THE PHENOMENON OF POWER IN THE CONCEPTS OF ARISTOTLE AND PLATO

¹Malik Galym, ²Abeuova Shuga
¹galym19888@gmail.com, ²shu.tan@mail.ru
¹Egyptian University of Islamic Culture Nur-Mubarak (Almaty, Kazakhstan)
²Abay Kazakh National Pedagogical University (Almaty, Kazakhstan)

¹Мәлік Галым, ²Әбеуова Шұға Құрманәліқызы
¹galym19888@gmail.com, ²shu.tan@mail.ru
*¹Нұр-Мүбарак Египет ислам мәдениеті университеті
(Алматы, Қазақстан)*
*²Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті
(Алматы, Қазақстан)*

Abstract. The article examines the problem of managing society according to the principle of «the power of the best» in the system of socio-philosophical views of Plato and Aristotle. The main definitions of this concept in the political theories of prominent thinkers of antiquity are shown.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the views of ancient philosophers on the problem of the social avant-garde. This problem in ancient philosophy is represented, first of all, by the works of two of its most prominent representatives: Plato and Aristotle. Both thinkers did not use the concept of «social avant-garde», and the advanced part of society, which played a leading role in its development, was designated by them by the term «the best people». Understanding the role of the best people in the structure of the state and power occupies one of the central places in Plato's philosophical system. Plato calls the best people philosophers. It is the philosophers, according to Plato, who should have a leading role in the state. Highlighting the main features inherent in philosophers, Plato proceeds from reasoning about the three basic principles of the human soul: reasonable, unreasonable (desiring) and rage of the spirit (anger). These principles, according to the philosopher, are inherent

Keywords: Power, the phenomenon of power, Plato, Aristotle, aristocracy.

Introduction

The question of power has roots that go back to the depths of time. The history of understanding the phenomenon of interest to us is complex and peculiar. Even ancient authors debated the meaning of power and the forms of its manifestation. The first attempts to comprehend the essence of power belong to ancient philosophers.

In the first millennium B.C., as social production developed, leading to a true leap in spiritual culture, humanity made its first steps toward rational self-knowledge. Initially, the ancient thinkers only fixed the existing socio-political system, without thinking about changing it. Then some of them began to reflect on the imperfections of the socio-political system and suggest ways to improve it. Basically, their ideas boiled down to the moral education of rulers and subjects, so that the policy would be based on moral norms. The theoretical search for an «ideal government» began.

The political philosophy of ancient Greece is rightfully considered to be the pinnacle of political thought in the ancient world. It originally developed as the ideology of free people, so its main value is freedom. Initially, the Greeks (Hellenes) also had mythological ideas about politics, but by the 6th-vth centuries B.C., they had been superseded by philosophical methods of knowledge and rationalistic approaches. Plato (424/423-348/347 B.C.) and Aristotle (384-322 B.C.), not satisfied with these ideas, were the first to consider the problem of the relationship between the social sphere and politics, for the first time proposing social transformation as a means to improve politics.

The political ideas of Plato and Aristotle had a defining influence on the entire subsequent development of political theory and practice. In reflecting on the happy life that man deserves, they linked its attainment to the construction of an ideal state. It was there that all faults and vices would be overcome, for they regarded the state as «the perfect form of life. However, Plato and Aristotle had different ideas about how to achieve this happy life and which forms of government were most suitable for this purpose.

The question of the driving forces of social development is one of the central places in social philosophical research. This question acquires a special urgency today, when Kazakh society is painfully recovering from a deep social, economic, political and spiritual crisis of the 1990s. The determination of ways out of the crisis is closely connected with the search for an answer to the question: who should play the leading role in developing society, setting its moral and spiritual guidelines, determining the vector of political course, providing conditions for maintaining and reproducing social life. In other words, one of the most urgent tasks of social philosophy is to study the mechanisms of formation of the social vanguard, its essence, institutional design and role in the development of society. The solution to this problem is a prerequisite for a comprehensive study of the problem of the driving forces of social development, since historical progress in any era is associated with the activity of the social vanguard - the most advanced part of society, capable of correctly understanding the tasks facing the country and adequately implementing them on the basis of national traditions and values. The role of the social vanguard in the development of society has been analyzed even in the most ancient philosophical works, the authors of which largely proceeded from the practice of developing modern societies and states.

Research Methodology

The methodological basis of the work consists in synthesis of philosophical system-structural method and dialectical principle of unity of historical and logical with historical-comparative, problem-chronological and analytical methods of scientific research and presentation of the material in the framework of theoretical developments of positivism. This approach allows us to objectively identify and reveal the fundamental ideas about power of Aristotle and Plato and their influence on the further dynamics of political thought in the context of its main problems and state practice of different countries of the world.

Plato and Aristotle on Power and the State

In ancient Greek philosophy the «ruling» is the corporeal basis of the world: «The ancient corporeal worldview, which gave birth to Natural Philosophy, could not help perceiving power as something material. Already in the boundless and formless it manifested itself as a defining beginning» [1]. Moreover, the first philosophers regarded the power beginning as a property of the prime mover, which is both the substratum and the law of the cosmos. «Fusis» acts as a defining condition, it dominates, manifesting itself as «ruling». Power thus reveals the inherent hierarchy of being.

Aristotle, who became one of the brightest founders of Western intellectual culture, paid close attention to the problem of power. «Aristotle characterizes power as a property (belonging) of any complex system. Everything that consists of several parts has a ruling element and a subordinate element, such is the «general law of nature. In Aristotle, power plays the role of an active form, transforming passive matter into real objects. In social life, power ensures the organization of joint activity and stabilizes relations in the social system [2].

The ancient philosopher attempted to differentiate this phenomenon by separating it from similar forms of interaction. According to Stagyrite, power is distinguished from «possession. This distinction follows from the idea of self-sufficient knowledge: «this science is the only free science, for it alone exists for its own sake» [3]. Power is at its fullest in the realm of the divided, of the singular, where there is a «being political.

«With the disintegration of the sciences», writes researcher I.A. Isaev, «prepared by the Aristotelian intellectual revolution, most of the «ruling» turns out to be human attributes. The very «Fusis» disintegrates into incompatible concepts: nature as a special sphere of being and cognition and nature as the essence of things, their inner law» [1, p. 15].

In the doctrine of Stagyrite the question of power is posed in terms of the dichotomy of domination and subordination. The thinker believes that such relations not only have the right to exist, but are also necessary for the life of the human community: «...for mutual self-preservation it is necessary to unite in pairs

a being, by virtue of its nature ruling, and a being, by virtue of its nature subordinated. The first, thanks to its mental properties, is capable of seeing, and therefore it is already by nature a ruling and mastering being; the second, since it is only capable of carrying out the received instructions by its physical powers, is a being subservient and slave. Therefore, both the master and the slave benefit from the same thing» [4]. It follows that «power» is seen as something of a sacral, mystical nature, since the possibility of standing at the top of the hierarchical ladder is given «from above», primordially, «by nature».

However, Aristotle considers the positions of the dominant or subordinate to be largely properties determined by «nature», its laws. The philosopher tends to think that there is an inherent predisposition to «domination» or «subordination.

«Unification» is the main task of man, first of all, in order to survive: «... man is a social creature to a greater extent than bees and all kinds of herd animals...» [4, p. 379]. Thus, in full measure the question of power arises in the human community, which must exist and must have a hierarchical structure with established subordination.

In Aristotle, the relations of domination and subordination, of the dominant and the subordinate, are constructed in different perspectives, depending on the sphere of their realization. These can be relations of a slave-holding character, where there is a «speaking instrument» and its master; relations of kinship, where the ties of husband and wife, «father and children» are distinguished; in the sphere of state administration - «the subject of power and the subject of subordination». The philosopher draws attention to the fact that «...the power of the master and the power of the state husband, as well as all kinds of power, are not identical... One is power over the free by nature, the other is power over slaves. The power of the lord in the family is monarchy (for every family is ruled by its lord monarchically), while the power of the husband of state is power over the free and equal» [4, p. 386]. In general, the philosopher distinguishes two kinds of power: «the power of the master» and «the power of the state».

But can «power over slaves» be seen as a full-fledged manifestation of the phenomenon of power? Modern authors, such as T. Parsons, H. Arendt, N. Luhmann, for example, connect power with the potency of freedom: «Power becomes more powerful if it is able to gain acceptance for its decisions in the presence of attractive alternatives of action or inaction. With increasing freedoms of subordinates it only becomes stronger» [5].

«Power over the other is a natural extension of power over oneself... In power over oneself the ancient tradition saw the power of the higher, rational part of the soul over the lower part...» [6]. Aristotle, like many ancient Greek philosophers and their followers, presents man as a combination of spiritual and bodily substances: «A living being consists first of soul and body; of them one is by nature the ruling origin, the other is the subordinate origin» [7]. As a consequence, we can also distinguish the dichotomy of passion and reason, where the priority of one over the other determines human life and activity. F.H. Cassidy in his intro-

ductory article to Stagyrite's Ethics («Nicomachean Ethics», «The Grand Ethics») writes that «Aristotle, in essence, was also in solidarity with Plato on the question of the necessity of mind dominating over the sensual desires and lusts of man» [7, p. 142]. The concept of «dominant reason» consolidates the Western metaphysical tradition, which determined the further way of considering being as a logically arranged substance.

The question arises about the possibility to consider the relation between a person and a thing as a relation of domination and subordination. F.V. Asmus believes that «...for Aristotle as a theorist of ancient slave-holding society it is very typical that he looks at wealth exclusively from the consumer point of view of a slave-owner. For him to be rich means to use rather than to possess: wealth is the real realization of possession, or the use of what constitutes property» [7, p. 101]. Ultimately, possession occupies a different niche than power and power relations.

Aristotle considers the question of the best people and their role in the life of society mainly in connection with the analysis of the aristocratic form of government. The «power of the best» (aristokratias), according to Aristotle, is the ideal form of government. The philosopher considers the possession of virtue to be the main quality inherent in the best people. In turn, by virtue Aristotle meant readiness to unswervingly follow the task of preserving and maintaining the foundations of the state system. In the philosopher's opinion, only those citizens are virtuous whose activity is aimed at «saving the communication they constitute, and this communication is the state system» [2, p. 376]. Exploring different types of virtue, Aristotle singles out the main virtue inherent in the powers that be, and consequently in the best people. This virtue is prudence. «Prudence is the only distinguishing virtue of a ruler. The other virtues seem to be the necessary common property of both subordinates and rulers [2, p. 452].

Aristotle formulated his socio-philosophical views on the basis of his study of the political arrangements of modern polities. Among them, he singles out special political arrangements based on the principle of «the power of the best», which are collectivist in essence. The great thinker, of course, does not yet use the concept of «collectivism», but pro forms a definition of its essence in the idea of the state (society) as a collective reality preceding the private, individual reality: «The whole must precede the part... the state exists by nature and by nature precedes every person» [2, p. 252]. «...Nor should we think, moreover, as if each citizen were his own person; no, all citizens belong to the state because each of them is a particle of the state. And care for each particle must naturally have in mind the care of the whole [2, p. 254]. Aristotle reveals the standards of naturalness corresponding to the principles of collectivism and the «power of the best» - the perfection of social relations and virtue. According to the thought of the great philosopher, the good of society is a consequence of the virtuous (perfect) life of all its citizens participating in government: «The virtue of the state is reflected in the fact that the citizens participating in government are virtuous; in our state all citizens participate in government» [2, p. 242]. Stagyritus explored the standard of perfection of social rela-

tions in the concept of «one final goal» of the people, expressed in the achievement by society of «virtue», «the best life», and the arrangement of a «virtuous state». «Who, at last, evaluates one man according to his inherent virtue, will consider a more virtuous state to be happy» [2, p. 221]. «So, it is clear that the best life for each person individually and for the state as a whole must be the same» [2, p. 225].

The optimal realization of the principle of «the power of the best» is possible under three forms of government - monarchy, aristocracy and the people's government («polity»). The establishment of these forms of government is based on the idea of implementing the concept of governing society, reflecting the collectivist specificity of its life. Aristotle presents the concept of governance in the concepts of «state system» and «state structure». According to his thought, the main goal of implementing the principle of «the power of the best» is «the good life». The latter is possible only when the structure of the state corresponds to the specifics of society and is, therefore, adequate to it: «... It is necessary to try to introduce such a state structure which under the given circumstances would be the most easily acceptable and flexible...» [2, p. 131]. According to Aristotle, «The State is established not only in order to live, but mainly in order to live happily, otherwise a State consisting of slaves and animals should also be admitted, which does not really exist, as neither of them constitutes a society seeking the well-being of all and organizing life as it sees fit [2, p. 108]. With ingenious perspicacity Aristotle establishes the direct dependence of the successful development of the state on the correctly chosen goal and strategy of national development, which must be based on the principle of «the power of the best»: «Now we must talk about the state system itself: which and what quality of components must comprise the state which wishes to become a happy state and to have a beautiful organization. The good in all circumstances depends on the observance of two conditions: one of them is the right establishment of the task and final aim of all kinds of activity; the second is the discovery of all kinds of means leading to the final aim [3, p. 240]. Aristotle theorizes a complete picture of the «good life» of the state, relying on the standard of mutual adequacy of the state (with its managerial strategy) and society (civilizational and cultural element). The basis of this adequacy is the imperative of the «good life» based on virtue.

At the same time, the great philosopher envisages two possible variants of the dead-end state development, related primarily to the notion of inadequacy: the first is the inadequacy of the correctly chosen goal, the strategy of national development to the concrete political tactics of the latter realization, which, ultimately, is determined by the inadequacy of specific representatives of the authorities to their status (the authorities are not «best people», social vanguard, but demagogues from politics, representing social elite) and also inadequacy of the correctly chosen goal the form of law.

The second option is inadequacy of the chosen goal and development strategy («the goal itself is poorly set») to the type of society, even in the presence of talented leaders: «It may happen that both of these requirements contradict each other,

and it may happen that they coincide, because sometimes the goal is perfectly defined, but mistakes are made in the means leading to its achievement: at other times there are all means leading to the goal, but the goal itself is poorly set» [2, p. 240]. According to Aristotle, the errors associated with the above-described variants of inadequacy are comparable to medical errors in the sense that a representative of the social vanguard must be fully aware of which form of government, type of state, and political strategy correspond to the healthy, that is, the natural state of a given society, just as a doctor must be aware of the criteria of human health.

Politicians often do not understand the civilizational and cultural tradition of their society - just as «...doctors sometimes do not imagine clearly enough in what should be expressed the healthy state of the human body, and do not find the actual means to achieve the goal before them» [2, p. 240]. The great thinker speaks of the vital need to build people's lives in accordance with the standard of adequacy of the type of state to the type of society.

The second aspect of adequacy (epistemological) is justified in the following statement of the great philosopher: «If the ultimate aim of all sciences and arts is the good, then the highest good is the primary aim of the most important of all sciences and arts, namely politics. ...» [2, p. 114]. Here Aristotle substantiates the main goal of socio-philosophical studies of the state and society, established within the framework of the dialectical project of science, as the theoretical development of the perfect model of their life organization. Aristotle believes that the main aim of research in this field is to establish the standard of adequacy of the type of State to the type of society: «Hence it is clear that the subject of this kind of science is also research of the best kind of state structure, what kind, what must be its properties so that it would be most desirable in the absence of any external obstacles, and further, for whom what kind suits most (it would be impossible for many states to reach the best kind, so that a good legislator and true lawmakers would be able to achieve the best kind) [7, p. 376]. Establishing the gnoseological aspect of adequacy (i.e. defining the project of science within the framework of which it is necessary to make a research comparison of the state structure of society life), Aristotle theorizes an essentially dialectical research strategy in this sphere. According to the idea of the unity of the beginnings of the moral, aesthetic, axiological orders, existing within the dialectical project of science, Aristotle asserts the fundamental interconnection between «the good life», «the best order» and «virtue» (the dialectical unity of truth, good and beauty).

Thus, power extends into all areas of human activity. The pattern of power interrelationship is inherent in any way of organizing human communication. A person who «is not capable of communicating or, considering himself a self-sufficient being, feels no need for anything, no longer constitutes an element of the state, becoming either an animal or a deity» falls out of the zone of power coverage [7, p. 379]. Let us pay attention to the concept of «state» which the thinker uses in the above-mentioned statement. For Aristotle, it is the highest form of human coexistence. It expresses the integrity of being, the cosmos as an order, where the singular

can exist in full measure only in connection with the universal. In the state man finds his «completion. «The state system is an order in the field of offices; under it all parts find their place either on the basis of the properties inherent in them, or by virtue of some rule conditioning their equality from a common point of view» [4, p. 490]. However, it is inherent in people «to form pairs, not states» [7, p. 224]. Aristotle adds, hinting that the whole does not override the part, the singular, the individual, etc. «...The state cannot by nature be to such an extent unified as some demand» [4, p. 405].

Power relations are an important element in the organization of the human community: «There are many kinds of rulers and subordinates, and the higher the subordinates stand, the more perfect the power itself is over them; so, for example, power over man is more perfect than power over an animal [4, p. 382].

Power represents the most effective way to control social «elements», and thus it has a positive aspect. However, for contemporary poststructuralist philosophers, this aspect of the power structure is, in contrast, negative. A positive aspect is the power's ability to immerse itself in the thoughts of the individual in an attempt to control his inner, spiritual life, which gives impetus, according to M. Foucault, to the development of subjectivity. As a consequence, the individual gets the opportunity to create his own discourse, which criticizes society's paradigmatic attitudes. Aristotle also saw the negative sides of power, which are formed on the basis of the distorted nature of power relations and the improper application of their levers. For example, tyranny, oligarchy and democracy are broadly interpreted by the philosopher as deviations, distortions in relation to the correct forms of government, such as royalty, aristocracy and police. What distinguishes them from the good ways of government is, first of all, their orientation not to «law» but to the will of the «powers that be. The administration of the state should not be carried out «according to the arbitrary will of the ruler. And «the law», Stagirite points out, «must rule over everything» [4, p. 497]. It represents a method of maintaining the ideal, the beautiful. The observance of law serves as a guarantee of a dignified life of the individual and of the community as a whole. Thus, law is the essence of the universal course of things, the interrelationship of all phenomena of the cosmos, in fact a manifestation of the cosmos itself. «No free man voluntarily endures this kind of authority» [4, p. 506], which is based on lawlessness and the arbitrariness of rulers. This is due to the disruption of order, where the elements have lost their place in the hierarchical structure of being. Naturally, the philosopher discovers a number of reasons affecting the preservation of primordial, natural-normal forms of government. Following the Greek tradition, he introduces the concept of virtue as a factor determining the normal functioning of the institution of power. The possessor of a ruling principle must command a number of virtues, for he risks not being a good ruler. The most important virtue for a «sovereign» is «prudence. The others seem to be the necessary common property of both subordinates and rulers; the subordinate has nothing to demand prudence as a virtue, but only correct judgment [4, p. 452]. Hegel, analyzing Aristotle's ethical ideas, wrote that «...

the subject must at the same time subordinate his passions to the universal, and this unity, in which reason is predominant, is precisely virtue» [8]. In Diogenes of Laertes the position of Aristotle is as follows: «He did not consider the virtues to be interdependent, for man may be both reasonable and just, and at the same time exuberant and without power over himself. The wise man, he said, is not free from his passions, but is temperate in his passions» [9].

As mentioned above, for Aristotle the relations of domination and subordination belong to the sphere of human communication. The human being is considered by the Stagirite as a «political being», i.e. existing only within the framework of the polis-state. Relations between people are necessarily built in the aspects of hierarchy and subordination, which is the pledge of the most «favorable» variant of interpersonal and group relations. However, power is not an end in itself, but a way of achieving the necessary balance in the human community, in the Cosmos as such. Furthermore, the Attic worldview is aesthetically oriented. The beautiful is a good, indispensable and unchangeable. Therefore, a universal order must be preserved, of which the human community, including various groups of people and forms of their interrelationship, is also a part. In this case, power acts as a formative principle, a formal cause. There must be regularity in being, and power can provide it. The importance of Aristotle's work for understanding the phenomenon of power is great. The philosopher revealed its multilevel and diverse structure, determining further ways of consideration in line with the tradition that formed the statist thinking, which presents the state and power as necessary forms of human dwelling. In this way, the idea of the dominance of law over momentary aspirations formed the basis of modern Western civilization, oriented toward liberal values. The Aristotelian interpretation of power also provides the foundation for positive teachings about the state and society, where power is a means of achieving the common good. The application of this philosopher's concept is not fully possible, as political, social and cultural conditions have changed in general. «Antique thinkers, unlike modern researchers, did not go into a detailed analysis of the concept of power, taking for granted that key terms like «power», «influence», «authority», «rule» do not need elaboration, since the meaning of these words is clear to people with common sense» [2, p. 25]. In addition, ancient «power» has form and boundaries, while modern «power» is diffuse, dispersed in the social space.

In antiquity, power as such does not become a topic, the need for a special clarification of its meaning is not awakened, while other concepts («justice», «virtue») attract the close attention of Socrates and his successors, the concept of power does not fall into this circle, its content seems clear in itself without a special study. The problem of power is discussed in the context of the practically oriented problem of the state of affairs in the state (polis). History has, after two thousand years, delivered the most important points of view, first of all the teachings of Plato. Plato created the first and great concept of society, which later became a common criticism - especially after Karl Popper's The Open Society. However, we should emphasize what Popper tends to ignore: the greatness of any philosopher is mani-

fested primarily in the ability to pose a problem and only in the second (if not the tenth) place - in the ability to suggest concrete ways of solving it. Plato's doctrine of the state should not be viewed through the spectacles of everyday pragmatism: «can this be applied in practice?» Plato, moving on to the topic of the state itself in The State, from the very beginning raises the question that defines the entire consideration later on. This question is: What is the purpose for which the state is created (exists)? What condition must first and foremost always be met, what criterion must invariably be met by those who undertake to establish social order? This question is not posed for abstract reasons, just to begin with. It is the quintessence of the preceding, introductory discussion. Plato, as we know, is an idealist, but he is by no means «detached from reality»; he is well aware of how things are in the «real» world and how «real» people reason [10].

It is against this «realist» obviousness that the idealist Plato does not hesitate to speak «alone in the field. He is convinced that the social order exists not for a chosen part, but for the whole («all estates must be allowed to have their share in the common prosperity»). Even if this is not usually the case in practice, this should not be the case - and such a must is more important than any «reality given in the senses. Plato stands firmly on the original Parmenidesian positions that created philosophy itself and European theoretical thinking in general: what people usually regard as reality is only visibility, and what people usually regard as visibility is true reality (being).

But how to accomplish the task of making the state «happy, but not in any particular part of it, not so that only some people in it would be happy, but so that it would be happy as a whole»? [11]. The solution proposed by Plato is really unfortunate. Here it is not the place to dissect the famous caste system of the «State» and to seek the reasons of its failure. But it is fundamentally important to note that the failure of Plato's solution is not at all a decisive argument in favor of the opposite position. It should be clear that the other position is invariably the position of Thrasymachus! This includes the position of Karl Popper, the notorious freedom fighter. This is why Popper promotes «social technologies» of gradual improvement, because he wants to evade the fundamental question: «who will win?» for whom, in fact, does the proposed order open to continuous improvement exist? Whose interests does it really reflect? That abstract majority, whose situation will hypothetically be infinitely and little by little improved through «social engineering»? Or, nevertheless, that concrete minority, whose situation in the «open society» is already in principle better than that of the others and does not require qualitative improvement? Doesn't it come out that «freedom» serves simply as a slogan, for the moment «acceptable to the strongest» (Thrasymachus), because it allows him to rule? To summarize: Plato clearly formulated as fundamental to all social problems the question of the goal of social unity («the goal of the state»). To answer the question is to make a choice between two alternative possibilities. In the first, the order is created directly in the expectation of ensuring for all parts of the social whole the greatest prosperity (which does not mean the same position).

In the second solution, the order is created in such a way as to maximize the good of a certain part, making the other parts servile, subordinate, usable. We consider this formulation of the question by Plato to be a direct entry into the very center of the problem of power; it must ultimately prove decisive for understanding this phenomenon.

Thus, Plato's classification of improper polities also reflects the degree to which the state fulfills its other most important function: to maintain the integrity and unity of society. From this point of view, thymocracy is the best of the existing non-ideal types of state. There they «honor the rulers», organize joint meals, there the higher classes are not affected by the spirit of profit, in many respects tradition-al upbringing is preserved. Oligarchy also turns out to be second among improper state structures. It already fully manifests the most important vice caused by the in-troduction of the property census - the division and confrontation between the rich and the poor: «Such a state will inevitably not be united, but it will have two states: one state of the poor, the other of the rich. Although they will inhabit the same ter-rain, they will forever be plotting against each other [10, p. 235]. The next stage of disintegration is democracy. With the paralysis of the state, which is characteristic of this system, everyone is his own master and no one cares about the interests of the whole. Society in democracy is already divided into three struggling parts: persons, so to say, free professions or, according to Plato's terminology, drones, the rich and the people. The worst kind of state system is tyranny. Here the state is transformed into its opposite, morality is trampled, venality and suspicion are cultivated, a war of all against all.

Drawing a parallel between the individual and the whole state, Plato empha-sizes that in man the irrational, emotional-sensual, desiring beginning must be sub-ordinated to the rational beginning. Only in this way is it possible to achieve inner harmony in man. Likewise, in an ideal state, Plato believes, people should not, for the sake of their desires or emotions, resist the power of rational and virtuous peo-ple, but, on the contrary, should submit to this power in every possible way. «The faculty of reasoning is fit to dominate, because wisdom and the care of the whole soul is precisely its business. But the fierce beginning must submit to it and be its ally» [8, p. 168].

Aristotle and Plato the Idea of Virtue

In Plato and Aristotle, the presence of rationality and its predominance in the general mass of qualities of the human personality is the main feature inherent in the best people. In addition, Aristotle develops another idea of Plato: the depen-dence of virtue inherent in the best people on certain properties of the human soul. The philosopher emphasizes that virtue must be inherent in all people. But the vir-tue of the best people differs from the virtue of the bulk of the people. The soul has two beginnings and two virtues. One beginning is the ruling beginning, the other is the subordinate beginning. These two beginnings relate to each other as the reason-

able and unreasonable beginnings. The best people have the highest virtues - the virtues of reason. The virtue of the bulk of the population, on the other hand, is of another, lower character. «The presence of them (moral virtues) must be assumed in all beings, but not in the same way, but in accordance with the purpose of each. Therefore, the superior should possess moral virtue in its entirety, and each of the others should possess it as much as it contributes to his share of participation in the solution of common tasks» [7, p. 211].

Thus, according to Plato, philosophers are that category of people in whom rationality prevails over irrationality and emotionality. At the same time, Plato does not reduce the characteristic of philosophers only to the predominance of reason over feelings. Philosophers, according to Plato, must also possess a certain set of moral qualities, such as «truthfulness, determination, rejection of any lie, hatred for it and love for the truth» [10, p. 237]. The set of virtuous qualities in certain categories of people Plato considers a phenomenon not hereditary, but acquired as a result of proper upbringing and lifestyle. Therefore, the number of philosophers can include representatives of different population groups.

In Plato's view, justice is the main thing that unites people. It is thanks to it that people live together, help each other, and in the pursuit of justice are able to live happily. The absence of justice leads to discord, mutual struggle and hatred, makes it impossible to live and work together: «For injustice causes discord, hatred, internecine strife, and justice causes unanimity and friendship [9, p. 125]. According to this understanding of justice, the most important task of the state, the function of state power is to maintain and strengthen the unity and integrity of society. «Can there be, in our opinion, a greater evil for the state than that which leads to the loss of its unity and its disintegration into many parts? and can there be a greater good than that which binds the state together and promotes its unity?» - Plato asks and answers: «In our opinion, it cannot be» [9, p. 126]. Plato believed that the main reasons that violate the unity of the state, generating confrontation between people, immoral actions, are the desire to have an excessive amount of material goods, caused by the presence of private property, and improper education. That is why in the ideal just state there is no private property, at least for the two upper classes, and only state education and control over works of art are introduced.

Aristotle certainly does not believe that justice can be neutral in this sense; he states that arguments about justice inevitably become arguments about honor, virtue, and the nature of the good life.

Understanding Aristotle's reasons for thinking that justice and the good life should be linked will help us understand what is at the heart of attempts to separate the two concepts.

According to Aristotle, justice means giving people what they deserve, giving everyone what they deserve. But what does a person deserve? What are the relevant grounds for merit or denial? The answer depends on what is distributed. Justice involves two factors - the benefits and the people to whom those benefits are intended. In general, we say that «the equal must have the equal» [3, p. 148].

But here a difficult question arises: what exactly should «equality» be? The answer depends on what we distribute and on the virtues, relevant to the distributed objects.

Suppose we distribute the flutes. Who should get the best of them? Aristotle answers: the best flutes should go to those who play the instrument best.

Conclusion

Thus, aristocracy, with which Plato identifies the best people, or philosophers, is viewed by the thinker as an extra-class and extra-class social group, whose main criterion is the presence of virtue. Plato's formulation of the question of the role of the best people in society and the state was developed in Aristotle's writings, first of all - in his main sociopolitical treatise «Politics». It is in Aristotle's system of views that the problem of aristocracy and the aristocratic form of government, by which the thinker meant the power of the best people, received its final embodiment.

Aristotle uses a variety of terms to describe the most advanced part of society: «husband of state», «king», «householder», «lord». All these categories of the population are united by Aristotle in the general concept of aristocracy. The thinker considered the main feature of aristocracy to be the presence of political power. At that, the highest caste of society, i.e. the best people do not represent a single social group. In Aristotle, these notions are the designations of different hierarchical categories of society.

The best state system can be established only with «the best government» (meaning the adequacy of political strategy to the type of society in question, the spirit of the people); this adequacy is conditioned by the presence of virtue in the persons governing state life. Virtue, in turn, is a condition of happiness (happiness is a consequence of «beautiful actions»): «...the best state is at the same time a happy and prosperous state, and it is impossible to prosper for those who do not perform excellent deeds; no excellent deed neither man nor state can perform, not having virtue and reason» [2, p. 220]; «Since our task is to determine the best state system, and this consists in the state being governed in the best possible way under it, the latter being achieved when the state has the opportunity to enjoy the greatest happiness, we must clearly not lose sight of what happiness is. We affirm (and have established in the Ethics, if this work can be of any use) that happiness is activity in the spirit of virtue and the perfect application of this latter, and not in the conditional, but in the full sense; by conditional I mean necessary, by full I mean beautiful in itself [2, c. 241].

Thus, the question of the social vanguard and its role in the development of society was raised for the first time in ancient philosophy. In the works of Plato and Aristotle this question was considered for the most part in connection with the projects of the ideal state put forward by them. Plato and Aristotle put forward in their political doctrine the basic principles of a state structure based on the principle of «the power of the best». This state system is the most acceptable for the realization of the «good life». Its essence is revealed in the following definitions:

- The best state system can be established only with the «best governance» (meaning the power of the best as the main condition for the adequacy of political strategy to the type of society in question);

- The state system based on the «power of the best» must correspond to the type of society and, as such, be easily accepted by that type of society.

List of references

1 Исаев И.А. Politica hermetica: скрытые аспекты власти. – Москва: Юрист, 2003. – 575 с.

2 Ледяев В.Г. Власть: концептуальный анализ. – Москва: РОССПЭН, 2001. – 384 с.

3 Aristotle. Metaphysics. translated by W. D. Ross. – New York: NuVision Publications, 2009 – 220 p.

4 Aristotle. The Works of Aristotle, 4 Volume. – Minneapolis: Franklin Library, 1978. – 468 p.

5 Luhmann N. Trust and Power 1st Edition. – Malden: ʹPolity, 2017. – 264 p.

6 Сапронов П.А. Власть: прошлое и будущее. – Москва: Мысль, 2008. – 248 с.

7 Robert C.B. Aristotle's «Politics»: 2nd Edition. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press 2012. – 368 p.

8 Hegel G.W.F. Lectures on the History of Philosophy 1825-6: Volume I: Introduction and Oriental Philosophy. translated by Robert F.B. – New York: Oxford University Press, 2009. – 352 p.

9 Plato. The Republic. translated by ʹBenjamin J. – New York: ʹIndependently published, 2020. – 248 p.

10 Plato. Complete Works. translated by John M. – Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Co, 1997. – 1848 p.

11 Диоген Л. О жизни, учениях и изречениях знаменитых философов. перев. Л.М. Гаспарова. – М., 1979. – 620 с.

Transliteration

1 Isaev I.A. Politica hermetica: skrytye aspekty vlastı [Politica Hermetica: Hidden Aspects of Power]. – Moskva: Iýrıst, 2003. – 575 s.

2 Ledıaev V.G. Vlast: kontseptýalnyı analız [Power: Conceptual Analysis]. – Moskva: (ROSSPEN), 2001. – 384 s.

3 Aristotle. Metaphysics. translated by W. D. Ross. – New York: NuVision Publications, 2009. – 220 p.

4 Aristotle. The Works of Aristotle, 4 Volume. – Minneapolis: Franklin Library, 1978. – 468 p.

5 Luhmann N. Trust and Power 1st Edition. – Malden: ʹPolity, 2017. – 264 p.

6 Sapronov P.A. Vlast: proshloe ı býdýee [Power: Past and Future]. – Moskva: Mysl, 2008. – 248 s.

7 Robert C.B. Aristotle's «Politics»: 2nd Edition. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press 2012. – 368 p.

8 Hegel G.W.F. Lectures on the History of Philosophy 1825-6: Volume I: Introduction and Oriental Philosophy. translated by Robert F.B. – New York: Oxford University Press, 2009. – 352 p.

9 Plato. The Republic. translated by ʹBenjamin J. – New York: ʹIndependently published, 2020. – 248 p.

10 Plato. Complete Works. translated by John M. – Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Co, 1997. – 1848 p.

11 Dıogen L. O jıznı, ýchenııah ı ızrechenııah znamenıtyh fılosofov [About the Life, Teachings and Sayings of Famous Philosophers]. perev. L.M. Gasparova. – M., 1979. – 620 s.

Мәлік Ғ., Әбеуова Ш.Қ.
Аристотель мен Платон тұжырымдамаларындағы билік феномені

Аңдатпа. Мақалада Платон мен Аристотельдің әлеуметтік философиялық көзқарастары жүйесіндегі «ең жақсы билік» қағидаты бойынша қоғамды басқару мәселесі қарастырылады. Бұл тұжырымдаманың негізгі анықтамалары ежелгі көрнекті ойшылдардың саяси теорияларында көрсетілген.

Бұл мақаланың мақсаты – ежелгі философтардың әлеуметтік Авангард мәселесіне деген көзқарасын талдау. Ежелгі философиядағы бұл мәселе, ең алдымен, оның ең көрнекті екі өкілінің: Платон мен Аристотельдің еңбектерімен ұсынылған. Екі ойшыл да «әлеуметтік авангард» ұғымын қолданбаған, ал оның дамуында жетекші рөл атқарған қоғамның алдыңғы бөлігі «үздік адамдар» терминімен көрсетілген. Мемлекет пен билік құрылымындағы ең жақсы адамдардың рөлін түсіну Платонның философиялық жүйесінде басты орын алады. Платон ең жақсы адамдарды философтар деп атайды. Бұл философтар, Платонның пікірінше, мемлекетте жетекші рөл атқаруы керек. Философтарға тән негізгі белгілерді бөліп көрсете отырып, Платон адам жанының үш негізгі қағидасы туралы пайымдаудан туындайды: ақылға қонымды, ақылға қонымсыз (қалаусыз) және рухтың қаһары (ашу). Философтың ойынша, бұл принциптер жеке адамға да, жалпы мемлекетке де тән.

Түйін сөздер: Платон, Аристотель, ақсүйектер, «ең жақсы билік», билік феномені, билік.

Малик Г., Абеуова Ш.К.
Феномен власти в концепциях Аристотеля и Платона

Аннотация. В статье исследуются проблема управления обществом согласно принципу «власти лучших» в системе социально философских воззрений Платона и Аристотеля. Показаны основные определения данной концепции в политических теориях выдающихся мыслителей древности.

Целью данной статьи является анализ воззрений античных философов на проблему социального авангарда. Данная проблема в античной философии представлена, прежде всего, трудами двух ее виднейших представителей: Платона и Аристотеля. Оба мыслителя не употребляли понятия «социальный авангард», а передовая часть общества, игравшая ведущую роль в его развитии, обозначалась ими термином «лучшие люди». Осмысление роли лучших людей в структуре государства и власти занимает одно из центральных мест в философской системе Платона. Лучших людей Платон называет философами. Именно философам, по мнению Платона, должна принадлежать ведущая роль в государстве. Выделяя главные черты, присущие философам, Платон исходит из рассуждений о трех основных началах человеческой души: разумного, неразумного (возжелающего) и ярости духа (гнева). Эти начала, по мысли философа, присущи как отдельному человеку, так и государству в целом.

Ключевые слова: Власть, феномен власти, Платон, Аристотель, аристократия.