

## **FIVE REASONABLE PEOPLE**

### **THE UNDERLYING STRUCTURE OF MORALITY**

#### **CHAPTER 10 POWER I: SIX KINDS OF POWER**

We find six kinds of power—two sets of three. The first three are accepted in the power literature; the other three are new. This is a long chapter but, at last, power is essentially worked out.

#### **CHAPTER 10 CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION: POWER OVERALL	1
POWER-TO AND POWER-OVER: YZ	3
POWER-WITH ON X	6
GENERAL POWER-TO, -WITH, -OVER	7
INFLUENCE AND DOMINATION: YZ	10
ZERO-SUM: 3s CAN'T BE POWERLESS	12
EMPATHY ON X	14
COMPARING INFLUENCE AND EMPATHY	17
COMPARING GENERAL AND CULTURAL POWER	18
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	20
REFERENCES TO CHAPTER 10	22

#### **INTRODUCTION: POWER OVERALL**

A politics lecturer once remarked to me, “We tell new students that political science is about power and then we never mention the word again.” It is only a small exaggeration.

WOLT could be seen as being all about power. There are the 1s who object to anyone ordering them around, the 2s who want to regulate precisely who can tell whom to do what, the 3s who abhor the very idea of power, the 4s who know that power lies with fate or (much the same thing) with more fortunate people, and the Type 5 who inhabits a non-social reality and over whom no one has any power.

Such generalisations may give some idea of the relationship of power to worldview but they don't illuminate power itself, its structure and interrelationships. In this chapter we use WOLT along with some of the literature to dissect power, identify its parts, and see how they fit together.

Colloquially, we think we know what power is but philosophically it has been intractable. Many prominent academics have tackled it and the picture is blurred.<sup>1</sup> Like leadership, power is a riddle scholars can't quite get a grip on though, as is often the case, we will find WOLT confirms some of the distinctions in the literature.

One thing that does have wide agreement is political scientist Robert Dahl's (1957) statement: "A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do." If we allow B's "doing" includes thinking, this will suffice for our purposes. That is, A has some intended effect on B. A and B are persons or groups.

This describes the power wielded by parents over children, teachers over students, employers over employees, higher military ranks over lower, police officers over civilians, dictators over populations, and so on.

---

<sup>1</sup> Political scientist Keith Dowding (2012) asks, "Why do we have so many different concepts of power? ... why is there so much disputation over the term?" Political theorist Peter Morriss (2002: 124) calls power "a social scientists' equivalent of a philosopher's stone." Says philosopher Amy Allen (2016): "...the literature on power is marked by deep, widespread, and seemingly intractable disagreements over how the term power should be understood." She provides a discussion of historical and current conceptions under "Defining Power" at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2016/entries/feminist-power/>.

Whether A's power helps or hurts B is a separate matter. To help or hurt is a purpose of wielding power and the effect, in any instance, is a moral judgement which (as we will see) will be according to Type. Whether the exercise is good or bad is not, though, immediately relevant to our purpose of seeing the structure of power and how it fits to other social relations.

B might be aware of A's effect, or B might not be aware. Any politically oriented Type 3 will say that a lot of political power is exerted by hidden manipulation, through inculcation of "false consciousness" or "consumerism", and by the subtleties of socialisation during childhood.

Type 1s, too, are wary of the insidious, incipient compulsions of socialisation but are less concerned with changing them. The 1s, being more inclined to AO Hirschman's *exit* than to *voice*, might prefer to give the whole socialisation thing a complete miss. More pragmatically, the 1s want it left up to individuals, meaning that society should be arranged so that individuals can socialise or can stand alone as they choose. That way, they won't be complaining (like the 3s) of being pushed around but will take responsibility for their own lives.

## **POWER-TO AND POWER-OVER: YZ**

In saying that A has power over B we are concerned for "power-over," which is about people, and not "power-to," which is about the material environment. We are not so concerned for the power to use a stone axe or to catch a fish or to read a book or to heal smallpox or to fly to the moon or to otherwise affect and control material nature; we are primarily interested in the power of people *over* people.<sup>2</sup> That

---

<sup>2</sup> Some of the literature says power-to is a sort of higher power which includes power-over. For our purposes power-to is confined to the material realm. Language itself would allow power *to* affect a person, or allow power *over*

said, *power-to* does have social consequences so we will consider it, as well as a third form called *power-with*, before getting into the details of *power-over*.

*Power-to* is almost another term for wealth and wielding it is one means of increasing *power-over*; media advertising and donating to politicians are examples. Conversely, *power-over* can affect *power-to*: should the sale of some products be restricted by law? Should I grant my child more pocket-money?

The distinction between *power-over* and *power-to* is widely recognised in the power literature though much argued over. In the basic forms here described, the two power concepts are in contrast, so we might examine their four logical combinations (“truth values”) to see how their interrelationships fit with WOLT.

It is the firm position of both 1s and 3s to reject power over people, which immediately suggests that *power-over* falls on Z. That will suit the 2s and the 4s since power over people is part of the 2-ist skill-set and for the 4s it is how the world works. If we now set *power-to* on the Y axis these two kinds of power will readily fit the four types (Table 10.1).

**Table 10.1. Power-to and power-over, YZ**

<i>Power-to</i>	Yes	1	2
<i>Y</i>	No	3	4
		No	Yes
		<i>Power-over Z</i>	

Table 10.1 has the 1s wanting only *power-to*; this suits their attitude of being free to utilise bountiful nature; it fits the 3s, rejecting Y, who object to heedless exploitation of fragile nature; and it fits the 4s, also rejecting Y, because nature is a capricious force over which one has no power.

---

material things but here *to* is just material and *over* is just people. German has two different words, *Kraft* and *Macht*, for material and social power.

The 2s, positive for both Y and Z, accept both power-to and power-over, and they make them work in complementary fashion: the greater the power *to* control material things—surveillance technology, helicopter gunships—the greater the power *over* people. And vice-versa: the more personnel allocated to a job, the quicker it will be done; the larger the army commanded, the greater the material impact.

The distinction between *power-to* and *power-over* is plain and its validity is confirmed by its neat fit to WOLT.

### **Economics and the Z axis**

As a generalisation, the study of power-to is economics and the study of power-over is political science. However, it is a poor fit to write *economics* on the Y axis and *political science* on Z. Politics is concerned with all four types, not just the 2s and 4s and, very significantly, economics does not recognise the 2s who, like the 1s, are positive on Y.

Practical economics does concede the need to regulate in order to provide security, to uphold free competition, and to quash insidious cooperation. However, the concession is not to 2-ist hierarchy<sup>1</sup> (though the word does sometimes get used) but to coercive, ad hoc regulation—in effect, to the Z axis directly.

WOLT tells us effective economic regulation requires 2-ism, not just to support trade but to coordinate and balance market with non-market forces. Economics has no theoretical comprehension of this, and reflexively condemns rule-bound bureaucracy as an imposition on the “free market.”

<sup>1</sup> There are, or were, partial exceptions, such as Weber and Pareto, and there is also a substantial literature on bureaucracy.

## POWER-WITH ON X

In recent years, scholarly writing on power seems to have increased and in addition to power-to and power-over, a third kind, *power-with*, has achieved some recognition.<sup>3</sup> *Power-with* is “the power emerging from the collaboration within the group,” say Pansardi and Bindi (2021: 4) And: “the three expressions appear to have crystallized and institutionalized themselves into three different, freestanding notions of power.” That would make sense, as such a *power-with* would fit on the X axis, for the 2s can make good use of such collaborative power while 1s and 4s can have no time for it.

Power-with is not a power *to do* anything or *over* anyone but a power whereby X solidarity counters exploitative power-to (Y) and oppressive power-over (Z). Any situation where people acting together affect an outcome would be a case of power-with. The majority voting in a fair election or referendum is a clear instance. A protest march, a political rally, a workers’ strike, a boycott, a movement against child labour, and a group working for nature conservation would be examples. Power-with is righteous and driven by norms; it is characterised by resistance (“resistance” is a very 3-ist word); no one in particular exercises it; no clear A is affecting any clear B. Its (lack of) efficacy has to be judged in retrospect and may be disputable yet power-with can have society-wide impact. The fall of the Berlin wall in 1989 might be attributed to power-with. An even more history-bending case is the centuries-long exercise of power-with which converted the Roman empire to Christianity.

The collectivist *power-with* opposes individualist *power-to* while authoritative *power-over* enforces a

---

<sup>3</sup> According to Pansardi and Bindi (2021: 2 ), the distinction between power-over and power-with actually stems from the 1930s, predating the distinction power-over versus power-to.

compromise to keep the peace. In democratic politics around the world, the 3-ist left relies on power-with to oppose the right which consists of an alliance of 1s and 2s. If *power-with* has a win, both the others must lose, however there is a silver lining for the 2s because they get to set up and maintain the new rules. Change is uncomfortable for 2s on account of their preference for the tried-and-true and because individuals in the hierarchy, or even whole branches, may suffer. So 2s resist change yet, ultimately, 2-ism carries on.

Regulation of any commercial activity such as gambling, drug manufacture, retirement homes, social media, taxi services, etc is bound to ruin someone's (some 1's) business model but chances are the new rules will increase overall 2-ism. Christian scripture is unrelentingly 3-ist but the Roman church turned norms into rules and became itself very 2-ist.

### **GENERAL POWER-TO, -WITH, -OVER**

We see the three widely recognised concepts, power-to, power-with, and power-over, fit readily on the Y, X, and Z axes. We might call them "general powers" for they apply generally to living organisms. Before venturing into human refinements, let us consider these general powers in evolution and human development.

*Power-to* includes the ability to find, eat and digest other organisms or organic matter and as such it is the basis of all life. In animals it is given by capabilities such as the sense of smell and teeth and the capacity to learn from experience, and in plants by such abilities as turning toward the light, attracting pollinators and poisoning predators.

*Power-with* is prominent in the social insects such as ants and bees which are programmed to forage and build nests and raise their young and fight their enemies collectively. Some *power-with* might also be inferred in social animals when they collect in a herd, combine to bring down prey, make warning signals, oppose an alpha male.

*Power-over* is the power of a parent over its young and it manifests as hierarchy in pack and herd animals.

Human hunter-gatherers' *power-to* lay with their use of tools, weapons and fire, and was enhanced by their ability to inform and learn via speech. They could also negotiate with gods and spirits for help in achieving material needs. As roaming bands of a few dozen they would have practised *power-with* when hunting, fighting, celebrating, and countering *power-over* in the group or tribe.

*Homo sapiens* lived as hunter-gatherers for hundreds of thousands of years. Suddenly, in Eurasia 10,000 years ago, agriculture was adopted and people began to settle and live in one place.<sup>4</sup> The greater *power-to* of agriculture caused populations to expand, increasing the opportunities for *power-over*. As hierarchical differences deepened, aristocracy and slavery evolved, provoking the countering solidarity of *power-with*. Power-with works for people who trust each other and these power expansions began to make it possible for strangers to live together and to accomplish large-scale projects such as irrigation and rampart building and war and empire.

After five thousand years of cropping and grazing and raiding, *power-to* was enhanced by writing. Literacy facilitated account-keeping and communication through distance and time, and it helped spread inventions such as the plough, the bow and arrow, and horses large enough to ride. States and empires developed and around 1000 BCE, give or take a few centuries, communities in Eurasia accumulated sufficient economic surplus<sup>5</sup>—sufficient power-to—to allow literacy to spread—and wide literacy made monotheism possible.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Presumably the root cause of the adoption of agriculture was hunter-gatherer overpopulation.

<sup>5</sup> For Axial economics see Baumard, et al. 2015

<sup>6</sup> This change, named the “Axial Age” by Karl Jaspers,



Scripture in writing acquires permanency. Literacy enables the story of an invisible God, who lives everywhere and nowhere, to be kept stable, inhibiting the splintering of belief into local gods and idols. Belief in an omnipotent, monotheist God who does not negotiate but to whom one submits, became the vehicle enabling 3-ism's power-with to expand beyond the small group where everyone knows everyone personally. This changed the world.

Literacy and monotheism facilitate the rule of large areas allowing the sort of nationalism to arise which we know today. We might say that *power-to* literacy extended *power-with* monotheism, and together they extended *power-over* reign.

For most creatures, the exercise of power is mainly determined by genes and physiology; for humans it is more flexible. This applies to all three of the general powers but in particular, *power-over*—where A gets B to do something B would not otherwise have done—is in humans more complex than the coercion we see in the hierarchies of other social animals. Though power-over in human beings can be violent, most of the time it is not; it is more complex because humans have culture and this is where the power literature thrashes about.

We can now consider our main issue, *power-over*, the form of power which is most of interest to human society. The discussion so far has been a sort of preamble locating the literature's established categories on the WOLT axes. This confirmed them, refined their meanings, and delimited what it is that really needs explaining: power-over in human beings.

---

was an apparently sudden pivot in thinking which occurred from China to Greece to India. It is much disputed.

## INFLUENCE AND DOMINATION: YZ

The way to understand a complex thing is not by trying to define it in words (as the social science literature does) but by identifying its parts and seeing how they interrelate. That's how science does it. To understand a social concept, WOLT tells us to split it into two hypothetical concepts which will deliver four truth values. Then, if the four truth values turn out to be the WOLT four, the two concepts will be correct.<sup>7</sup>

So to proceed we need two contrasting *power-over* concepts. The literature has many, many terms for power types but there is no recognised binary division of power-over. Sociologist David Knoke (1990) offers a distinction which works. After reviewing various authors on power, Knoke declares that “some scheme is necessary to order the diversity” and suggests two kinds of power-over which he calls *influence* and *domination* and from them he forms a table of the four truth values.<sup>8</sup> These four types of power turn out to be the four WOLT types.

*Influence*, says Knoke, is the sort of power the doctor has if you take the medicine he prescribes. He has power because his communication changes your perception and your behaviour. When you freely buy a product, you and the seller have *influence* over each other in the reciprocal deal.

*Domination* is the power of a person who controls you “by offering or withholding some benefit or harm.” (Knoke 1990: 4) That is, the power of a person or

---

<sup>7</sup> This process—splitting a concept into two and examining the four truth values—is demonstrated in Appendix 1 for freedom, justice, human nature, Mother Nature, risk, identity, and managing needs and resources.

<sup>8</sup> Other theorists have noted the division between *influence* and *domination* (using various contrasting terms: soft and hard; money and guns...) but only Knoke formed the four truth values from them. The power literature is unaware of Knoke's analysis.

organisation you obey because you fear their threat or you seek their reward such as with ordinary wage employment. Or you could obey unawares: it would be *domination* if the doctor bore you a grudge and refrained from giving you the prescription, or if the seller deceived you about the product.

Table 10.2 is Knoke's table with the type numbers and the YZ labels added. **1.** Influence without domination (I not D) is *persuasive power*; **2.** I and D is *authoritative power*; **3.** Not I not D is *egalitarian "power"* where the quotation marks indicate that there is no power; and **4.** D not I is *coercive power*.

**Table 10.2. Power-over: influence and domination, YZ**

Influence	Yes	1 <i>persuasive power</i>	2 <i>authoritative power</i>
Y	No	3 <i>egalitarian "power"</i>	4 <i>coercive power</i>
		No	Yes
		Domination Z	

The fit to WOLT is straightforward: the negotiating Type 1 who would persuade you to buy goods or services; 2-ism consisting of obedience which is both willing and backed by force; power-shy 3-ism; and the coercive Type 4 environment. With that, Knoke's four kinds of power are connected to the rest of the moral universe.<sup>9</sup>

Power-over is another (and major) aspect of the pervasive antagonism between 1s and 3s; they both reject *domination*, however each accuses the other of

---

<sup>9</sup> Knoke mentions Linton but does not inspect the four truth values from Linton's social *role* and social *status* (Appendix 1 footnote 6). Had he done so he may have been astonished to find them the same as the four he formed from power—and then further astonished to notice that Linton's two statuses and Knoke's two kinds of power are direct concomitants (both use the Y and Z dimensions) and are, in that sense, the same. Knoke also mentions *roles* and *status* but, apparently unaware of psychology's two competing self-identity theories of *role-identity* and *social-identity* (Appendix 1), he doesn't use them to discover that the four truth values from them, too, are the same four.

practising *domination*. The 3s perceive *influence* to be *domination* because they regard it as one-sided, the classic instance being the rich capitalist who may choose to invest money, whereas the impoverished worker is compelled to invest his body. For their part, the 1s see 3-ist collectivism as conformity and its normative constraints on bargaining to be a form of non-negotiable *domination*, stifling freedom and stunting the economy.

### **ZERO-SUM: 3s CAN'T BE POWERLESS**

We have plugged Knoke's distinction into WOLT and found it fits. Table 10.2 would have it that when there is no influence and no domination, power vanishes entirely; we know, though, the 3s are not powerless. We already located collective *power-with* on the X axis and everyday life tells us that, as the political left, the 3s are often effective. So in Knoke's scheme, the 3s must have a power to match that of 1-ist *influence* and it must lie on the X axis—which does not appear in Table 10.2.

When discovering WOLT issues, a question of what to put on a third axis often crops up: we have two concepts on two axes and we ask what might fit on the third. The answer can be illuminating<sup>10</sup> but often there does not seem to be a specific contrasting word for the third axis. This is usually of no consequence, especially if the two axes we know are Y and X and we are wondering about Z. Z doesn't need a specific word because a YX contradiction is usually resolved with the 2s' universal solvent of rules and authority—i.e., power-over.

Here we have Y and Z and since we know the 3s aren't powerless we might ask: What is the power on X exercised by the 3s? However there is a further, fundamental reason which actually makes it necessary

---

<sup>10</sup> Illuminating answers as to what goes on the third axis occurred with *equality* and *status*. For numerous examples of two axes only see Appendix 2.

to ask what goes on the third axis. It is that *Power-over* has a special property which no other axial issue possesses: it is “zero-sum.” It has to go somewhere; it cannot, so to speak, be created or destroyed.

*Power-to* applies to material things and *power-over* applies to people. The former is unlimited; the latter is not. *Power-to* includes the realm of the natural sciences, and the total amount of it, and the amount available to individuals, increases with knowledge and technology. In industrial society, and probably in human existence overall, the power to affect our physical environment is ever-increasing. The total amount of *power-to* knows no limit.<sup>11</sup>

By contrast, the total amount of available *power-over* is limited by the number of people available. In any particular circumstance, *power-over* is “zero-sum;” there is a fixed amount and what one person or group has, another cannot have.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Is *power-with* also unlimited? It can have an enormous effect yet it is sometimes hard to detect its effects, let alone try to quantify it.

<sup>12</sup> There is an extensive literature on whether power is zero-sum but since it doesn't clearly distinguish *power-over* from the other two kinds, the argument depends on word meanings and can come to no clear result. Also, much power discussion is normative and, in the 3-ist context of academic social science, the idea of zero-sum is not nice, so it can be seen as a defect. Zero-sum is implicit in polemics which assert that one section of society should, or should not, have power over another, e.g., Marx and Engels *The Communist Manifesto*, C Wright Mills *The Power Elite*, Joseph Schumpeter *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*.

Modern 1s like to point out that the beauty of the free market is that it is not zero-sum, that it is “win-win” whereby mutually beneficial dealing makes everyone better off. But they mean better off in material terms, i.e., *power-to*. The *power-over* remains zero-sum and the 1s' striving for esteem necessarily means some will increase their *influence* and others will decrease.

This is obvious in politics where in order for some people and parties to win, others must miss out. At any moment there is a certain number of people over whom power can be held and this limited quantity of available power will be shared. In the extreme case of social breakdown, the 2-ist government's loss of power-over will be taken up by warlords (1s), revolutionaries (3s), or hoodlums (4s).

The zero-sum nature of *power-over* is particularly clear at the level of the individual person. If party A wins office it has power over me and party B has not. I represent a certain modicum of power. Many others also have power over me. I have a certain amount of power over myself while the rest of me is subject to the power of others: the government, my boss, my spouse, my children, my neighbour, even my dog. A stranger in the street has some *influence* and in exceptional circumstances, *domination*.

If I quit my job my boss will cease to have power over me and then others' power—my own, my spouse's, my children's, etc—will expand to fill the vacuum. I have power over them, too, and it is evident that our social relations are a web of power. Our every relationship—every friendship, every alliance, every obligation—is to some extent a relationship of power-over.

But what sort of power-over is this? Y axis *Influence*? Occasionally perhaps, but my relationship with my friends is not characterised by deal-making. Z axis *Domination*? It is not feasible for me to relate, to any significant extent, to my spouse and children via threat and reward.

## **EMPATHY ON X**

If 3-ism is the absence of both *influence* and *domination* power, and if power-over is zero-sum, there must be a Type 3 power. This power on the X axis designating relations in a 3-ist environment has to be something accepted by the 2s and rejected by the 1s and the 4s. That is, WOLT requires that this X-factor

be in conflict with *influence* on Y, and that the 2s resolve the conflict with *domination*.

I suggest *empathy* as a name for X axis power. This seems to be an appropriate word for an ideal 3-ist group (sect, cult) where everyone is similar so there is no need to *influence* or to *dominate* because everyone knows the right thing to say and do. It also seems to be the appropriate word for the web of power which binds friends and family.

Table 10.3 sets out the axial relationships. Empathy on X suits the hierarchical 2s, who need empathy in order that people pull together toward a common goal. In a hierarchy there are no horizontal—peer to peer—connections (Ch. 1) so a team of equal rank will need empathy to be effective.

**Table 10.3. Influence and empathy, YX**

<i>Influence</i>	Yes	1	2
<b>Y</b>	No	4	3
		No	Yes
		<i>Empathy X</i>	

It suits the 1s, negative on X, who must reject empathy because it would perturb negotiation and cause misjudgement. Empathy in the form of nepotism, or an old-boy network, subverts honest dealing. In the real world, empathy has a way of creeping into the 1-ist environment where it is considered collusion.<sup>13</sup>

The 4s also reject empathy for they do not believe there really is such a thing; they will deem its appearance to be empty words or trickery and in their world this mistrust will be confirmed daily.

---

<sup>13</sup> Said Adam Smith: “People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices.” (*The Wealth of Nations*, Book I, Ch X, Part II, para. 27)

The power literature does not mention “empathy” and inasmuch as it is implied it would be subsumed under *influence* or *domination*. In the literature, nepotism would be considered a form of *influence*, while collusion to rig prices would be seen as a kind of *domination*, so the idea of *empathy* would not arise. But these are category errors for nepotism and price rigging are acts of cooperation, not acts of competition or of coercion—however much they may be intended to compete with, or coerce, others. This is a nice illustration of how WOLT can discipline thinking.

It is not immediately obvious that people considerate of each other and being mutually helpful is a form of power. It becomes obvious if it is withheld. Ostracism (“sent to Coventry,” the “silent treatment”) is its crude exercise but the possibility of withholding (or merely disapproving) is constantly implicit in our ordinary helpful or friendly actions. Zero-sum power-over is a sort of fluid; it cannot disappear; it flows back and forth between people and groups, with circulating currents and eddies of empathy, influence and domination.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> The power literature doesn’t know the *domination*, *influence* and *empathy* dimensions but international relations experts do. Here are Princeton and Harvard professors, Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, Jr.: “The Trump administration misses a major dimension of power. Power is the ability to get others to do what you want. This goal can be accomplished by coercion, payment, or attraction. The first two are hard power; the third is soft power. In the short term, hard power usually trumps soft power, but over the long term, soft power often prevails. Joseph Stalin is thought to have once mockingly asked, ‘How many divisions does the Pope have?’ But the Soviet Union is long gone, and the papacy lives on. ...

“Power has three dimensions, and by ignoring attraction, Trump is neglecting a key source of American strength. In the long run, it is a losing strategy.”

<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/united-states/end-long->



## COMPARING INFLUENCE AND EMPATHY

Ideally, *empathy* power, like *influence* power, is symmetric between people. *Domination* will taint *empathy* where a person is consciously afraid of disobeying norms, just as it taints *influence* where bargaining is under duress. The 1s with their taste for the reciprocal cut and thrust of competition (e.g., in small business and individual sports) will relish the flows of *influence* power and will retreat (*exit*) from situations where they see disadvantage through domination. The 3s with their taste for harmony (e.g., in teaching and health professions) cannot retreat; they do not want people driven by threat and promise and will disagree (*voice*) with it.

We should be careful with vocabulary. For our purposes, *influence* on Y excludes not only threat or compulsion but also any genuine friendliness (often violated in the real world), and is confined to above-board, out-on-the-table impersonal proposals, deals, and exchange of favours.<sup>15</sup> That means *influence* would be communications taking the typical Type 1 form of: “Do this for it is in your interests...”

Correspondingly, *empathy*, the power of the 3s, cannot include agreement for a reciprocal deal. Nor, in theory, may it include that form of domination which is the deliberate exclusion of certain people or certain topics. In the real world this occurs in 3-ist groups because cliques and leaders do arise and agenda setting is a way to exercise power. This is associated with egalitarianism’s endemic problem of having no mechanism of internal discipline to maintain solidarity and purity, other than by demonising the outside world and threatening exclusion or expulsion. The Salem witch trials, “cancel culture,” and denigration or

---

american-century-trump-keohane-nye?s=EDZZZ005ZX

Most WOLT issues concern how we live together *within* society; power relations also exist *between* societies.

<sup>15</sup> It was this impersonal interaction that struck economist Sam Bowles—see Appendix 4.

deletion on social media are examples of domination stemming from intolerance of people and actions deemed impure or unacceptable.

### Remarks on sub-issues

We have taken a Z relational issue, *power-over* and we have split it into issues on all three axes. This can also be done with the Y issue, *just process* (Appendix 1). The pattern of these issues being divided into sub-issues is as follows:

#### **Justice** divides as

X just outcome, Y just process, Z due process;  
then **Y just process** divides as  
X restorative, Y adversarial, Z inquisitorial.

#### **Power** divides as

X power-with, Y power-to, Z power-over;  
then **Z power-over** divides as  
X empathy, Y influence, Z domination

The sub-issues are the XYZ components of the original broader Y or Z issue. These examples, *just process* and *power-over*, are the only known instances but presumably, in principle, any axial issue might be split into sub-issues and perhaps sub-issues might be divided into sub-sub-issues.

The four truth values which any two axial issues or sub-issues deliver must be the WOLT four because these four are all that exist; axial issues are ultimately subjective preferences and a consistent social person can only prefer (or adhere to or believe in) one of the four WOLT types of worldview and social structure.

## COMPARING GENERAL AND CULTURAL POWER

The fit of the two sets of three kinds of power on the WOLT axes are summarised in Table 10.4. The three general kinds, well established in the academic literature, are kinds of power found throughout the

living world; power-with and power-to are potentially unlimited, although in non-humans, they are limited by instinct, emotion and physiology. Power-over is zero-sum, intrinsically limited by the number of social individuals in the society. The three kinds of cultural power which make up power-over, are mainly human and rational and physiology is less important.

**Table 10.4 General power and cultural power-over**

	<b>X (Type 3)</b>	<b>Y (Type 1)</b>	<b>Z</b>
<b>General power:</b>	<b><i>power-with</i></b>	<b><i>power-to</i></b>	<b><i>power-over</i></b>
<i>Examples:</i>	material / social social insects	material <i>Kraft</i> all organisms	social <i>Macht</i> social animals
<i>Held by:</i>	equal distributn	individual	indiv and group
<i>Source:</i>	true heart	technical skill	strength, rank
<i>Extent:</i>	no limit?	no limit	zero-sum
<b>Cultural p-over:</b>	<b><i>empathy</i></b>	<b><i>influence</i></b>	<b><i>domination</i></b>
	via norms	via persuasion	v rules, coercion

*Empathy* and *power-with* are both on the X axis. What is the difference between them? *Power-with* is that collective power which counters *power-to* on Y and *power-over* on Z. It is the power of the herd or flock or crowd. *Empathy* is the X part of *power-over*, the part which, as norm-driven expectation, counters deal-making *influence* on Y and the reward and punishment of *domination* on Z. *Power-with* is not directed at anyone in particular but *empathy* is targeted; it is a *power over* some other person. *Power-with* is righteous and overt, exerted in public and en masse; *empathy* is love, discreet, and scarcely noticed unless withheld. *Empathy* is private and personal; *power-with* is public and impersonal.

The X and Y axial properties are also the properties of Types 3 and 1 (in humans). The Z axis, where the 4s are trapped, is operated by the 2s who employ all the kinds of power including an exclusive franchise to exercise the *domination* form of *power-over*. Though both 1s and 3s claim to reject power-over, each perceives the other to be exercising power. The 3s say *influence* leads to exploitation and inequality; the 1s say *empathy* imposes conformity and restricts freedom.

It is common for the power literature to make the general assertion that power is ubiquitous and pervades social relations. WOLT shows which kind of power is applied by whom, to whom, in what circumstances, to what end. The terms here (and a great many more) can be found in the literature so the categories themselves are known; but the connections are missing and so category meanings are fuzzy. Discussion is mainly of which scholars have said what and who agrees or disagrees with whom. It tends to be quite abstract, very rarely contains illustrative examples, and is sometimes normative. Scholars muse on different kinds of power and occasionally express opinions on the connection to other concepts, such as freedom. By contrast, the WOLT framework objectively determines available kinds of power and how which kind of power relates to which kind of freedom—as well as to which kind of equality, justice, self-identity, human nature and dozens of other issues which make up social life.

How complete is the WOLT schema of Table 10.4? We have split the Z axis property of power-over into three components; might there be further sets of power kinds that go on the axes? The subdividing of an axial issue into two (or three) new issues has no limit in principle. And if the resulting four truth values turn out to be the WOLT types then the new issues are a valid categorisation. The scheme of Table 10.4 might be accepted as complete if all the descriptions of power in the literature fit to one or more of the six WOLT kinds. If any do not, then there might be further sub-kinds.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The widely recognised division of power into *power-to* (achieve material ends) and *power-over* (people) fits on the Y and Z axes and the less well-known but long-standing *power-with* (solidarity and activism) fits on X. These three forms of power are found in the animal kingdom though power-over would be mainly confined to social animals. In humans, 1-ist power-to

is potentially unlimited as is perhaps 3-ist power-with. Our main interest is power-over which is limited by the number of individuals in the society; this makes power-over zero-sum.

In a given situation, there is a certain amount of *power-over* available and what one individual has, or one group has, another must lack. In humans, the 1s and 3s reject *Z power-over* people though they each accuse the other of it. Though their mutual accusations are biased, the 1s and 3s are not powerless over people; they share, with the 2s, in the available zero-sum power-over.

They share *power-over* because power-over can itself be divided into three: *domination* on Z, *influence* on Y, and *empathy* on X. So 1-ism and 3-ism each practise *power-over* in their own way, in the form of *influence* in 1-ist bargaining, and *empathy* in 3-ist concord. As ever, *Z domination* in the form of rules about punishments and incentives is the key to compromise between the Y and X kinds of *power-over* and, as ever, all three forms of *power-over* sustain the 2-ist hierarchy.

The six kinds of power are summarised in Table 10.4.

We owe the division of *power-over* into *influence* and *domination* to Knoke (1990) who is not cited in the power literature. In forming the four truth values from these two concepts, Knoke just wanted an orderly framework and did not realise he had stumbled on the universal structure of morality and social relations. Some theorists distinguish two kinds of power corresponding to Knoke's but he appears to be the only one who formed the four truth values.

Knoke's distinction of convenience did not suggest any further kinds. It is WOLT's 3D framework that suggests looking for a third kind to fit the X axis. And it is the zero-sum nature of power-over, whereby all social interaction implies balanced losses and gains in power-over, that *requires* there to be a third kind of power to match Knoke's two—which I have called

*empathy*. *Empathy* power and *power-with* are both on the X axis; *empathy* is private; *power-with* is public.

Conventional writing on power would subsume empathy under influence and domination but, once pointed out, the distinctive nature of empathy is plain. *Influence* appeals to self-interest, *empathy* exerts power through norms of togetherness, *domination* commands through threat and promise.

The 1s and 3s each aver that a major feature of their way of life is rejection of power over people and ideally no one should have it. At the same time, the 1s and 3s accuse each other of practising devious power-over, namely that *influence* leads to exploitation and inequality and that *empathy* imposes conformity and limits freedom. Overall, 1-ist influence and 3-ist empathy drive society with 2-ist domination moderating their rivalry.

Thus does WOLT sort out the nature of power, identifying the different kinds and who employs them, and showing their fit with all other issues we must take into account in order to be social. □

## REFERENCES TO CHAPTER 10

- Allen, Amy, "Feminist Perspectives on Power", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.)
- Baumard, Nicolas, Alexandre Hyafil, Ian Morris, and Pascal Boyer. 2015. "Increased Affluence Explains the Emergence of Ascetic Wisdoms and Moralizing Religions." *Current Biology* 25: 10-15.
- Dahl, Robert. 1957. "The Concept of Power." *Behavioral Science* 2(3), 201-215.
- Knoke, David. 1990. *Political Networks: The Structural Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Morriss, Peter. 2002. *Power: A Philosophical Analysis*, 2nd Ed. Manchester University Press.