SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

UDC 323.26

V. Y. KRAVCHENKO[1*], Y. V. KOLDUNOV[2*]

[1*]Dnipro State Medical University (Dnipro, Ukraine), e-mail politologdma@gmail.com, ORCID 0009-0000-8393-2097
[2*]Dnipro State Medical University (Dnipro, Ukraine), e-mail ykoldunov101@gmail.com, ORCID 0009-0003-6637-8807

Philosophical and Anthropological Understanding of the Nature of Collective Violence

Purpose. The purpose of this research is to analyse and systematize modern philosophical and anthropological ideas about the nature, essence, causes and sources of collective violence. **Theoretical basis.** Given the complexity and multifaceted nature of the phenomenon of violence, the authors used a range of philosophical and general scientific research methods. In particular, the comparative method helped to identify the main advantages and disadvantages of using philosophical and anthropological approaches to studying the nature and patterns of violence in the social environment. The use of the systemic and structural-functional methods contributed to a better understanding of the structure, features, mechanisms and criteria for ethical justification of the permissibility of collective violence. The psychological approach made it possible to analyse the role of social dissatisfaction, disappointment, relative deprivation and frustration in the process of radicalization of individuals and their readiness to use violence. **Originality.** The originality of this research lies in the application of modern analytical approaches to the study and philosophical understanding of the phenomenon of violence. It has been proven that at the current stage of social development, the following non-traditional forms of violence are becoming widespread: structural, symbolic, cultural, and psychological. It has been established that the main sources of collective violence are value, cultural, ideological and structural contradictions, as well as socio-psychological dissatisfaction, economic inequality and discrimination. **Conclusions.** Throughout history, violence has been an integral part of spiritual, social, value and economic transformations. The study of such a complex phenomenon requires the creation of an effective interdisciplinary theory that would take into account various anthropological, social, philosophical, psychological, physiological and biological dimensions and forms of its use. That is why there is a need to further improve scientific theories and approaches to studying the nature, forms and sources of violence. Taking advantage of a comprehensive approach, we have been able to establish that violence is a form of social influence that involves the use of physical force against individuals, social groups or institutions to cause physical, mental or moral harm and to subordinate their behaviour and will.

Keywords: human nature; coercion; justification and rationalization of violence; values; dehumanization; suffering; dignity; domination; injustice; structural violence; collective violence; exploitation

Introduction

For a long time, the phenomenon of violence has been the subject of important theoretical and practical socio-philosophical discussions. Modernity demonstrates that there is an urgent need for philosophical understanding of the nature, essence and mechanisms of violence in the system of social relations. The study of the ontological features, causes, forms and principles of violence increasingly requires the creation of effective interdisciplinary socio-psychological, philosophical and anthropological approaches that would focus on the patterns of violence in power relations, state-building processes and social conflicts. Despite the destructive and disruptive nature of violence, it continues to be perceived as an element of human nature. This is a complex and controversial phenomenon, and the experts from various anthropological, social, philosophical, natural and psychological directions are trying to explain its origins. It is worth noting the desire of researchers in their works to start theoretical discussions about the role of philosophical approaches to studying the nature of violence and classifying various forms of armed struggle, conflicts and destructive behaviour (Janzen, 2016). Some scholars have focused their efforts on identifying the main mechanisms and patterns of aggressive and destructive behaviour within

individual and social relations (Dyrstad & Hillesund, 2020). Some of them have tried to overcome the theoretical limitations of previous studies and find universal approaches to a broader definition of violence that would take into account not only acts of physical harm, war or terrorism, but also various forms of non-traditional violence, such as structural and symbolic violence, inequality, discrimination and exploitation (Hartmann, 2017). However, there is still a lack of modern comprehensive scientific theories able to offer universal approaches to defining and explaining the nature, causes and dynamics of collective violence.

Philosophical understanding of the nature of violence is intended to reveal the main social, ethical and anthropological dimensions of its functioning. The dominant scientific paradigm continues to be the study of the value components of justifying the permissibility of violence, as well as determining the level of legitimacy of physical coercion against individuals. It is moral and ethical values and attitudes that allow us to identify situations and events in which the use of force is a tool to counteract evil and injustice. Adherence to such principles and standards contributes to an objective and impartial assessment of violence as an element of the biological, social and spiritual nature of human beings. The study of the nature of violence should be based on a variety of philosophical, psychological, anthropological and social theories, which together form a new approach to understanding the mechanisms and causes of this phenomenon. That is why our research aims to better understand the nature of violence, which will further reveal why certain actors prefer destructive behaviour to peaceful methods and strategies of conflict resolution. The use of interdisciplinary approaches to studying the nature, causes and forms of violence can serve as a basis for creating effective mechanisms for conflict prevention and resolution.

Purpose

Given the relevance of the phenomenon under study, the purpose of the article is to provide a philosophical and anthropological understanding of scientific and theoretical approaches to determining the nature, causes and sources of collective violence.

Statement of basic materials

Interpersonal relations have always been a sphere of conflict and competition for the distribution of scarce resources, values, influence and power. Throughout history, violence has been perceived as an inherent element of the imperfect nature of man, their instincts and psyche. This explained its prevalence and questioned the possibility of social relations that would completely exclude conflicts, cruelty and power struggle. The existence of deep disagreements that could not be resolved peacefully led to the use of various forms of collective violence and armed struggle. The emergence of new manifestations of violence has prompted researchers to test different approaches to studying the sources and factors that lead to its use. From the point of view of philosophical anthropology, the study of this phenomenon allows us to better understand the diverse nature, motives and beliefs of a person, to comprehend their values and worldview. The majority of research hypotheses identify economic inequality, psychological discontent, ideological, political, ethnic and religious contradictions as the main causes of the escalation of violence. In particular, in the broad anthropological dimension, V. Slyusar (2015) characterised violence as "the use of coercion by one social group against another, for the purpose of domination, struggle to obtain, use and maintain power and influence" (authors' transl.) (p. 246). In our opinion, this gave grounds to perceive violence as a manifestation of deliberate and conscious destructive behaviour towards individuals with the intention of causing them physical, spiritual or psychologi-

cal harm. That is why, depending on the context and meaning, violence can be perceived as a destructive element that negates the human right to dignity and freedom and turns people into a means to achieve collective goals.

Identifying and studying its causes, forms and mechanisms of use plays an important scientific and analytical role for philosophical and anthropological understanding of the nature of collective violence. The scientific community is still debating the terminological characterisation of this phenomenon and the definition of its main components. Most attempts to describe the essence of violence have ended with the study of its causes, forms and consequences. The dominant practice is to describe violence by defining it as physical, psychological, material or spiritual unlawful harm that results from its use. Traditionally, the scientific community has been dominated by approaches that see the main sources of violence in the egoistic nature of man, human instincts, inclinations, needs, desire for power and domination, as well as a set of social, economic, psychological, cultural and ideological factors that can provoke violent conflict. In general, most existing approaches recognise that an important feature of any violence is the use of physical force and coercion to gain or maintain power, authority, influence and social resources. In particular, we can agree with the statement of C. Sousa (2013) that most forms of collective violence involve "the deliberate use of power and force to achieve personal goals, gain or maintain power through intimidation, coercion and physical harm to individuals or social groups" (p. 170).

An analysis of the scientific literature has shown that the vast majority of scholars describe collective violence as "a set of actions with the use of physical coercion and harm to influence decision-making" (Daase et al., 2022, p. 4). This interpretation of the essence of violence is noteworthy, as its use involves a wide range of forceful actions that result in physical, psychological or symbolic harm in order to influence the will of a person and achieve social, cultural, economic and ideological goals. Within this scholarly tradition, M. Wajzer and M. Cukier-Syguła (2020) define violence as "the deliberate use of force and power to maximise economic benefits and achieve intended goals" (p. 144). Such violence can take the form of physical coercion, intimidation, murder, destruction of property, blackmail or threats. Definitions of this type aim to describe violence as a type of misconduct that causes physical harm, suffering and impairment of human freedom.

In turn, L. Levchenko (2012), summarising the main approaches to defining the phenomenon of collective violence, noted that most of them include "the use of physical force and coercion, causing material or spiritual damage, restriction of rights and freedom of choice, as well as intimidation of individuals or social groups" (authors' transl.) (p. 12). We can agree with such arguments because without taking into account the role of physical coercion, it is impossible to understand the nature of various manifestations of violence that take place in modern interpersonal and intergroup relations. There is also a consensus among different scientific fields that the distinguishing feature of acts of violence is "consciousness and intentionality of actions" rather than the random use of force (Bardall, Bjarnegård, & Piscopo, 2020, p. 919). For example, D. della Porta (1995) believes that violence "is the organised and deliberate use of physical force in order to damage, destroy or intimidate opponents" (p. 2). Sharing this point of view, T. Khomych (2012) describes violence as "the deliberate use of physical coercion directed against an individual or social group and involving physical, psychological or moral harm" (authors' transl.) (p. 4). The undoubted practical value of such widespread statements is that it is the intentions of the subject of violence to cause harm that characterise the nature of this phenomenon and determine its focus on dehumanising the object against which it is used. However, such a

minimalist approach to understanding the nature of violence takes into account only cases of physical coercion that causes bodily or material harm. This view of the nature of violence has some weaknesses, in particular, it does not take into account the broader social context of violence and the non-pecuniary damage it can cause. It should be remembered that violence is always part of socio-cultural relations and can take on various forms of psychological, ideological and spiritual coercion.

The long-term systemic and structural consequences of the use of violence almost always lead to a decline in public trust, social, humanitarian and ideological crises, instability, degradation of social institutions and economic decline of entire regions. In this regard, one can increasingly find a description of violence as "a destructive ontological form of social interaction that always leads to a reduction of being of the actors against whom it is directed" (Hartmann, 2017, p. 3). Such statements reflect a widespread desire to minimise the unjustified use of force and to find effective social mechanisms that would deter individuals from such destructive behaviour and minimise manifestations of aggression. This is what K. Krause (2016) was guided by when he described violence as "the illegal use of physical force that directly undermines and challenges the state's legal monopoly over the legitimate use of force, or implicates the state and its repressive apparatus" (p. 120). A similar model of philosophical understanding of the patterns of collective violence is followed by V. Slyusar (2016), who defines it as "violent actions of certain social groups against individuals or society as a whole in order to achieve their own goals, access to the distribution of scarce resources, accelerate social transformations and fight against opponents" (authors' transl.) (p. 128).

A brief analytical review of current approaches to the study of collective violence has shown that there is a tendency in the scientific community to describe this phenomenon as the use of physical coercion against an individual or his/her property or as a means of struggle for the acquisition, retention and maintenance of power for the purpose of political and socio-economic domination. The advantages of such theoretical constructs are the unambiguity and ease of identifying violence as the direct use of physical force that results in visible bodily harm. Such definitions are ethically neutral and do not contain moral condemnation or justification of the use of force against individuals or their property. However, this approach overlooks an important part of non-physical violence (psychological, emotional, spiritual), which also causes subjugation of the will, suffering and restriction of human autonomy.

Creating an effective theory of violence requires a combined approach to explaining and clarifying not only the physical manifestations of this phenomenon, but also its non-traditional forms that have a destructive impact on the inner world of a person. In this regard, there is a need to get acquainted with the experience of psychological theories that explained the nature and forms of violence and aggressive behaviour by feelings of discontent, frustration and relative deprivation. The proponents of these theories were convinced that "such a predicament is unfair and may lead to the experience of personal relative deprivation, which then evokes feelings of anger or resentment and provokes the use of violence to achieve radical change" (Greitemeyer & Sagioglou, 2019, p. 664). Difficult socio-economic conditions caused by inequality, discrimination and unfair treatment can lead to a sense of relative deprivation, which manifests itself in increased levels of aggression, discontent, resentment, antisocial behaviour, hostility, anger and willingness to use violence.

Within the framework of the socio-psychological approach, the well-known American researcher T. R. Gurr (2011) defined relative deprivation as a value discrepancy between what in-

dividuals or social groups want to get and what they actually get within social relations. In his work, he found a link between the level of deprivation, poverty, unemployment, discontent, economic inequality and the intensity of intrastate violence. In general, relative deprivation can be described as a feeling of frustration and dissatisfaction among members of a particular social, religious or ethnic group due to the existence of artificial restrictions and barriers to access to a fair distribution of resources and power. The particular value of this approach is that it allows us to understand how the feeling of injustice and discontent provokes aggression and violence, which is perceived as a justified means of quickly achieving the desired changes. In such circumstances, inequality, exploitation, poverty, frustration, competition for resources and power become the main factors that provoke the use of various forms of violence.

An attempt by some Ukrainian researchers to analyse the role of relative deprivation as a factor in the intensification of violent conflicts is worthy of note. In particular, R. Kliuchnyk (2017), studying the causes of conflicts, crises, protests and demonstrations, found that "a significant part of acts of collective violence and large-scale protests can be explained by the phenomenon of relative deprivation and feelings of discontent, frustration and alienation among representatives of certain social groups" (authors' transl.) (p. 63). In our opinion, the application of this model of anthropological understanding of the nature of collective violence has provoked an active search for an answer to the question of whether the use of violence can be an ethically justified and acceptable means of self-defence or a tool for fighting injustice. This view of the nature of violence is part of a dialectical perception of the essence of this phenomenon, but we should not ignore the fact that this approach poses a threat of its potential normalisation and rationalisation in the system of social relations.

Another related group of studies is represented by approaches that identify frustration as one of the main sources of violence escalation, which is understood as a state of psychological tension, dissatisfaction, anger and despair due to the existence of significant obstacles that do not allow individuals to achieve their goals or satisfy their needs. This opens up the possibility of a scientific assumption that, under certain circumstances, the main source of violence is frustration, which causes aggression and violent actions against those individuals, social groups and institutions that are considered to be the main cause of such obstacles. In this regard, we find convincing the arguments of P. Lupsha (1971), who saw the causes of violence in feelings of frustration from the gap between what individuals want to get and what they actually get, and he defined the phenomenon of collective violence as "a collective or mass outburst, characterized by excitement, rage, aggression, repression and acts of destruction and disrupting the social stability and tranquility" (p. 89). In other words, in the face of unmet life needs and frustration, individuals begin to feel anger, which can provoke the use of violence against social groups or institutions that they consider to be the source of their personal problems.

We also tend to believe that feelings of frustration lead to a conflict of interest, dissatisfaction with the current situation, increased levels of aggression and motivation to use violence against the object perceived as the source of such frustration and injustice. The intensity of such violence will depend on the level of discrepancy between what a person has and what they expect. In most cases, such conflict turns violent when frustrated social groups have lost confidence in existing social and legal institutions and are convinced that they are unable to protect and fulfil their interests. In such circumstances, frustration, anger, desire for revenge and implicit approval of violence can lead individuals to justify the acceptability of force to punish those responsible for the existence of inequitable distribution of resources and discrimination against certain social

groups. In our opinion, the weakness of this approach is that it defines violence too broadly, which can make it difficult to understand this phenomenon due to the additional pile-up of psychological, ethical and ideological components. Such an evaluative and moral perception of violence can become a significant obstacle to an objective assessment and interpretation of its main sources and patterns. This is due to the fact that various forms of non-traditional violence are difficult to record and study its long-term consequences. To a large extent, some criticism of this perception of violence is also related to the difficulty of identifying it and the lack of proven mechanisms that would explain how individual discontent can cause frustration and violence at the level of collectives, social groups or states. After all, violence is a very complex and dynamic phenomenon, which is caused not only by psychological but also by socio-political, ideological, economic, religious and ethnic factors. It should also be borne in mind that frustration, disappointment and dissatisfaction do not always lead to aggressive behaviour or violence. Historical experience points to numerous examples of escalation and justification of violence that were not linked to feelings of injustice, grievance, discrimination or exploitation.

However, there are still attempts to explain the causes of violence by the high level of collective or individual discontent in society, which can lead to the radicalisation of certain social groups and justify its use by ethical criteria (Ajil, 2022, pp. 309-310). We tend to believe that this view is based on the assumption that the lack of effective mechanisms of social representation, high levels of corruption, repression and persecution, as well as the loss of general public trust play a significant role in the growth of discontent and escalation of violence. Economic inequality or discrimination can also influence the motivation of certain social groups to use violence to change these conditions. Thus, common causes of such discontent may include income inequality among different social groups, restrictions on access to education or the labour market.

In recent years, scholars have tried to establish whether there is a link between socio-economic inequality, poverty and the dynamics of violence (Dyrstad & Hillesund, 2020; Fearon & Laitin, 2003; Kravchenko, 2015). Common to these studies was the desire to prove that general instability, discontent, conflict and violence are the result of vertical or horizontal inequalities among members of different social, ethnic or religious groups. G. Østby (2013), analysing the specifics of armed conflicts, concluded that "different types of economic, ethnic and religious inequality often cause instability, which increases the possibility of violence and physical coercion" (p. 210). This indicates that violence is always part of social relations that constantly reproduce social injustice, discrimination and human exploitation. A similar assumption about the main sources of collective violence was made by the authoritative scholar C. Tilly (2003) in his research, when he proposed to describe violence as a wide range of social interactions in society that involve the use of force and coercion to protect or expand one's own interests at the expense of the interests or resources of others (p. 4). Within this tradition, Norwegian researchers K. Dyrstad and S. Hillesund (2020) have also suggested that "the risk of violence depends on the level of group solidarity, socio-economic inequality and general grievances" (p. 1727). Such reasonable assumptions are important because they allow us to understand the mechanisms by which deep discontent can turn into overt forms of violent struggle. We tend to believe that the intensity and dynamics of such violence will be high if people have no real opportunity to influence decision-making, and feelings of discrimination, injustice, inequality and exclusion increase the desire to achieve the desired changes by force. These negative consequences can be minimised by effectively redistributing public resources and providing opportunities to influence decision-making, which will reduce discontent, increase overall trust and pave the way for peaceful conflict resolution.

A special place among modern approaches to the study of the nature of collective violence belongs to theories whose representatives focus on the study of indirect or non-traditional forms of violence (symbolic, cultural, psychological, systemic, informational). Such forms of violence are often impersonal and do not involve physical coercion, but rather affect the emotions, feelings, psyche and consciousness of individuals. In such circumstances, violence takes on structural, psychological or cultural forms, which makes it difficult to identify and study objectively. Unfortunately, the practice of recent decades has shown that sometimes non-traditional forms of violence can have more devastating long-term consequences for a person's spiritual and psychological balance than the direct use of physical force. That is why the identification and philosophical understanding of such forms of violence plays an important role in building a comprehensive theory that would take into account all interrelated biological, philosophical, anthropological, spiritual, ethical and psychological elements of its essence and nature.

One of the most famous authors of the concept of structural violence, J. Galtung (1969), established that it arises due to the existence of inequality of opportunity and artificial barriers that limit access to the distribution of power and resources (p. 171). This is embodied in the creation of such socio-political, economic or cultural conditions under which a certain social group is subjected to various forms of exploitation, constantly experiences harassment and restriction of its rights and cannot meet its basic needs. The specific features of structural violence are its invisibility, difficulty of identification, systematic impact and destruction of personal potential. In the context of structural violence, social, cultural and economic institutions act as instruments of oppression of a certain social group of individuals, restricting their rights and freedoms. Following a similar position, V. Ruggiero (2018) argues that structural violence is a reflection of unjust social, economic, ideological or cultural norms "as they reproduce inequality, immobility, injustice and misery in a society" (p. 44). The results of these studies have allowed us to establish that the main element of structural violence is social injustice, which impedes the realisation of the personal potential of individuals who begin to experience the destruction of social ties, values, collective identity and isolation from the rest of society, as well as lose interest in participating in public life. The greatest threat of structural violence is that, being embedded in existing social institutions, it becomes a daily practice of discrimination, exploitation and socio-economic injustice and can provoke the use of direct physical violence, coercion and restriction of a person's freedom of will. As a result, such violence leads to a deterioration in the quality of human existence and the functioning of social institutions, increased corruption, destruction of infrastructure, and reduced funding for social spending.

Among other examples of indirect violence, J. Galtung (1969) describes in detail its psychological and cultural forms, which are manifested through "threats, intimidation and ideological influence", the ultimate goal of which is to control the behaviour of individuals or social groups and to limit access to power and resources (p. 169). Continuing this tradition, some scholars also analyse the place of structural, cultural and psychological violence in the system of modern interpersonal relations. In particular, O. Balatska (2015) emphasises that structural violence "comes into play where impersonal socio-political or economic institutions create discriminatory conditions for the existence of certain social groups, leading to the stratification and fragmentation of society" (authors' transl.) (p. 173). In its turn, cultural violence is the basis for ideological, spiritual and informational justification and legalisation of the struggle with the use of various forms of coercion. This gives grounds to believe that such violence is a reflection of the prevailing system of value norms and beliefs that become an element of discriminatory practices

and influence the determination of the level of its acceptability and normalisation in the public consciousness. The existence of such violence is a means of defining and imposing a certain dominant truth that must be shared by the majority of society.

As a result, through critical analysis and comprehension of modern approaches to the study of the nature of violence, we were able to identify and summarise a set of the following main reasons that provoke its use:

1) Social discontent – inequality, ethnic, religious or ideological conflicts, discrimination, limited access to the distribution of power;

2) Institutional factors – weakness of social and economic institutions, corruption, low efficiency of public administration and systematic human rights violations;

3) Psychological factors – a sense of frustration and dissatisfaction with the conditions of existence of individuals or social groups;

4) Value contradictions – the existence of deep value and spiritual differences between competing social groups or individuals;

5) Economic factors – economic instability, uneven distribution of resources, competition and the desire to seize the economic resources of opponents;

6) Cultural, ideological and informational factors that justify the necessity and permissibility of using violence.

Originality

The paper substantiates the scientific value of a comprehensive study of the nature, sources and patterns of collective violence in the context of modern anthropological and philosophical analytical approaches. The role of socio-psychological, economic, cultural and value factors in the escalation of armed struggle with the use of various forms of violence and coercion is determined. It is established that social disappointment, discrimination, relative deprivation, frustration and economic inequality increase the risk of violence in the system of social relations. The distinctive features and peculiarities of the use of non-traditional forms of violence (structural, symbolic, cultural, psychological) are investigated.

Conclusions

The growing role of philosophical and anthropological understanding of the nature and dynamics of contemporary violence makes it possible to streamline the discussion and summarise different points of view on the role of collective violence in the system of social relations, as well as helps to overcome the analytical difficulties associated with the study and assessment of the main mechanisms of influence of this phenomenon on the restriction of human rights and freedom. The conclusions obtained give grounds to assert that the phenomenon of collective violence is part of human nature, their inclinations, instincts and desires. This gave us the opportunity to form a holistic view of the dynamics of violence, as well as to take into account most of the components and characteristics that determine its place in human life and society. A comprehensive approach to the analysis of violence has revealed that the main features of most forms of violence are physical, moral or psychological harm, anti-systemic nature, involvement of a wide range of participants and the desire to justify the permissibility of its use by ethical criteria.

It has been proved that in the vast majority of cases, violence is a consequence of psychological (frustration, relative deprivation, disappointment), socio-economic (inequality, poverty, polarisation of society and demographic imbalance), political (decline in trust and legitimacy, destruction

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

of the monopoly on the use of coercion, restriction of rights and freedoms, repression), ideological, ethnic, cultural and structural contradictions that provoke conflicts and confrontation among individuals and social groups. It has also been established that, by its etymological meaning, violence implies the use of physical force and coercion to cause injury or harm to a particular object or subject. It can be physical, psychological, individual, institutional, direct, indirect, overt or covert. From the point of view of epistemology, the use of such violence violates the human right to the body and autonomy, destroys, oppresses and disfigures the person both physically and spiritually. Further interdisciplinary research will help to create strategies for conflict resolution and prevention of collective violence in the system of interpersonal and social relations.

REFERENCES

Ajil, A. (2022). Politico-ideological violence: Zooming in on grievances. *European Journal of Criminology, 19*(2), 304-321. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370819896223 (in English)

Balatska, O. (2015). Typology of political violence forms as a part of modern political process. *Bulletin of Mariupol State University. Series: History. Political Studies,* (13-14), 172-182. (in Ukrainian)

Bardall, G., Bjarnegård, E., & Piscopo, J. M. (2020). How is Political Violence Gendered? Disentangling Motives, Forms, and Impacts. *Political Studies, 68*(4), 916-935. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321719881812 (in English)

Daase, C., Driedger, J. J., Kroll, S., Mannitz, S., Simon, H., & Wolff, J. (2022). *Transformations of Political Violence? A Research Program*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.48809/PRIFTraCeWP2201 (in English)

Dyrstad, K., & Hillesund, S. (2020). Explaining Support for Political Violence: Grievance and Perceived Opportunity. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 64*(9), 1724-1753. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002720909886 (in English)

Fearon, J., & Laitin, D. (2003). Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War. *American Political Science Review, 97*(1), 75-90. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055403000534 (in English)

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research, 6*(3), 167-191. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/002234336900600301 (in English)

Greitemeyer, T., & Sagioglou, C. (2019). The impact of personal relative deprivation on aggression over time. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 159*(6), 664-675. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2018.1549013 (in English)

Gurr, T. R. (2011). *Why Men Rebel*. New York: Routledge. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315631073 (in English)

Hartmann, E. (2017). Violence: Constructing an Emerging Field of Sociology. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence, 11*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4119/UNIBI/ijcv.623 (in English)

Janzen, J. M. (2016). The anthropology of violence: Context, consequences, conflict resolution, healing, and peace-building in Central and Southern Africa. *Journal of Public Health Policy, 37*, 122-132. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41271-016-0008-1 (in English)

Khomych, T. M. (2012). The notions of violence and duress and their correlation. *Journal of NUOA. Law Series,* (2). (in Ukrainian)

Kliuchnyk, R. M. (2017). Relative deprivation and political protest. *Scientific and Theoretical Almanac Grani, 20*(1), 62-67. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15421/171710 (in Ukrainian)

Krause, K. (2016). From Armed Conflict to Political Violence: Mapping & Explaining Conflict Trends. *Daedalus, 145*(4), 113-126. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/daed_a_00416 (in English)

Kravchenko, V. (2015). Socio-economic determinants of political violence. *Visnyk of Dnipropetrovsk University. Philosophy, Sociology, Political science,* (1), 81-90. (in Ukrainian)

Levchenko, L. O. (2012). Deiaki aspekty shchodo vyznachennia katehorii "politychne nasyllia". *Naukovi pratsi. Politolohiia, 197*(185), 12-15. (in Ukrainian)

Lupsha, P. A. (1971). Explanation of Political Violence: Some Psychological Theories Versus Indignation. *Politics & Society, 2*(1), 89-104. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/003232927100200105 (in English)

Østby, G. (2013). Inequality and political violence: A review of the literature. *International Area Studies Review, 16*(2), 206-231. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/2233865913490937 (in English)

Porta, D. della. (1995). *Social Movements, Political Violence, and the State: A Comparative Analysis of Italy and Germany*. Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511527555 (in English)

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

Ruggiero, V. (2018). Political Violence: A Typology. *Kriminologijos Studijos, 5,* 43-63. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15388/crimlithuan.2017.5.11732 (in English)

Slyusar, V. M. (2015). Some remarks to the definition of concept of "violence":social and philosophical aspect. *Hileya: Scientific Bulletin, 98*, 245-248. (in Ukrainian)

Slyusar, V. N. (2016). Violence: Content and Forms of Realization in the Transformational Processes. *Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal. Philosophical Sciences,* (1), 127-132. (in Ukrainian)

Sousa, C. A. (2013). Political violence, collective functioning and health: A review of the literature. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival, 29*(3), 169-197. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13623699.2013.813109 (in English)

Tilly, C. (2003). *The Politics of Collective Violence.* Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511819131 (in English)

Wajzer, M., & Cukier-Syguła, M. (2020). Studying Political Violence Using Game Theory Models: Research Approaches and Assumptions. *Polish Political Science Yearbook, 49*(2), 143-157. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15804/ppsy2020208 (in English)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

Ajil A. Politico-ideological violence: Zooming in on grievances. *European Journal of Criminology*. 2022. Vol. 19, Iss. 2. P. 304–321. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370819896223

Балацька О. Б. Типологія політичного насилля як складової сучасного політичного процесу. *Вісник Маріупольського державного університету. Серія : Історія. Політологія.* 2015. Вип. 13–14. С. 172–182.

Bardall G., Bjarnegård E., Piscopo J. M. How is Political Violence Gendered? Disentangling Motives, Forms, and Impacts. *Political Studies*. 2020. Vol. 68, Iss. 4. P. 916–935. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321719881812

Daase C., Driedger J. J., Kroll S., Mannitz S., Simon H., Wolff J. *Transformations of Political Violence? A Research Program*. 2022. 14 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.48809/PRIFTraCeWP2201

Dyrstad K., Hillesund S. Explaining Support for Political Violence: Grievance and Perceived Opportunity. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 2020. Vol. 64, Iss. 9. P. 1724–1753. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002720909886

Fearon J., Laitin D. Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War. *American Political Science Review*. 2003. Vol. 97, Iss. 1. P. 75–90. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055403000534

Galtung J. Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*. 1969. Vol. 6, Iss. 3. P. 167–191. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/002234336900600301

Greitemeyer T., Sagioglou C. The impact of personal relative deprivation on aggression over time. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 2019. Vol. 159, Iss. 6. P. 664–675. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2018.1549013

Gurr T. R. *Why Men Rebel*. New York : Routledge, 2011. 446 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315631073

Hartmann E. Violence: Constructing an Emerging Field of Sociology. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*. 2017. Vol. 11. 9 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4119/UNIBI/ijcv.623

Janzen J. M. The anthropology of violence: Context, consequences, conflict resolution, healing, and peace-building in Central and Southern Africa. *Journal of Public Health Policy*. 2016. Vol. 37. P. 122–132. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41271-016-0008-1

Хомич Т. М. Поняття насильства і примусу та їх співвідношення. *Часопис НаУОА. Серія "Право"*. 2012. № 2 (6). 17 с.

Ключник Р. М. Відносна депривація та політичний протест. *Науково-теоретичний альманах Грані*. 2017. Т. 20, № 1. С. 62–67. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15421/171710

Krause K. From Armed Conflict to Political Violence: Mapping & Explaining Conflict Trends. *Daedalus*. 2016. Vol. 145, Iss. 4. P. 113–126. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED_a_00416

Кравченко В. Соціально-економічні детермінанти політичного насилля. *Вісник Дніпропетровського університету. Серія: Філософія. Соціологія. Політологія*. 2015. № 1. С. 81–90.

Левченко Л. О. Деякі аспекти щодо визначення категорії "політичне насилля". *Наукові праці. Політологія*. 2012. Т. 197, № 185. С. 12–15.

Lupsha P. A. Explanation of Political Violence: Some Psychological Theories Versus Indignation. *Politics & Society*. 1971. Vol. 2, Iss. 1. P. 89–104. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/003232927100200105

Østby G. Inequality and political violence: A review of the literature. *International Area Studies Review*. 2013. Vol. 16, Iss. 2. P. 206–231. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/2233865913490937

Della Porta D. *Social Movements, Political Violence, and the State: A Comparative Analysis of Italy and Germany*. Cambridge University Press, 1995. 270 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511527555

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

Ruggiero V. Political Violence: A Typology. *Kriminologijos studijos*. 2018. Vol. 5. P. 43–63. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15388/crimlithuan.2017.5.11732

Слюсар В. М. Деякі зауваження до визначення поняття "насилля": соціально-філософський аспект. *Гілея: науковий вісник*. 2015. Вип. 98. С. 245–248.

Слюсар В. М. Соціальне насилля: зміст і форми реалізації у трансформаційних процесах. *Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка. Філософські науки*. 2016. Вип. 1 (82). С. 127–132.

Sousa C. A. Political violence, collective functioning and health: A review of the literature. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*. 2013. Vol. 29, Iss. 3. P. 169–197. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13623699.2013.813109

Tilly C. *The Politics of Collective Violence*. Cambridge University Press, 2003. 276 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511819131

Wajzer M., Cukier-Syguła M. Studying Political Violence Using Game Theory Models: Research Approaches and Assumptions. *Polish Political Science Yearbook*. 2020. Vol. 49, Iss. 2. P. 143–157. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15804/ppsy2020208

В. Ю. КРАВЧЕНКО[1*], Я. В. КОЛДУНОВ[2*]

[1*]Дніпровський державний медичний університет (Дніпро, Україна), ел. пошта politologdma@gmail.com, ORCID 0009-0000-8393-2097

[2*]Дніпровський державний медичний університет (Дніпро, Україна), ел. пошта ykoldunov101@gmail.com, ORCID 0009-0003-6637-8807

Філософське та антропологічне осмислення природи колективного насилля

Мета. У цьому дослідженні передбачено здійснити науково-теоретичний аналіз і систематизацію сучасних філософських та антропологічних уявлень про природу, сутність, причини та джерела колективного насилля. **Теоретичний базис.** Зважаючи на складність і багатогранність феномена насилля, автори застосували комплекс філософських та загальнонаукових методів дослідження. Зокрема, завдяки порівняльному методу вдалося виявити основні переваги й недоліки філософських та антропологічних підходів до вивчення природи й закономірностей використання насилля в соціальному середовищі. Системний та структурно-функціональний методи сприяли кращому розумінню структури, властивостей, механізмів та критеріїв етичного виправдання допустимості застосування колективного насилля. Психологічний підхід дозволив проаналізувати роль соціального невдоволення, розчарування, відносної депривації та фрустрації в процесі радикалізації індивідів і їхньої готовності до використання насилля. **Наукова новизна.** Оригінальність цього дослідження полягає в застосуванні сучасних аналітичних підходів до вивчення і філософського осмислення феномена насилля. Доведено, що на сучасному етапі суспільного розвитку значного поширення набувають нетрадиційні форми насилля: структурне, символічне, культурне та психологічне. Установлено, що основними джерелами колективного насилля є ціннісні, культурні, ідеологічні та структурні протиріччя, а також соціально-психологічне невдоволення, економічна нерівність і дискримінація. **Висновки.** Протягом усієї історії насилля було невід’ємною частиною духовних, соціальних, ціннісних та економічних перетворень. Вивчення такого складного явища потребує створення дієвої міждисциплінарної теорії, яка б враховувала різноманітні антропологічні, соціальні, філософські, психологічні, фізіологічні та біологічні виміри і форми його використання. Саме тому постає необхідність у подальшому вдосконаленні наукових теорій і підходів до вивчення сутності, форм та джерел насилля. Використовуючи переваги комплексного підходу, автори встановили, що насилля є різновидом соціального впливу, який передбачає застосування фізичного примусу щодо індивідів, соціальних груп чи інститутів, із метою завдання їм фізичної, психічної чи моральної шкоди, а також підкорення їхньої поведінки та волі.

Ключові слова: природа людини; примус; виправдання і раціоналізація насилля; цінності; дегуманізація; страждання; гідність; панування; несправедливість; структурне насилля; колективне насилля; експлуатація