

Olena Mezhenska

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

COUP AS A VIOLENT FORM OF POLITICAL STRUGGLE

Political sphere is riddled with power struggle and, in the most cases, during this struggle the policy is based not on persuasion, but on force. One kind of political power struggles is a coup. A brief analysis of the essence of political phenomena, as a "political violence" and "coup" leads to the conclusion that a coup is a type of violent forms of political struggle. Despite the large number of diverse democratic and peaceful forms of political struggle, violence is still used in power struggles. Being technically illegal and legally unacceptable form of political struggle for power, a coup is, unfortunately, one of the common forms of direct action, which leads either to a radical restructuring or the elimination of the current government.

Key words: politics, political struggle, forms of political struggle, political violence, coup.

The circumstances of social and political life increasingly affect the interests of the citizens, and make us be more attentive to politics as a special kind of activity. The most different and sometimes contradictory associations and people's reactions are connected with politics. The content of the politics, on the one hand, is a very moral and creative activity that is based on the understanding of politics as statecraft to achieve justice, social order and stability. On the other hand, politics is an activity of individuals, aimed at the conquest, distribution and retention of power with egoistic purposes to assert own will in social, economic, cultural and other relations, despite the resistance. There are a variety of approaches to define this term (functional, communicative, directive, etc.) in the scientific dictionaries and special literature. However, the politics, which mainly relies on force, rather than on persuasion, describes directive (force) approach.

As a general, the essence of the investigated phenomenon significantly reveals in its scientific definition. Thus, with the term "power struggle" is most commonly associated term "political struggle". Consider some concepts of "political struggle", the authors of which are foreign and domestic philosophers, sociologists, politicians.

Conflictology dictionary, edited by A. Antsupov and A. Shipilova, defines politics as a form of political activity, which is in cooperation and confrontation between different political forces and organizations (parties, unions, armed groups, etc.), aimed at acquisition, preservation, consolidation, reversion or alteration a specific procedure of distribution of property and power, achieving a sustainable position in the political system and the complete extrusion the opponent from the political space¹. A.Borsch under the political struggle means "complex socio-political phenomenon, aimed at the conquest of power by certain political groups (classes) in order to achieve certain political, economic, military and other interests"². Y. Petrunina and M. Panov believe that political struggle is a kind of political cooperation, where people demonstrate their aspirations to the same resources of power, on the same status positions in the political hierarchy, the right to influence the large sector of the people, including through the dissemination of certain political values³. A. Pobochniy considers that "political struggle is based on contradictory of objective political interests of different social groups, classes, nations, etc. and political struggle is carried out in respect to the conquest and distribution of state power"⁴.

The analysis of these concepts brings us to the conclusion that the political struggle is a confrontation between social groups, pursuing their own political purposes (to preserve power, consolidate power or offer to society a new power in the state). The political struggle is conducted not only for the ideas, views about

1 Анцупов, А.Я., Шипилов, А.И. (2006). *Словарь конфликтолога*. 2-е изд. Санкт-Петербург: Питер, 315.

2 Борщ, А. (2013). Политическая борьба в современном мире. *Сравнительная политика*, 3(13), 70-74.

3 Политология. Словарь по обществознанию (2006). <<http://politike.ru/dictionary/885/word/politicheskaja-borba>> (2014, december, 14).

4 Побочий, И.А. (2008). *Политическая борьба как форма взаимодействия социальных сил в условиях утверждения государственности современной Украины*: автореф. дис. на соискание учен.степени доктора полит.наук: спец. 23.00.02 – «Политические институты и процессы». Киев.

the structure of the state and society, but also for the real status and position in the power structure. It is important to note, that the political power struggle is appropriated in a stable society, and in society in times of crisis.

Wide ranges of means are used in this struggle. These means in political and scientific community are accepted to differentiate for several reasons, the main among which is: a) the principle of legality (legitimacy). That is, a struggle, that takes place in the form of the corresponding provisions of the law – a legitimate, and illegitimate – which does not meet the legal and ethical norms and regulations in the particular society, accordingly; b) by the forms and methods of achieving the goal. Forms of political struggle submit to its goals and objectives.

Historical experience shows that there are peaceful (nonviolent) and non-peaceful (violent) nature of any form of political struggle. The nature of the political struggle is determined by using means and methods of struggle.

Nonviolent actions of political struggle are dominated in the political sphere and they constitute the norm of political life. Nonviolent (peaceful) forms of political struggle are: family heritage (succession); elections; parliamentary activity; parliamentary struggle (open to the public, open conflict of opinions and political programs of competing parties) and extra parliamentary struggle (agitation and propaganda); public events (meetings, rallies, marches, picketing); mass action (demonstrations, civil disobedience acts, strikes)¹.

When there is a violation of the existing social order and the conflict of opposing forces reaches an extreme peak, the political struggle results in violent actions² and can be carried out in a very acute form using direct physical compulsion and the means of violence (various forms of isolation, persecution, murder). The most typical forms of violent political struggle in the field of power relations are wars, revolutions, counter-revolutions, armed revolts, rebellions, putsches, coup.

War is a method of resolving contradictions of social status between states, nations by the organized armed struggle to achieve certain political goals³. The difference in wars is reflected in their political and technical aspects. The political aspect involves political reasons and purpose of war. Civil war is characterized by the organization of the armed struggle for political power between different social and political forces, social stratum and groups⁴.

Revolution is a violent method of principal changes of political system, which is carried out in the course of class struggle, who are striving to win political dominance.

As a result, revolution is aimed at creating a public integrity, which corresponds to the interests of the dominant class⁵.

Counter-revolution is the reaction of the class which is overthrowing or already deposed class to revolution, in the form of the struggle for the repression of the new power and restoration of the past social order. Counter-revolution accompanies any revolution, because the ruling class does not response power in hands voluntarily.

Revolt is armed opposition to governmental power of hostile forces, aimed at the conquest of power, changing the form of state rule or separating the territory⁶. Revolt is the action or state of armed, open resistance to political power or functioning government.

Rebellion – is the open insurgency warfare of a certain class or social group against the current political power, ruling classes, national and religion oppression⁷.

Coup this is changing of the dominant policy elite to opposition political elite. The literal meaning of “coup d'état” is a sudden attack on the government, and in a broad sense, the expulsion of the rulers (Kings,

1 Борщ, А. (2010). Формы политической борьбы. *Обозреватель-observer*, 12, 49-59.

2 Nieburg, H. (1990). *Violence. Behavioral Process*. New York, 16.

3Макар, Ю.І., Докаш, О.Ю., Лаврук, Т.П. (2010). *Політологія: навчальний посібник*. Чернівці: Чернівецький нац. уні-т., 453.

4 Борщ, А. (2010). Формы политической борьбы. *Обозреватель-observer*, 12, 54.

5 Бляхер, Л.Е. и др. (2008). *Концепт «Революция» в современном политическом курсе*. Санкт Петербург: Алетейя, 79.

6 Кирилюк, Ф.М., Конверський, А.С., Білик, В.Ф. (2004). *Політологія*. Київ: Київський нац. ун-т ім. Т. Шевченка.

7 Кирилюк, Ф.М., Конверський, А.С., Білик, В.Ф. (2004). *Політологія*. Київ: Київський нац. ун-т ім. Т. Шевченка.

Presidents, Regents, etc. together with their supporters)¹. The nature of the coup, its political orientation, depends on what political forces commit a coup, for what purpose it done and whose interests they defend.

A brief analysis of these terms leads to the conclusion that irrespective of used methods, the aims of political struggle are: a) advance to power or the establishment of a new socioeconomic or political system; b) removal from power of certain political force (group, leader) without changing the existing state system. The above mentioned forms of political struggle lead to state that the violent methods of struggle, as well as non-violent, are quite diverse.

The usage or direct threat of usage the “various forms, methods and means of direct or non-direct coercion or repression (political, economic, military and other) relating to the other groups, classes, states and social systems, aiming to the conquest and retention of power and strive for economic rule, the acquire and preserve of the independence and sovereignty of the different kinds of rights and privileges, meet the territorial and other claims, limit interests of counter-party, impose will on somebody”² is an integral part of political struggle from ancient times until now.

Violence as a form of struggle in the arsenals of those who are trying to achieve certain goals using any means and methods. The founder of political ideology – “Machiavellianism” that neglects the moral standards and rules of law in order to achieve power, N. Machiavelli in his struggle rules confirmed that: “to achieve purpose, all means should be used, including amoral... if only to justify the results... Deals are judged by purpose (whether it is achieved), not by means (how it is achieved)... Acquire the state, it is necessary commit all strong measures at ones, in order to repeat them every day... It is better to kill than to threaten, – threat – is to create and warn the opponent, kill- to alienate from the opponent completely”³. The same point of view expressed French writer A. Camus: “The revolt expelled God from heaven. God is dead, people are remaining, Id Est, the history, which should be built. It can be built using any means...”⁴.

World and national historiography confirm the accuracy of the above mentioned. That’s exactly is why, the problem of political violence has become the object of close attention for such thinkers as Heraclitus, Thucydides, Grotian, Aristotle, Platon, N. Machiavelli, I. Kant, F. Gegel, M. Weber, P. Sorokin, K. Marx, F. Engels, V. Lenin, R. Beyli, L. Kozer and others.

The problem of the violence researches in politics has not lost its relevance in our time. H. Arendt, B. Pauell, K. Gadzhiev, A. Dmitriev, I. Zalisin, A. Kugay, I. Lipatov consider the problem of political violence, in power relations context. Among Ukrainian researchers of this problem are A. Bobrova, V. Ostruhova, V. Kremenyuk, A. Doroshenko and others. The objects of research for these scientists are reasons and conditions of using and the escalation of violence in politics, the nature and essence of political violence, the nature and variety of political violence.

In the modern period of political science development, there are several concepts, which determine political violence, the main distinguishing feature in understanding the essence of political violence are the following terms: physical force, physical and psychological coercion, limitation of freedom, damages, etc.

For example, A. Pidzhakov, E. Van den Haag hold the opinion that political violence is “physical coercion, which is used as a means of imposing the will of the subject with the aim of acquirement power, principally, the state power, its usage, distribution and protection”⁵. A. Kugay proposes to understand political violence as “repression or forced limitation of the free agency of the social subject, due to the actions of social forces, aimed at political power, its performing, confirming the terms socio-political ideal”⁶. In the opinion of I. Lipatova, political violence is nothing more, than “ideological and material determined activity of classes, nations, social groups and social institutes, which realize their goal, oriented to using means of enforcement, aimed at the conquest, retention and using of state power, achievement of

1 Кравченко, А. (2009). *Политология: учебник*. Москва: Проспект, 367, 376.

2 Денисов, В.В. (1997). *Социология насилия (критика современных буржуазных концепций)*. Москва: Политиздат, 6-7.

3 Макиавелли, Н. (1982). Государь Оригинальное издание: *Макиавелли Н. Избранные произведения*. Москва: Худ. лит. <lib.ru/POLITOLOG/МАКИАВЕЛЛИ/gosudar.txt> (2014, october, 24).

4 Камю А. Бунтующий человек. *Библиотека Якова Кротова*. <http://krotov.info/library/11_k/am/u_2.htm> (2014, december, 27).

5 Пиджаков, А.Ю. (2002). Сущность политического насилия. *Теоретический журнал CREDO NEW*. <<http://credonew.ru/content/view/274/64>> (2014, december, 21).

6 Кугай, А. (1993). *Природа политического насилия и его роль в современном мире: автореф. дисс. ... канд. филос. наук*. Москва.

political rule, management of social processes in the interests of classes”¹. From the above definitions may be noted that the authors agree that political violence cannot be understood without connection with such political phenomenon as political power.

Political power as an object of political struggle, usually, belongs to the financial capital, and the concentration of persons, who make economic decisions and strive for comprehensive political power, is ever increasing and are unamenable to governmental regulation, create conflict and violence in the social and political relations.

Famous American politic B. Franklin rightly observed, “There are two passions, which have a powerful influence on human affairs. This is the love of power and the love of money ... When they are joined ... they produce the most violent action”².

The question of conquest of power, power shift or redistribution of power has always been a major issue in any community. One of the most common form of direct action, which leads to changing of government, not government policy, is a coup – it is a form of political struggle, which is, formally, illegal and unallowable in the legal sense.

Despite the considerable amount of scientific researches, devoted to the problem of political violence, at the present time there are not scientific studies, the subject matter of which is coup as one of the violent form of political struggle. Coup as a form of political violence is mentioned in some typologies³ or historical materials, at the best case.

Violent methods of conquest of power or change the dominant elite were quite frequent political phenomenon as early as in primitive tribes, when the political power was gained using ordinary club. The nature and mechanism of conquest of power in state in the Cretan-Mycenaean period (XIII-XII century B. C. E. and VIII century B. C. E.), in the Warring States Period of Ancient China (VII – III century B. C. E.), in the Ancient Greece (VI- first half of IV century B. C. E.), in Rome, Greece, Macedonia, Asia Minor and other regions (the latter half of IV – II century B. C. E.) vary in accordance with certain circumstances, but the common features are either violence or deceit. In such case, “to the physical violence is resorted or direct from the beginning, or applying a coerced further”⁴.

In the Middle Ages, relatives or representatives of the pressure groups (court nobility or dynastic) with the purpose of implementation of mercantile aims, in well-organized struggle, removed from power existent leaders by illegal manner (Kings, Emperors) through the agency of limited violence or the threat of violence. In the context of the conspiracy theory in history, R. Epperson indicated that “the contenders for power will always press forward, intentionally set off the depressions, in order to meet their desires of great power and even can inflict harm to people, making wars, coups and revolutions”⁵.

In new history and contemporary history, a coup as a way of removal of power, which is not able to ensure realizing of political and socioeconomic civil rights, on the one hand, has become as a means of obtaining certain rights and freedoms and, on the other hands, is a single way to structural changes in society.

However, coups have occurred in contravention of the Constitution and used illegal methods, which “have led to bloodshed and destroyed any order and involved society in the chaos, resorting to violent means”⁶.

¹ Липатов, И.М. (1989). *Сущность и основные формы политического насилия в современных условиях (философско-социологический анализ)*: автореф. дисс. ... канд. филос. наук. Москва.

² Эпперсон Р. Невидима рука. Взгляд на историю как на заговор. *Электронная библиотека bookZ.ruc*. <http://bookz.ru/authors/ral_f-epperson.html> (2014, december, 19).

³ Липатов, И.М. (1989). *Сущность и основные формы политического насилия в современных условиях (философско-социологический анализ)*: автореф. дисс. ... канд. филос. наук. Москва; Пиджаков, А.Ю. (2002). Сущность политического насилия. *Теоретический журнал CREDO NEW*. <<http://credonew.ru/content/view/274/64>>(2014, december, 21); Боброва, А.Г. (2005). *Основні форми сучасного політичного насилля*: дис. ... канд.політ.наук. Київ.

⁴ Аристотель (1983). *Политика. Сочинения в 4-х томах. Т. 4*. Москва: Мысль, АН СССР, Ин-т философии, 53-294.

⁵ Эпперсон Р. Невидима рука. Взгляд на историю как на заговор. *Электронная библиотека bookZ.ruc*. <http://bookz.ru/authors/ral_f-epperson.html> (2014, december, 19).

⁶ Гоббс, Т. (1989). *Сочинения в 2-х томах. Т. 1. Философское наследие*. Москва: Мысль, 107, 248-255.

Analyzing coups, Italian researcher K. Malaparte noted, that to secure a victory in coup, precipitate the course of events, is possible only if forget about the legitimacy and use violence¹. According to the American political scientist E. Luttwak, only certain strategy and tactics using violence, promote successful coups². The modern researcher O. Galustyan also attends to the fact, that “coups are accompanied by significant amount of human losses or repressions of the dissentients after a coup”³.

Noted, that, in spite of the existence of different ways of democratic struggle for power, a coup as a violent way to the conquest of power is, unfortunately, one of the common ways of struggle today (2006 – Turkmenistan⁴, 2008 – Guinea⁵ and other). In some cases, coups are only based on armed power, but the serious armed struggle is absent. In other cases – violent armed conflicts are occurring, accompanied by bloodshed. If the coup initially flows peacefully, but when some political force comes to power, based on force structures and secret services, coup is finished using violence (repressions, economic measures) and neglecting the constitution. A Coup as the political importance process is characterized by open negative and even pejorative content.

Take note of the original meaning of the “coup”. In the encyclopedic dictionaries of political science and jurisprudence, may be found several nearly identical definitions of the coup. In their interpretation, a coup is the one of forms of violent conquest of power by some of political force, in the process of power struggle, which exceeds legitimacy. A specific feature of the coup is actions of a narrow group of conspirators, aimed at changing the subject of political power⁶. The conflictology dictionary, edited by A. Antcupov and A. Shipilova, explains the coup as “conquest of governmental power through conspiracy or open armed rebellion. The aim of the coup is changing of state administration or overthrow of a government of supreme power and shift of power to others”⁷. There is one more definition of the coup, suggested by the modern Ukrainian scientist P. Shlyakhtun, who states, “the coup is violent or committed in an unconstitutional way, conquest of governmental power”⁸. Based on a range of definitions for the term “coup”, also, on the fact analysis of this phenomenon in history, we provide our definition. A coup is an unconstitutional form of changing ruling power in the context of politico-social, economic instability, which is accomplished momentary using violent methods, and means of struggle, organized group of people under the guidance of charismatic leader, aimed to the conquest of power or change the political power in the certain state. Consequently, a coup, in content, is conquest, a redistribution of power through the replacement of the ruler and/or ruling class/ elite; a coup, in form, is violent, committed in contravention of the constitution, laws and moral, the replacement of the ruler, or ruling class.

Comparing terms “political violence” and “coup”, the last – a coup, in the given context, is a type of political violence and is a common form of political violence. It should be given due attention to types of political violence in accordance with the existing typology, and determine to which types of political violence can be referred a coup.

There are different typologies of political violence in political science. The basis for classification of political violence is a variety of criteria for researchers. Thus. A. Derkach, V. Zhukov, L. Laptev offer typology, which is based on two coordinates. The first coordinate – the subjective type. By the subjective type, there are collective violence and individual violence. The second coordinate – structure level of an act of violence. Structured violence has some certain rules. Unstructured violence does not have clearly defined rules, it is spontaneous and unpredictable⁹. There are four types of political violence, based on these coordinates: collective structured, collective unstructured, individual structured, individual unstructured.

1 Малапарте К. (1988). *Техника государственного переворота*. Москва. Аграф. <http://modernlib.ru/books/malaparte_kurcio/tehnika_gosudarstvennogo_perevorota/> (2014, november, 23).

2 Люттвак, Э. (2012). *Государственный переворот*. Москва: Университет Дмитрия Пожарского.

3 Галустьян, О. (2010). О государственных переворотах: сравнительно-исторический аспект вопроса. *Международное уголовное право и международная юстиция*, 3, 19-25.

4 Кадыров, Ш. (2007). Турмения. Дворцовый переворот? *Азия и Африка сегодня*, 4, 41-45.

5 Nossiter, A. (2009). Guinea's Capital Fades into a Ghost Town after Soldiers' Rampage. *The New York Times*, A5.

6 Храмов, В. (1997). Політологічний енциклопедичний словник. <<http://subject.com.ua/political/dict/417.htm>> (2013, december, 22); Юридична енциклопедія. <http://leksika.com.ua/15710312/legal/derzhavniy_perevorot> (2013, december, 27).

7 Анцупов, Я., Шипилов, А. (2006). *Словарь: конфликтология*. Санкт-Петербург: Питер, 307.

8 Шляхтун, П.П. (2005). *Конституційне право: словник термінів*. Київ: Либідь, 119.

9 Деркач, А.А., Жуков, В.И., Лаптева, Л.Г. (2001). *Политическая психология: учебное пособие для вузов*. Москва: Академический Проект, Екатеринбург: Деловая книга, 360.

Based on the abovementioned, the coup is collective unstructured violence, because it is committed by some group of people or political force and directed against the governmental power institutes.

T. Gurr in his work “Why men rebel” distinguishes “governmental violence” and “violence of the masses and classes”, the last one – violence of the masses and classes is broken down into a riot (it is relatively spontaneous, unorganized mass violence), revolt (it is well-organized violence with limited quantity of participants) and internal war (it is well-organized, mass, directed to destruction of political regime or the state)¹. Approximate the same point of view has D. Galtung². By the same criteria, I. Zalisin, A. Dmitriev distinguish political violence into individual, collective and mass violence³. Whereas, P. Wilkinson, by the same criteria, divided into mass political violence and violence of small groups. At the same time, I. Lipatov, by the subject of violence, distinguishes the governmental violence and opposition⁴ violence. If take as basis criteria “subject of political violence” thus due to abovementioned typologies, a coup – is well-organizes violence with limited quantity of participants, who are in opposition. Political power struggle is public, mass struggle. There were no cases in history, when some leader or elite won rivals alone, without support (even sometimes-tacit support) of certain social groups. Thus, according to the Dutch scientist I. Massa “The organizers of the coup deftly directed anger of rebellious people. This is a really impudent event”⁵. Even palace coups, that had “upper class” nature and led to a change or minor rotation of the political elite, were committed by small groups of conspirators, found support on the part of the ruling class and elite military units.

One more, also important, criteria, which is used in the typology of political violence, is its object. Thus, I. Lipatova mentioned that according to the object, a coup can be domestic violence (relaxation of power, increasing of political crisis in the state – allow for activity of forces, that undermine the legitimacy of power or try to change political power) and international violence⁶. The World history is full of examples, where a coup, committed in certain country, has the aspect of external interference of the other states. For example, a coup in Russia, 1st of June 1605 (overthrow of Feodor II Godunov) was committed with military and financial support of Poland elite. A coup in Sweden in 1772 was committed by the Queen Gustav III with the participation and financing of France in the interests of French external policy. Indisputable fact of the foreign policy impact, participation in financing of the coup P. Skoropadsky 29th of April 1918 in Ukraine and others.

Important criterions in the typology of political violence are directionality and scope of application, aims and tasks, used methods and means of violence.

Important criterions in the typology of political violence are directionality and scope of application, aims and tasks, used methods and means of violence.

According to the typology of political violence offered by D. Galtung⁷, a coup it is direct violence, because it has not only exact addressee, but also clearly defined source.

If follow the logic of G. Kozirev, according to the aims and tasks, a coup can be referred to the praetorian violence (violent changes in governmental) and to the repressive violence (repression or removal of real or potential opposition by new power after committing the coup)⁸.

By used means of violence, a coup, according to the typology of I. Lipatov⁹, can be armed (military coup, putsch, pronunciamiento) and legal violence (coup which committed with unconstitutional methods and further unconstitutional laws can be enacted), economic and ideological repressions.

Military coup – it is violent changing of governmental power, that returns to power civilians and

1 Gurr, T. (1974). *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 11.

2 Галтунг, Д. (1995). Культурное насилие. Социальные конфликты. *Экспертиза, Прогнозирование, Технологии разрешения*. Москва: вып. 8, 34-36.

3 Дмитриев, А., Залысин, И.Ю. (2000). *Насилие: социально-политический анализ*. Москва: «Российская политическая энциклопедия»(РОССПЕН), 36.

4 Липатов, И.М. (1989). *Сущность и основные формы политического насилия в современных условиях (философско-социологический анализ)*: автореф. дисс. ... канд. филос. наук. Москва.

5 Опасная история. Государственные перевороты. *Источник: file-rf.ru*.
<<http://newsland.com/news/detail/id/1020385/>>.

6 Липатов, И.М. (1989). *Сущность и основные формы политического насилия в современных условиях (философско-социологический анализ)*: автореф. дисс. ... канд. филос. наук. Москва.

7 Галтунг, Д. (1995). Культурное насилие. Социальные конфликты. *Экспертиза, Прогнозирование, Технологии разрешения*. Москва: вып. 8, 34-36.

8 Козырев, Г. (2008). *Политическая конфликтология*. Москва: ИНФРА Форум, 304.

9 Козырев, Г. (2008). *Политическая конфликтология*. Москва: ИНФРА Форум, 304.

establishes of a dictatorship of the military as a means of solving certain (urgent) socio-political problems¹. For example, a coup 28th of June 1762, organized by the supporters of Catherine II with the assistance of Semenovsky and Preobrazhensky regiments and Horse guard in Russia.

Putsch (German – Putsch) – it is a coup, committed by the group of conspirators or an attempt of such coup². Putsch is committed by the formalized structure, which operates within the armed forces system and submits to the sole command, but not army as a whole. For example, Hylon putsch in Sparta in 220 B. C. Eputsch of General L. Kornilov, 25th of September 1917 (7th October), who took advantage of the weakness and progressive paralysis of the Provisional government, laid a course with his troop for the Petrograd, in order to establish a military dictatorship in Russia³. The Kapp-Putsch in Germany, in March 1920⁴, State Committee on the State of Emergency putsch in the USSR, 19-20th of August 1991, which led to the demise of the Soviet Union (by aims – reactionary⁵).

Pronunciamento (sp.) – it is rebellion, revolt against the government, basically, military⁶. In the Spain and Latin American countries in XIX-XX centuries, pronunciamento was the main method of conquest the power, some kind of ritual⁷.

As historical experience shows, a violence, which paved the way to the power of the certain group of people, always leads to the long period of non-freedom, persecutions and repressions. Repressions as a kind of violence can be different forms. For example, against the oppositionists can be used murders, legal prosecutions with contrived pretext, different kinds of isolation, and persecutions of family members. Against the dissentients can be organized moral, psychological and administrative terror.

Such criteria in typology as functionality includes: irrational, rational, instrumental and communicative violence. Precisely rational violence exercises a strongly pronounced social and economic function. Rational violence, commonly, is oriented to the conquest of power with purpose of using power in the certain interests (radical rebuilding, liquidation of old power) and it is a result of volitional violent action, aimed to the conquest of political rule. Rational violence is based on force and authority⁸. A coup is rational violence type. Instrumental violence⁹ is used as a means of new power formation or its redistribution in the process of creeping coup or after committing a coup.

The next characteristic, used in violence typology, is results and consequences. By results, a coup as a form of political violence can be destructive and constructive¹⁰. Many established views about coups, have to be reviewed in the light of political reality. There are many examples in history, when unconstitutional military coup, establishment of military dictatorship can be salutary. When only cruel and punitive actions can avert civil war, chaos and stabilize a situation in the state. There are several actual examples. Resulting a military coup, Caesar established his dictatorship; reformed state structure; consolidated all segments of the people and put an end to eternal civil wars, which pulled apart “Late Republic”. Because of military coup, committed by General Pinochet in Chile in 1973, the government, which won power, was able to stabilize ravished economy and Chile become one of the successful states in the South America. In 1990, a dictator, after “well-development” of the State, shifted power to a democratically elected government¹¹.

1 Меженська, О. (2014). Зміст і співвідношення понять «державний переворот», «військовий переворот» та «політичний переворот». *Науково-теоретичний і громадсько-політичний альманах «Грані 3(107) березень*, 46-53.

2 Современная энциклопедия. <[<http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc1p/396666%>](http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc1p/396666%)> (2015, , January, 04);

Толковый словарь Ожегова. <[<http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/ogegova>](http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/ogegova)> (2015, , January, 04).

3 Bankowicz, M. (2004). *Historia polityczna swiata XX wieku 1901-1945*. Czerwiec, 127-129.

4 Панкевич, Ф. (1972). *Капповский путч в Германии*. Москва: Наука.

5 Липатов, И.М. (1989). *Сущность и основные формы политического насилия в современных условиях (философско-социологический анализ)*: автореф. дисс. ... канд. филос. наук. Москва.

6 Энциклопедический словарь Брокгауза и Ефрона. <[<http://be.sci-lib.com/article083582.html>](http://be.sci-lib.com/article083582.html)>.

7 Люттвак, Э. (2012). *Государственный переворот*. Москва: Университет Дмитрия Пожарского.

8 Канаев, С.З. (2003). Об исследовании проблемы политического насилия. *Право и образование*, 2, 129-135.

9 Канаев, С.З. (2003). Об исследовании проблемы политического насилия. *Право и образование*, 2, 129-135.

10 Липатов, И.М. (1989). *Сущность и основные формы политического насилия в современных условиях (философско-социологический анализ)*: автореф. дисс. ... канд. филос. наук. Москва.

11 О военных переворотах, дополнение к предыдущей теме о Египетской революции.

<[<http://exclusive.kz/eksperty/2632>](http://exclusive.kz/eksperty/2632)> (2015, January, 26).

Based on the abovementioned, it is fair to say that kinds and forms of political violence are closely related and can transform into each other. One of the common form of political violence is a coup –it is formally, illegal and unallowable in the legal sense form of political struggle. A coup refers to the collective, unstructured, but well-organized violence with limited quantity of participants. It is, aimed to the radical rebuilding or liquidation of the ruling power, commonly. Like any irrational violence, coup is based on force and authority. During the coup can be used either physical and psychological violence or legal ways of violence. Instrumental forms of violence are used as a means for the new power formation or its redistribution in the process of creeping coup or after committing a coup.

Characteristic features of the coup as a form of violent forms of political power struggle are stiffness and cruelty, because the value of human life is not taken into account. It brings human losses; there is the principle of “the end would justify the means”; it is creating the appearance of impunity of actions during the achievement of subjective goals of the population. The organizers and participants of the coup during the struggle demonstrate force, authority, superiority over political opponents. Coup it is dangerous, difficult and well expensive political process, because of which the main political formations are paralyzed and governmental structure and functions are greatly changed.

References

1. Ancupov, A.JA., Shipilov, A.I. (2006). *Slovar' konfliktologa*. 2-e izd. Sankt-Peterburg: Piter.
2. Aristotel' (1983). *Politika*. Sochinenija v 4-kh tomakh. T. 4. Moskva: Mysl', AN SSSR, In-t filosofii.
3. Bankowicz, M. (2004). *Historia polityczna swiata XX wieku 1901-1945*. Czerwiec.
4. Bljakher, L.E. i dr. (2008). *Koncept «Revolucija»v sovremennom politicheskom kurse*. Sankt Peterburg: Aletejja.
5. Bobrova, A.G. (2005). *Osnovni formi suchasnogo politichnogo nasillja*: dis. ... kand.polit.nauk. Kiiv.
6. Borshch, A. (2010). *Formy politicheskoy bor'by*. *Obozrevatel'-observer*, 12, 49-59.
7. Borshch, A. (2013). *Politicheskaja bor'ba v sovremennom mire*. *Sravnitel'naja politika*, 3(13), 70-74.
8. Denisov, V.V. (1997). *Sociologija nasilija (kritika sovremennykh burzhuaznykh koncepcij)*. Moskva: Politizdat.
9. Derkach, A.A., Zhukov, V.I., Lapteva, L.G. (2001). *Politicheskaja psikhologija: uchebnoe posobie dlja vuzov*. Moskva: Akademicheskij Proekt, IEkaterinburg: Delovaja kniga.
10. Dmitriev, A., Zalyzin, I.JU. (2000). *Nasilie: social'no-politicheskij analiz*. Moskva: «Rosijskaja politicheskaja inciklopedija»(ROSSPEN).
11. Ehnciklopedicheskij slovar' Brokgauza i Efrona. <<http://be.sci-lib.com/article083582.html>>.
12. Ehpperson R. Nevidima ruka. Vzgljad na istoriju kak na zagovor. *Ehlektronnaja biblioteka bookZ.rus*. <http://bookz.ru/authors/ral_f_epperson.html> (2014, december, 19).
13. Galgtung, D. (1995). *Kul'turnoe nasilie. Social'nye konflikty. Ehksperetiza, Prognozirovanie, Tekhnologii razreshenija*. Moskva: vyp. 8, 34-36.
14. Galust'jan, O. (2010). *O gosudarstvennykh perevorotakh: sravnitel'no-istoricheskij aspekt voprosa. Mezhdunarodnoe ugovolnoe pravo i mezhdunarodnaja justicija*, 3, 19-25.
15. Gobbs, T. (1989). *Sochinenija v 2-kh tomakh. T. 1. Filosofskoe nasledie*. Moskva: Mysl'.
16. Gurr, T. (1974). *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
17. *Juridichna enciklopedija*. <http://leksika.com.ua/15710312/legal/derzhavniy_perevorot> (2013, december, 27).
18. Kadyrov, SH. (2007). *Turmenija. Dvorcovyj perevorot? Azija i Afrika segodnja*, 4, 41-45.
19. Kamju A. Buntujushchij chelovek. Biblioteka Jakova Krotova. <http://krotov.info/library/11_k/am/u_2.htm> (2014, december, 27).
20. Kanaev, S.Z. (2003). *Ob issledovanii problemy politicheskogo nasilija. Pravo i obrazovanie*, 2, 129-135.
21. Khramov, V. (1997). *Politologichnij enciklopedichnij slovník*. <<http://subject.com.ua/political/dict/417.htm>> (2013, december, 22);
22. Kiriljuk, F.M., Konvers'kij, A.IE., Bilik, V.F. (2004). *Politologija*. Kiiv: Kiivskij nac. un-t im. T. Shevchenka.
23. Kozyrev, G. (2008). *Politicheskaja konfliktologija*. Moskva: INFRA Forum.
24. Kravchenko, A. (2009). *Politologija: uchebnik*. Moskva: Prospekt.
25. Kugaj, A. (1993). *Priroda politicheskogo nasilija i ego rol' v sovremennom mire: avtoref. diss. ... kand. filos. nauk*. Moskva.
26. Lipatov, I.M. (1989). *Sushchnost' i osnovnye formy politicheskogo nasilija v sovremennykh uslovijakh (filosofsko-sociologicheskij analiz)*: avtoref. diss. ... kand. filos. nauk. Moskva.
27. Ljuttvak, EH. (2012). *Gosudarstvennyj perevorot*. Moskva: Universitet Dmitrija Pozharskogo.
28. Makar, JU.I., Dokash, O.JU., Lavruk, T.P. (2010). *Politologija: navchal'nij posibnik*. Chernivci: Chernivec'kij nac. uni-t.
29. Makiavelli, N. (1982). *Gosudar' Original'noe izdanie: Makiavelli N. Izbrannye proizvedenija*. Moskva: Khud. lit. <lib.ru/POLITOLOG/MAKIAWELLI/gosudar.txt>. (2013, october, 24).
30. Malaparte K. (1988). *Tekhnika gosudarstvennogo perevorota*. Moskva. Agraf. <http://modernlib.ru/books/malaparte_kurcio/tehnika_gosudarstvennogo_perevorota/> (2014, november, 23).

31. Mezhens'ka, O. (2014). Zmist i spivvidnoshennja ponjat' «derzhavnij perevorot», «vijs'kovij perevorot» ta «politichnij perevorot». *Naukovo-teoretichnij i gromads'ko-politichnij al'manakh «Grani 3(107) berezen'*, 46-53.
32. Nieburg, H. (1990). *Violence. Behavioral Process*. New York.
33. Nossiter, A. (2009). Guinea's Capital Fades into a Ghost Town after Soldiers' Rampage. *The New York Times*, A5.
 - voennykh perevorotakh, dopolnenie k predydushchej teme o Egipetskoj revoljucii. <<http://exclusive.kz/eksperty/2632>> (2015, January, 26).
34. Opasnaja istorija. Gosudarstvennye perevoroty. *Istochnik: file-rf.ru*. <<http://newsland.com/news/detail/id/1020385/>>.
35. Pankevich, F. (1972). *Kappovskij putch v Germanii*. Moskva: Nauka.
36. Pidzhakov, A.JU. (2002). Sushchnost' politicheskogo nasilija. *Teoreticheskij zhurnal CREDO NEW*. <<http://credonew.ru/content/view/274/64>> (2014, december, 21).
37. Pobochij, I.A. (2008). *Politicheskaja bor'ba kak forma vzaimodejstvija social'nykh sil v uslovijakh utverzdenija gosudarstvennosti sovremennoj Ukrainy*: avtoref. dis. na soiskanie uchen.stepeni doktora polit.nauk: spec. 23.00.02 – «Politicheskie instituty i processy». Kiev.
38. Politologija. Slovar' po obshchestvoznaniju (2006). <<http://politike.ru/dictionary/885/word/politicheskaja-borba>> (2014, december, 16).
39. Shljakhtun, P.P. (2005). *Konstitucijne pravo: slovnik terminiv*. Kiiv: Libid', 119.
40. Sovremennaja ehnciklopedija. <<http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc1p/39666%>> (2015, January, 04);
41. Tolkovyj slovar' Ozhegova. <<http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/ogegova>>(2015, January, 04).