

POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS AND PROCESSES

Svitlana Vovk, PhD in History

Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University, Ukraine

CIVIL WAR AS ILLEGITIMATE MODEL TO CHANGE STATE POWER

Civil war is not only a large-scale confrontation between alternative models of social development, but also the period of armed struggle, which is essentially a struggle for the supreme state power. There are several models of changes in a state: democratic, undemocratic and model of procedural decisions within the ruling elite for election of a new political leader.

Civil war is an armed struggle for power, which results in an illegitimate transfer of state power from one carrier to another (the latter are classes, ethnic groups and social layers or socio-political groups of the same class, social layer, ethnic group) during which the type of society and the political regime may vary.

Key words: civil war, power struggle, state power, a model of the power change.

Civil war as a crucial period associated with a crisis leads to change in political and cultural ideas at the level of political actors and grassroots. That impels a power struggle, which eventually leads to a transition of state power.

In order to characterize a civil war as a form of transition of state power, it is necessary to consider the concept and nature of state power itself. State power is a socio-political phenomenon, the main form of manifestation of the political power that belongs to a social community (nation, class, etc.), which has specialized instruments to regulate social relations and supremacy in society¹.

State power is always public, since it extends at the whole society, acts on its behalf and is characterized by impersonality; it is also political, since a state is the central element of a political system and the main actor of political process. State power has some specific features. Firstly, it has its own subject (carrier of power) who expresses its social nature and whose decisions are binding for all members of society, the entire population; secondly, it has legally unlimited nature; thirdly, represents a concentration of force, using the method of persuasion, but relying on coercion (the latter is coercive state power); fourthly, state power is able to organize social relations and establishment of their legal forms (monopoly law-making and law enforcement). Moreover, a fundamental feature of state power is its ability to regulate and limit all other types of power, such as power of political parties, power of teachers over students and even parental power over children. That is "all other social organizations are only having a part of power or one of its forms. Power of all other social organizations requires permission for its realization from state power². Political analysts believe that state power is a state organization of political management of society, which is both in volume and by means of influence exceeds all other types of power in all social formations³.

State power is a complex concept that incorporates, firstly, the ability of a state and its bodies to manage vital functions of society, its citizens and their associations, to direct them, control and subordinate to its will; secondly, effective state bodies; thirdly, state power is a generalized name of the circle of people with the highest authority. State power acts as a function of economically and politically dominant group to manage the affairs of society through specially created instruments to exercise power.

Thus, a carrier of state power is a group of people (social community, class, etc.), to whom state power belongs and whose interests are represented by a state; that is one who can be called a ruling elite. The latter provides the supreme state power, which by perforce is political power.

¹ Владимиров, М.В. (2013). Державна влада в умовах розвитку громадянського суспільства. *Актуальні проблеми державного управління*, 2, 46-53.

² Кисляковский, Б.А. (1916). *Социальные науки и право*. Москва: Издание М. и С. Сабашниковых, 409.

³ Погорілка, В. (2002). *Органи державної влади України*. Кив: Ін-т держави і права ім. В. Корецького, 390.

In cases of dissatisfaction with state political line of ruling elite, other political actors are prone to change a course of public policy. One of the means to change the course is removal of the ruling elite from state power, its replacement by another top-brass, i.e. transition of state power from one group of people into the hands of another group of people. That causes a change of state power.

The change of state power is a transition from one supreme power carrier (ruling elite) to another as a result of political struggle for power or in accordance with existing state mechanisms and legal framework, or in violation of applicable law. Considering the aforesaid, we may distinguish two ways of transition of power, legitimate and illegitimate.

In the first case, transition of state power may be implemented by means of a legitimate mechanism to pass power from the hands of one group into the hands of another group; in the second case - by means of a coup, revolution or civil war. According to V. Huliev and P. Panov it is possible to identify several models of power change: 1) "democratic" in which a change of power is implemented due to a victory of opposition in competitive elections; 2) counter-elite comes to power by means of "undemocratic" way as a result of a coup or a civil war; 3) "succession" when a procedural decision, taken on the sidelines of the ruling elite, may be formalized through election of a "new leader" or as a purely "intra-party solution"¹.

During a civil war two or more opposing parties, which have army in possession, act within one socio-historical organism. The goal of an army of each opposing sides is to seize territory controlled by an army of the other party and thus establish control and power over the whole country. Considering the latter, we would like to note that transition of state power as a result of civil wars occurs by force of arms.

T. Semenova thinks that: "Management of one of the warring parties (usually the one controlling capital of a country) claims to be a carrier of supreme state power. Often, it is claimed by leaders of both parties. However, a party whose leadership does not consider itself as a carrier of supreme state power seeks to master this power"².

Civil war is a model characterizing a change of a supreme power carrier that takes place in illegitimate, armed way. Classes, social and political powers and ethnic groups may act as a carrier of power.

Under certain conditions, an internal war may be a transition of power from one class (socio-political layer) to another. After the English bourgeois revolution of the XVII century during the Civil War there was a struggle between the bourgeoisie and feudal lords. Each camp had its own government, authorities and army. The result of the fight was a transition from feudal to bourgeois monarchy.

The Spanish Civil War (1936 - 1939) led to a transition of state power from socio-political forces (republicans and socialists), that personified democracy and freedom from dictatorship, to forces which established a military regime. According to B. Frank's opinion, democracy, providing a solid law and order, respect for safety, faith and property of people is not mandatory.³

Civil wars in Rwanda (1963 - 1965) and Burundi (1965 - 1966) are the most striking example of struggle for state power among certain ethnic groups. If the Rwandan state power passed to the Hutu ethnic group, the Burundi government moved to the Tutsi ethnic group.

Angolan Civil Wars (1974 - 1989, 1992 - 1994, 1995 - 1997, 1998 - 2002) are struggle between political forces, representing some ethnic territories and different models of social development. Thus, the FNLA, MPLA, UNITA controlled their ethnic territory, turning it into a citadel. The struggle for power for nearly 30 years ended up with creation of a government of national unity and reconstruction.

Mozambiti Civil War (1975 - 1992) was the result of fight between Marxist (FRELIMO) and anti-government (RENAMO) forces, which were supported by the Soviet Union, Cuba and the United States and South Africa respectively.

Civil war may impel transition of sovereign powers from one fraction (territorial clan, military elite) of a class, socio-political stratum to another fraction.

One example of a power struggle between individual fractions is fighting between Gaius Marius and Sulla, and later between Pompey and Caesar. First civil wars of ancient Rome were caused by power struggle between groups of slave-holders warring between themselves. The victory of Sulla allowed him to

¹ Гуляев, А.Г. (2012). Преемничество как практика воспроизводства власти в «Черной Африке». *Вестник Пермского университета. Политология*, 3, 105.

² Семенова, Т.Н. (2014). *Сущность и формы перехода государственной власти в истории общества: Легитимная смена власти, государственные перевороты, революции, гражданские войны*. Москва: ЛЕНАНД, 139.

³ Ламздорф, В. (1997). Гражданская война в Испании. *Посев*, 6, 14.

establish extraordinary dictator rights without specifying the term of office; it gave him capability to manage all the affairs of state. Caesar defeated him and established in Rome the power of one, perpetual dictatorship and lifelong power.

Another example of a civil war within the same social layer is The war of the Roses in England (1455-1485). It was a war between two rival dynasties - Lancasters and Yorks. The result was the death of both dynasties and coming to power of Tudors, which paved the way to absolutism.

The civil war in Sudan resulted in the overthrow of the coalition government and power was seized by military led by Omar al-Bashir and islamist Hassan al-Turabi, who signed an agreement on the distribution of oil revenues. So, state power passed within one social group.

The civil war in Nigeria (1967-1970) was a struggle between military elites of different ethnic origin; it led to a change of supreme power: the regime of General Johnson Aguiyi-Ironsi (1966) was changed by the regime of Lieutenant-Colonel Yakubu Gowon (1966 - 1975).

The civil war in Tajikistan (1992 - 1997) was a fight between regional clans for redistribution of power in their favor. The main participants were fighting regional clans (Hodzhenzskiyi, Kuliabskiyi, Hysarskiyi, Harmskiyi and Pashyrskiyi) and political parties that personified them (Democratic Party of Tajikistan, "Rastohaz", "Lamy Badahshon").

A change of political regime may be a consequence of transition of state power from one carrier to another after a civil war. The consequences for political regime, as for a set of means and methods of state power implementation, are mostly the dictatorship of political parties or, as an exception, application of democratic principles and political freedoms in the country. An example of the latter is a civil war in the US; there was commitment of government to democratic tendencies, when the most citizens felt themselves a part of the political process. But this is an exception, because conditions of a civil war usually impel ruling elite, which is a carrier of state power, to move away from democratic principles and apply dictatorial methods.

It should also be noted that most of the civil wars of the 1990s finished up at the end of the last decade or early 2000s with political settlement through the mediation of the UN or the African regional/sub-regional organizations. And in some countries (Liberia, Burundi, DRC, Sierra Leone) fragile democracy was established¹. This democracy is based on the support of international or regional/sub-regional organizations, and, as a consequence, is unstable and leaves a threat to turn toward semi-authoritarian regime.

In the country often emerges totalitarian regime that is characterized by presence of only one ideology, formed by a certain social and political movement, political party, ruling elite, a political leader or a charismatic *vozhd*.

One of the types of totalitarian regime, established after transition of power owing to a civil war is an authoritarian regime in which state power is not formed and is not controlled by people. Despite the fact that there are representative bodies, in real life they do not play a significant role, parliament takes decisions elaborated by a ruling elite led by a leader or a group of people. National leader is the chief ideologue of the regime.

Forms of authoritarian regime, which were established after changing of supreme power owing to a civil war, may be the following:

1. Military dictatorships that rely on the army, servicemen are the most organized force in society that has resources of power. For example, during the civil war in Hungary in 1919 a fight power was wage between the Hungarian Communist Party and the Social Democrats, supported by the army with M. Horthy in the lead. Following the resignation of the Soviet government Social Democrats paved the way for establishment of dictatorship of Admiral Horthy.

2. Theocratic regime in which political and state power really belongs to spiritual leaders and religious prescriptions regulate social relations. As an example, we may recall a revolution and a civil war in Iran.

3. Oligarchic regime in which power belongs to some corporate clients. As a rule, existing executive, legislative and judicial structures perform will of comprador bourgeoisie and bureaucracy. Compradors are the part of bourgeoisie, politically and economically dependent on foreign capital, as they are focused on export of raw material resources and practically have no interest in integrated development of national

¹ Кривушин, И.В. (2011). Гражданские войны в Африке в период независимости. *Исторический журнал: научные исследования*, 1, 46-54.

economy. This results in a deep economic crisis, impoverishment of general population and deep confrontation between authorities and population. For countries with such regimes is typical constant political instability, leading to armed struggle - civil war or guerrilla movement (El Salvador, Colombia, Philippines).

4. Vozhdist regime (regime of personal power) is based on the authority of a strong leader. This regime may have the support of people. The basis for emergence of such regimes may be a sense of external threat to a country. Most leaders often use nationalist slogans, ideas about independence or "modernization breakthrough" (quick solving of economic backwardness and poverty) to consolidate population around own power. This consolidates power of a charismatic leader who receives purposefully organized, unconditional and unlimited support. Decisions of such leader are perceived as realization of expectations and hopes of people; his policy aims to achieve strength of a state, expand its territory and fight against internal and external enemies. Broad layers of population are involved in implementation of political events and violence¹. The twentieth century has plenty of such examples: Stalin, Mao Zedong, Fidel Castro.

5. Ethnocracy in which application of discriminatory measures regarding nonprevailing ethnic groups depends on the whims of ruling circles, it ranges from rather severe to mild forms. Representatives of one nonprevailing ethnic minorities suffer stiff discrimination, while representatives of other feel more comfortable. This ambiguous attitude is based on historical stereotypes and myths, negative or neutral perception of various ethnic groups by ruling circles and prevailing ethnic community. Namely examples of Rwanda and Burundi, which had reverse situation: in the first country state power was seized by ethnic majority - the Hutu, while in the other country state power was in the hands of the Tutsi, ethnic minority².

So, a civil war - is an armed struggle for power, as a result of which happens illegitimate transition of state power from one carrier to another (the latter are classes, ethnic groups and social layers or socio-political groups of the same class, social layer, ethnic groups), during which a type of society and political regime may change. Civil war is not only a large-scale confrontation between alternative models of social development, but also a period of acute political struggle, which in its essence is a struggle for supreme state power.

References:

1. Vladimirov, M.V. (2013). Derzhavna vlada v umovakh rozvytku gromadyanskogo suspilstva. *Aktualni problem derzhavnogo upravlinnya*, 2, 46-53.
2. Kistyakovskiy, B.A. (1916). *Sotsialnye nauki i pravo*. Moskva: Izdanie M. i S. Sabashikovykh.
3. Pogorilka, V. (2002). *Organy derzhavnoi vlady Ukrainy*. Kyiv: In-t derzhavy i prava im. V. Koretskogo.
4. Gulyaev, A.G. (2012). Preemnichestvo kak praktika vosproizvodstva vlasti v «Chernoy Afrike». *Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Politologia*, 3, 105.
5. Semenova, T.N. (2014) *Sushnost i formy perekhoda gosudarstvennoy vlasti v istorii obshestva: Legitimnaya smena vlasti, gosudarstvennye perevoroty, revolutsii, grazhdanskije voyny*. Moskva: LENAND.
6. Lamzdorf, V. (1997). Grazhdanskaya vojna v Ispanii. *Posev*, 6, 14.
7. Krivushin, I.V. (2011). Grazhdanskije voyny v Afrike v period nezavisimosti. *Istoricheskij zhurnal: nauchnye issledovanya*, 1, 46-54.
8. Lyubishits, V.Ya. (2005). Gosudarstvennaya vlast: ponyatie, osobennosti funktsionirovaniya. *Ekonomicheskij vestnik Rostovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, Tom 1, 2, 133.
9. Krivushin, I.V. (2009). Ruandiyskiy genotsid: prichiny, kharakter, znachenie. *Pax Africana: kontinent i diaspora v poiskakh sebya*. Moskva: GU VTSE.

¹ Любищиц, В.Я. (2005). Государственная власть: понятие, особенности функционирования. *Экономический вестник Ростовского государственного университета*, Том 1, 2, 133.

² Кривушин, И.В. (2009). Руандийский геноцид: причины, характер, значение. *Pax Africana: континент и диаспора в поисках себя*. Москва: ГУ ВШЭ.