and, at the, same time, keen competition among them. It also admits of independent existence of the interests. A recent analyst Schmitter defines corporatism in the following language: Corporatism is the specific political structure which typically performs the post-liberal advanced capitalist, organised democratic welfare state. The fact is that during the last few decades corporatism has advanced rapidly and it has become a salient feature of a capitalist society. The origin of corporatism can conveniently be traced to the strong urge for survival. The different business organisations and industries were fighting among themselves to keep their physical existence intact. But the unhealthy competition ultimately foiled their attempts. So the organisations decided to form a harmonious and unified corporation so that they can fight unitedly against all odds and evils. The organisation of the corporate body created a power centre in society. The corporate body began to influence the policy making and policy implementing functions of the state authority. Thus, in a capitalist society there are at least two and in many cases more than two centres of powerâ€"one is state and the other is corporate. Thus the most important aspect of corporatism is the existence of different centres of power should lead to any perceptible damage of capitalist system. Ralph Miliband has given us a very beautiful and vivid account of corporation or corporate body in advanced capitalist countries. With the advancement of capitalism the powers and importance of corporate bodies have increased at an unprecedented rate. The small and medium sized industries have failed to cope with the growing problems of economy. Miliband says, the advanced capitalism is synonymous with giant enterprise. It has been estimated by experts that in employment, investment, research, development, military activities, policy making the corporatism has been able to establish its overwhelmingly disproportionate importance. In fact, the corporate bodies are the chief or potential sources of power and authority and the situation has reached such a pass that the corporatism is in unrivalled position. Miliband concludes that there is every reason to believe that the giant enterprise or corporatism will accumulate more and more power and importance in the coming years and there is no agency in advanced capitalist country to halt its growth. Corporatism is controlling all the key centres of power in advanced capitalist states. Miliband is of opinion that this tendencyâ€"gargantuan nature of corporate bodyâ€"is inevitable. In capitalist society the domestic economy and politics cannot be thought of corporatism. Corporatism in International Field: The growing importance and increasing role of the corporate body are not confined within the national area of the state. Simultaneously the internationalization is on the advanced stage. The multinational corporations have intensified their functions in numerous forms in various developing countries of the Third World. This is quite unavoidable because the developing states require both investment and sophisticated technologies for rapid development and for these they are to depend on MNCs. The MNCs are not only controlling the economy and other elements of development but also the politics. The governments of the Third World states are practically forced to accept the terms and conditions of the corporate bodies and if they refuse that will result in the withdrawal of help. This tendency has become more and more pronounced in the age of globalisation. Many Third World states are inviting the big corporations of the industrialised nations to take the task of rapid

economic development.

Chapter 6 : Hans Morgenthau - Wikipedia

Anna G. Jónasdóttir is the author of Love power and political interests (avg rating, 3 ratings, 0 reviews, published), Why Women are Oppressed.

The Roots of the Realist Tradition 1. Most importantly, he asks whether relations among states to which power is crucial can also be guided by the norms of justice. His History of the Peloponnesian War is in fact neither a work of political philosophy nor a sustained theory of international relations. Much of this work, which presents a partial account of the armed conflict between Athens and Sparta that took place from to B. Nevertheless, if the History is described as the only acknowledged classical text in international relations, and if it inspires theorists from Hobbes to contemporary international relations scholars, this is because it is more than a chronicle of events, and a theoretical position can be extrapolated from it. Realism is expressed in the very first speech of the Athenians recorded in the Historyâ€"a speech given at the debate that took place in Sparta just before the war. Together these factors contribute to a conflict-based paradigm of international relations, in which the key actors are states, in which power and security become the main issues, and in which there is little place for morality. The set of premises concerning state actors, egoism, anarchy, power, security, and morality that define the realist tradition are all present in Thucydides. Realists view human beings as inherently egoistic and self-interested to the extent that self-interest overcomes moral principles. The lack of a common rule-making and enforcing authority means, they argue, that the international arena is essentially a self-help system. Each state is responsible for its own survival and is free to define its own interests and to pursue power. Anarchy thus leads to a situation in which power has the overriding role in shaping interstate relations. To attain security, states try to increase their power and engage in power-balancing for the purpose of deterring potential aggressors. Wars are fought to prevent competing nations from becoming militarily stronger. Thucydides, while distinguishing between the immediate and underlying causes of the Peloponnesian War, does not see its real cause in any of the particular events that immediately preceded its outbreak. He instead locates the cause of the war in the changing distribution of power between the two blocs of Greek city-states: According to him, the growth of Athenian power made the Spartans afraid for their security, and thus propelled them into war 1. This dialogue relates to the events of B. The Athenian envoys presented the Melians with a choice, destruction or surrender, and from the outset asked them not to appeal to justice, but to think only about their survival. Since such an authority above states does not exist, the Athenians argue that in this lawless condition of international anarchy, the only right is the right of the stronger to dominate the weaker. They explicitly equate right with might, and exclude considerations of justice from foreign affairs. Political realism is usually contrasted by IR scholars with idealism or liberalism, a theoretical perspective that emphasizes international norms, interdependence among states, and international cooperation. Can international politics be based on a moral order derived from the principles of justice, or will it forever remain the arena of conflicting national interests and power? For the Melians, who employ idealistic arguments, the choice is between war and subjection 5. They are courageous and love their country. They do not wish to lose their freedom, and in spite of the fact that they are militarily weaker than the Athenians, they are prepared to defend themselves 5. They base their arguments on an appeal to justice, which they associate with fairness, and regard the Athenians as unjust 5. They are pious, believing that gods will support their just cause and compensate for their weakness, and trust in alliances, thinking that their allies, the Spartans, who are also related to them, will help them 5. Hence, one can identify in the speech of the Melians elements of the idealistic or liberal world view: What the Melians nevertheless lack are resources and foresight. In their decision to defend themselves, they are guided more by their hopes than by the evidence at hand or by prudent calculations. The Athenian argument is based on key realist concepts such as security and power, and is informed not by what the world should be, but by what it is. The Athenians disregard any moral talk and urge the Melians to look at the factsâ€"that is, to recognize their military inferiority, to consider the potential consequences of their decision, and to think about their own survival 5. There appears to be a powerful realist logic behind the Athenian arguments. Their position, based on security concerns and self-interest, seemingly

involves reliance on rationality, intelligence, and foresight. However, upon close examination, their logic proves to be seriously flawed. Melos, a relatively weak state, does not pose any real security threat to them. The eventual destruction of Melos does not change the course of the Peloponnesian War, which Athens will lose a few years later. In the History, Thucydides shows that power, if it is unrestrained by moderation and a sense of justice, brings about the uncontrolled desire for more power. There are no logical limits to the size of an empire. Drunk with the prospect of glory and gain, after conquering Melos, the Athenians engage in a war against Sicily. They pay no attention to the Melian argument that considerations of justice are useful to all in the longer run 5. And, as the Athenians overestimate their strength and in the end lose the war, their self-interested logic proves to be very shortsighted indeed. It is utopian to ignore the reality of power in international relations, but it is equally blind to rely on power alone. Thucydides appears to support neither the naive idealism of the Melians nor the cynicism of their Athenian opponents. Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero were all political idealists who believed that there were some universal moral values on which political life could be based. Building on the work of his predecessors, Cicero developed the idea of a natural moral law that was applicable to both domestic and international politics. His ideas concerning righteousness in war were carried further in the writings of the Christian thinkers St. Machiavelli â€" challenged this well-established moral tradition, thus positioning himself as a political innovator. The novelty of his approach lies in his critique of classical Western political thought as unrealistic, and in his separation of politics from ethics. He thereby lays the foundations for modern politics. It represents the sum of the practical conditions that he believes are required to make both the individual and the country prosperous and strong. Machiavellianism is a radical type of political realism that is applied to both domestic and international affairs. It is a doctrine which denies the relevance of morality in politics, and claims that all means moral and immoral are justified to achieve certain political ends. He operated within the single framework of traditional morality. It became a specific task of his nineteenth-century followers to develop the doctrine of a double ethics: Thus he overturned the traditional morality. Referring to Machiavelli, Heinrich von Treitschke declared that the state was power, precisely in order to assert itself as against other equally independent powers, and that the supreme moral duty of the state was to foster this power. He considered international agreements to be binding only insofar as it was expedient for the state. The idea of an autonomous ethics of state behavior and the concept of realpolitik were thus introduced. These concepts, along with the belief in the superiority of Germanic culture, served as weapons with which German statesmen, from the eighteenth century to the end of the Second World War, justified their policies of conquest and extermination. Machiavelli is often praised for his prudential advice to leaders which has caused him to be regarded as a founding master of modern political strategy and for his defense of the republican form of government. There are certainly many aspects of his thought that merit such praise. Nevertheless, it is also possible to see him as the thinker who bears foremost responsibility for the demoralization of Europe. However, before Machiavelli, this amoral or immoral mode of thinking had never prevailed in the mainstream of Western political thought. It was the force and timeliness of his justification of resorting to evil as a legitimate means of achieving political ends that persuaded so many of the thinkers and political practitioners who followed him. The effects of Machiavellian ideas, such as the notion that the employment of all possible means was permissible in war, would be seen on the battlefields of modern Europe, as mass citizen armies fought against each other to the bitter end without regard for the rules of justice. The tension between expediency and morality lost its validity in the sphere of politics. The concept of a double ethics, private and public, that created a further damage to traditional, customary ethics was invented. Perhaps the greatest problem with realism in international relations is that it has a tendency to slip into its extreme version, which accepts any policy that can benefit the state at the expense of other states, no matter how morally problematic the policy is. According to classical political philosophy, on which the idealist perspective is based, human beings can control their desires through reason and can work for the benefit of others, even at the expense of their own benefit. They are thus both rational and moral agents, capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, and of making moral choices. They are also naturally social. With great skill Hobbes attacks these views. They therefore inevitably struggle for power. In setting out such ideas, Hobbes contributes to some of the basic conceptions fundamental to the realist tradition in international

relations, and especially to neorealism. These include the characterization of human nature as egoistic, the concept of international anarchy, and the view that politics, rooted in the struggle for power, can be rationalized and studied scientifically. He derives his notion of the state of war from his views of both human nature and the condition in which individuals exist. Anyone may at any time use force, and all must constantly be ready to counter such force with force. Being suspicious of one another and driven by fear, they are also likely to engage in preemptive actions and invade one another to ensure their own safety. Finally, individuals are also driven by pride and a desire for glory. Hobbes is primarily concerned with the relationship between individuals and the state, and his comments about relations among states are scarce. Nevertheless, what he says about the lives of individuals in the state of nature can also be interpreted as a description of how states exist in relation to one another. Accordingly, the quest and struggle for power lies at the core of the Hobbesian vision of relations among states. The same would later be true of the model of international relations developed by Hans Morgenthau, who was deeply influenced by Hobbes and adopted the same view of human nature. By subjecting themselves to a sovereign, individuals escape the war of all against all which Hobbes associates with the state of nature; however, this war continues to dominate relations among states. This does not mean that states are always fighting, but rather that they have a disposition to fight XIII 8. With each state deciding for itself whether or not to use force, war may break out at any time. The achievement of domestic security through the creation of a state is then paralleled by a condition of inter-state insecurity. One can argue that if Hobbes were fully consistent, he would agree with the notion that, to escape this condition, states should also enter into a contract and submit themselves to a world sovereign. He does not propose that a social contract among nations be implemented to bring international anarchy to an end. This is because the condition of insecurity in which states are placed does not necessarily lead to insecurity for their citizens. As long as an armed conflict or other type of hostility between states does not actually break out, individuals within a state can feel relatively secure. His theory of international relations, which assumes that independent states, like independent individuals, are enemies by nature, asocial and selfish, and that there is no moral limitation on their behavior, is a great challenge to the idealist political vision based on human sociability and to the concept of the international jurisprudence that is built on this vision. However, what separates Hobbes from Machiavelli and associates him more with classical realism is his insistence on the defensive character of foreign policy. His political theory does not put forward the invitation to do whatever may be advantageous for the state. His approach to international relations is prudential and pacific: By suggesting that certain dictates of reason apply even in the state of nature, he affirms that more peaceful and cooperative international relations are possible. Neither does he deny the existence of international law.

Chapter 7 : Anna G. Jónasdóttir (Author of Love power and political interests)

Love power and political interests: towards a theory of patriarchy in contemporary western societies.

Chapter 8 : Leveraging Power and Politics

6 Interests, Conflict, and Power Organizations as Political Systems I live in a democratic society. Why should I have to obey the orders of my boss.

Chapter 9 : SOCIAL POWER: COERCION, AUTHORITATIVE, BARGAINING, INTELLECTUAL, ALTRUIST

Return to Article Details Anna Jonasdottir: Love Power and Political Interests. Ãˆrebro studies 7: HÃ¸gskolan i Ãˆrebro, , pp. Download Download PDF.