Machiavellianism and manipulation: from social philosophy to social psychology

Ibragim D. Ibragimov – Badma V. Sangadzhiev – Sergey N. Kashurnikov – Ivan A. Sharonov – Julia A. Krokhina

Abstract
The paper deals with the challenges that the modern society development faces in social interaction both at the macro level (international interaction, interaction within individual states) and the micro level (the level of interaction in and between small social groups, and interpersonal communication). Social and philosophical understanding of the phenomena of Machiavellianism and manipulative behavior is a relevant issue because in any of the manifestations they are considered as social constructs developing in social interaction, and using philosophical methods and taking into account all the factors influencing them we contribute to their investigation: objective (social) and subjective (psychological). The purpose of the study embraces analysis of different approaches to understand Machiavellianism and manipulative behavior and their evolution from social and political philosophy to social psychology, generalize and develop a more general and complex point of view concerning their essence and determinism. The research methods applied include the philosophical principles of development as the methodological basis to study the issue. These principles cover laws of dialectics: the law of dialectical synthesis, the law of the passage of quantitative changes into qualitative changes, the law of the unity and conflict of opposites; the philosophical principle of determinism; and a systemic activity approach. The main theoretical method used is the content analysis of scientific papers related to the topic of discussion, which allows a comprehensive analysis of the factors associated with the development and manifestation of Machiavellianism and manipulative behavior. The paper analyzes the ideas of Niccolo Machiavelli and his followers, their relationship with the phenomena of Machiavellianism and manipulation, as well as the evolution of these concepts from social and political philosophy considering their global manifestations in politics and the implementation of political power to social psychology studying them in the aspect of interpersonal interaction from the social and philosophical point of view. The criteria underlying the phenomena of Machiavellianism and manipulative behavior are determined on the basis of the system-activity approach. It has been established that the characteristics of Machiavellianism and manipulation (indirect, hidden and implicit influence, deception, disregard of moral and ethical norms and social and cultural values, focus on domination, control, coercion, use of force, use of the other as things, objects, programming of thoughts, intentions, etc.) are the features of public administration sphere, refer to peculiar and interpersonal relations.
Key words: Machiavellianism, manipulation, social and political philosophy, manipulative behavior

Introduction
The relevance of the study of Machiavellianism and manipulation due to the challenges in the modern stage of the society development, entailing changes in social interaction at the macro level (international cooperation, interaction within individual states) and at the micro level (the level of interaction of small social groups, interpersonal communication). Political, economic and social changes lead to redirection from interaction for self-realization and the common good towards interaction for achieving individual goals by a particular person; and this brings to the

fore the problems of Machiavellianism and manipulation. Social and philosophical understanding of these phenomena is important because Machiavellianism and manipulative behavior are social constructs in any of their manifestations, and form and manifest themselves in the process of social interaction, and the use of philosophical methods makes it possible to study them taking into account all the factors that influence their formation: objective (social) and subjective (psychological).

In the current situation, in the development of political, economic and social spheres, interpersonal and international communication on the level of states, regions and person-to-person, we can observe that the communication problem involving one sort of persons manipulating others is becoming more serious and strained. This is a clear example of Machiavellianism. Machiavellian adults employ a range of tactics in order to manipulate others. This is accompanied by the spread of asymmetric interpersonal relations, i.e. the relations of rivalry, competition and manipulation.

An ideal society has never existed and hardly will ever exist. Social relations and social contradictions inherent in different types of societies at different stages of their development have a fundamental impact on the formation of the individual's personality. The unity of genetics and living environment (social relations, values, norms, attitudes, rules of behavior) determines the activity structure of the individual, both at the individual level and at the level of society development.

The phenomenon of social interaction and human nature in Machiavelli's work should be considered in the context of his views on the most fundamental ethical issues. He gives characteristics for good and evil, points to their correlation and the possibility of their mutual transition. Machiavelli distinguishes secondary and derivative nature of good and evil phenomena. A person can not only study the forces that control good and evil, but also influence them to some extent. Machiavelli's views on the overall theme of moral values are of certain significance when discussing the personality. He conducted a detailed study of the categories concerning purpose and means, stating that an individual ought to set goals and strive to achieve them. A human should recognize good and evil although it does not help them to get rid of evil. Machiavelli insists that anyone who does not want to go the path of Good joins the path of Evil (Gnatenko, 2015).

The insights of what Machiavelli wrote, referring to the sovereign, the Prince, almost five hundred years ago, should be very carefully carried over onto modern interpersonal interaction. It is not only the difference of epochs that is essential, but also the risk of inadequate transfer of the ideas and formulations from the macro-social level of interaction to micro-social one. It is less hazardous for modern social philosophy and political science because of their fundamental nature rather than for social psychology that studies specific types of interactions, relationships, and their aspects (Kalutskaya, Poddjakov, 2007).

I.N Kalutskaya and A.N. Poddjakov (2007) propose a system of two-level perceptions of social-psychological theories related to Machiavelliasts. The perceptions the first level describe the psychological personality traits of a Machiavellist, while the perceptions of the second level describe his understanding of others and himself. The second-level perception are always present in any Machiavellian theory, since manipulation, like any other targeted success-oriented impact, implies a partial or complete knowledge of the object it is directed to. They proceed from the fact that the essential Machiavellian trait is not the tendency to manipulate others for their own benefit, but the use of manipulation as the main means to achieve one's goals (Kalutskaya, Poddjakov, 2007).

According to A.A. Kokoshkin (2010), when studying Machiavelli's heritage it is important to distinguish what he wrote in the analytical part of his papers from what he presents in the advisory part. In the first case, Machiavelli might indeed be

recognized as a person who made a significant contribution to a realistic understanding of politics as a phenomenon of public life. If we consider his recommendations to state leaders and politicians, they should appreciate them negatively, but even more so because they are written with a literary brilliance. These recommendations are formulated in such a way that they have indeed served as, and in many cases justify it, the brutal, dangerous and destructive policies affecting all its participants (Kokoshkin, 2010).

Speaking on the philosophical foundations of Machiavelli's social-and-political theory, we may cite the opinion of the Russian researcher I.I. Yevlampiev (2002), who thought that Machiavelli considered all the most powerful forces in the world as irrational, disobeying and defiant. It is a human who is the only link in the universe that has the ability to create and follow laws. However, since the human himself formulates these laws, he is not bound by them; the laws have secondary and relative significance compared to the absolute significance of domination over others (Yevlampiev, 2002).

Machiavellianism, no doubts, entails a tendency of being prone to manipulate other people. The criterion of manipulative behavior is defined by the majority of authors as 'hidden, implicit, and deceptive'. The second most common top criterion is 'exploitation, domination'. Then come 'governance, control', 'coercion', 'the use of force', 'treating the others as things, objects', 'indirect influence' and 'programming thoughts, intentions', etc. Form the rest of the criteria list we select 'structuring the world', 'acting in the interests of the manipulator', 'at odds with the will of another', 'inducement', 'playing on people's vulnerabilities', 'non-violent way', 'spiritual impact', 'focusing on the state of mind and inner peace,' etc. (Dotsenko, 1997).

V.P. Sheynov (2010) notes that in practice all existing definitions of manipulation are considering it as a specific control method exerted on the addressee. Most definitions directly indicate the latent nature of the impact on the addressee. Many definitions stress the condemnable actions of the manipulator, contrary to the will of the addressee and causing him harm. The initiator of the manipulation has the unilateral advantage, and the target is the victim of such covert, hidden, control of them (Sheynov, 2010; Sheynov, 2014).

Materials and Methods
2.1. General Philosophical Laws
In this study, we applied the philosophical principles of development as the methodological basis for studying the issue. These principles cover laws of dialectics: the law of dialectical synthesis, the law of the passage of quantitative changes into qualitative changes, and the law of the unity and conflict of opposites.

2.2. Philosophical Principles
In our study, we preceded from the principle of determinism, the essence of which is the existence of a natural and required, indispensible, dependence of the phenomena on the factors that generate them. Determinism comes from causality, and has the following features:
1) Given a particular input, will always produce the same output: it is the cause that produces the effect, and never vice versa;
2) Temporal asymmetry – the cause always exists before the consequence, and never vice versa;
3) Necessity – regardless of its presence in space and time, it is the consequence that always comes: the same reasons always give rise to the same consequences;
4) Spatial and temporal continuity – the cause and effect represent a chain of events in time and space (Alekseyev, Panin, 2003).

2.3. Theoretical Approach

The main approach to the study of this problem, we believe, is the systemic activity approach. Within the framework of this approach, activity is considered as one of the types of active human existence, which is primarily aimed at creative transformation and cognition of the surrounding reality. In is namely through activities that both the human mind and his psyche form, develop and manifest themselves. In other words, the psyche and activities are interconnected, and not isolated from each other. A set of characteristics inherent involve the following:

1.From the human's birth his/her activity is not his inherent feature, it develops during the whole period of his/her socialization (education and training);

2. Carrying out any activity, the person manages to go beyond the limits constraining the human's consciousness, creates both spiritual and material values that, in turn, promote historical development and progress of society;

3. Activities meet the needs of a human: natural, cultural, cognitive, etc;

4. It is productive, by participating in it; the human creates more and more ways to help in meeting his needs (Rubinstein, 2012).

Results

3.1. Machiavelli's Social, Philosophical and Political Views on Power, Morality and Personality

Initially, manipulation of people was considered in social philosophy as an attribute of politics. Philosophical study of the problem concerning manipulation of human consciousness began in ancient philosophy. But it is important to note that the very concept of 'manipulation' appeared in science much later, therefore, there is no direct mentioning of this phenomenon in the works of ancient philosophers. What we are talking about is the latent influence on the consciousness on the individual; it is determined only by the individual characteristics that are characteristic of manipulative influence.

From the Plato's (2016) point of view, manipulation, is on the one hand an integral part of the surrounding reality, on the other hand, is a unique phenomenon, since it is almost the only means to subdue the human will and turn the other person to certain ideas and manner of thinking, also persuade him to commit some specific actions with no use of physical force. Plato (2016) spoke of manipulation as an art of persuasion, which is vastly different from all other arts because it alone can force others to slavishly and voluntarily rather than forcibly serve the person that is skilled at this art (Plato, 2016).

Discussing a tyranny and personality of the tyrant, Aristotle stated that the tyrant in the eyes of his subjects should not look like a tyrant and a robber, but rather a homegrown, a good king, guardian. He must lead the people with demagogic methods to attract his noble people by his courteous behavior. The tyrant should not demonstrate luxury and allow himself to be superfluous, but be an example of modesty, restraint and beneficence. This will allow him not to arouse fear and hatred, but to win the love and respect of his subjects, to lead the best representative of his nation and make his power stable and durable (Aristotle, 2018).

The late 15th and early 16th century, the Renaissance epoch, was the period of a shift from understanding 'power' as a purely religious phenomenon to its interpretation as naturally occurring phenomenon based on the human nature and worldly-mindedness implemented through the form of government. The need for a strong state that would accomplish this task of forming a strong state and stable power is best expressed in its social-and-philosophical and political theory by Niccolo Machiavelli.

The study of historical and political events leads Machiavelli to understand the motives of political activity. He concludes that it is the real interests, selfish intentions, and the thirst for enrichment that determine political activity. Machiavelli

considers politics to be a product of free human will, personal desires, and character peculiarities (Machiavelli, 2017).

He formulates the main features of a new type of a ruler, the Prince, an absolute ruler, a despot. A ruler should not be guided by any a priori schemes, legal prescriptions, religion or his own word. He should rest only on analysis of real facts; he is allowed to be cruel, insidious, and merciless, and he does not comply with God's laws. The ruler as a public figure should be guided only by the moral force, but not the moral religion, should know and be able to manage the natural causes of human behavior, which arise from the desire of wealth, power and those instincts that determine human life. The morality of the ruler only needs to match the reality of life. It is based on the fact that people to achieve their goals, to defend their interests must consciously look at reality, rely on their own strength, and not blindly rely on divine Providence and salvation after death (Machiavelli, 2013).

In order to gain and retain power, the ruler must correlate his actions with the law of necessity and with the life of his subordinates. He is not entitled to minor errors. If a strong ruler makes mistakes, then only the large ones. He should not allow ambitious people who do not have power develop their will to power, feel a desire to take the upper hand and obtain all that is connected with power: wealth and honors that develop corruption and bureaucracy. The ruler should not encroach on the property and personal rights of the subjects, but should be able to use the passions of the crowd, manage the crowd, as the crowd if prone to following the illusion of success. In his governing he must use two fundamental human motives: fear and love, with priority to fear. He should not be overly generous to the detriment of himself and should not be afraid to be cruel if necessary. He may make any promises, but he is not obliged to keep them. It is important for him to pursue goals through socially approved means, and means should not be conformed with emotions and desires, but with circumstances and results. For the ruler, moral norms should not be a reference point, since power and politics refer to the sphere of relativeness while morality is absolutized. It is significant for the ruler to have a clear social role, a mask, that would not allow to see his real self, combine the qualities of the lion (force and honesty) and the fox (mystification and skillful pretence) (Machiavelli, 2018).

He introduces conniving, cunning, manipulation and selfishness as a means to gain control and stay in power; his message on power has become a model of cynicism and immorality in politics, an activity based on the principle that 'ends justified the means' and the only law is success at any cost.

Machiavelli also created a number of rules of manipulation, the key principle of which was to create a distorted perception of the manipulator by means of flexible and long-term techniques. One of effective rules of manipulation consisted in rigorous compliance with polite and correct forms of refusal. All Machiavelli's rules implied maximum attention to the outward behavior of the manipulator, since it enters into interaction with others, is perceived by them and can be analyzed by them. The seaming, not the reality, of aspirations; the inability to expose dishonest intentions – these are the main reasons for the effective manipulation (Yurenkov, 2013).

A.A. Guseynov (2014) points out that Machiavelli's position is that both virtuous and immoral actions integrated into the logic of political expediency do not lose their original nature, by virtue of which they are considered as virtuous or vicious. New ideas expressed by Machiavelli are, in the opinion of A.A. Guseynov (2014), connected with the awareness of the need to commit evil to achieve political objectives with a clear understanding that this is an action that in itself is, was and still remains unacceptable from a moral point of view. The sovereign ruler should not only have the courage to take the path of evil, and the ability to do it. It is undoubtedly important for him to be able to make a good impression and appear virtuous, but still it only means that a Vice, such as hypocrisy, is also a means of his success. Without denying the role of morality in politics, Machiavelli to some extent includes morality

in politics, putting moral criteria in dependence on political. He sees morality as a means to political ends. The sovereign, who represents the state, should equally have the ability to transcend morality, not be afraid to seem immoral, perform his actions only for the purpose of strengthening his power (Guseynov, 2014).

However, some researchers believe, that a moral goal, according to Machiavelli, cannot justify any immoral means. Cruel measures can be justified only when the Good obtained from these measures exceeds the Evil they have caused. When a politician has a choice: to decide on a cruel measure and thus cause a direct evil to a minority, or to abandon this measure and allow the development of a social disease that can infect the whole society and destroy it, he is obliged to sacrifice the interests of the minority for the sake of the interests of the majority in accordance with the well-known rule: of two evils choose the least. However, Machiavelli warned that one can never use evil to do any good if that good can easily be destroyed by evil. Even though in times of social crisis when it is permissible to resort to cruel measures, in the normal course of public life any illegal activity is hazardous. He warned statesmen about the danger of blindly following 'the purpose sanctifies the means' rule (Antsibor, 2014).

3.2. Historical Development of the Concepts of Manipulation and Machiavellianism in Social and Political Philosophy

Machiavelli's theory was developed in the treatises of the Jesuits. They replaced Machiavelli's idea that the ruler, the Prince, for the sake of success, should be guided by his own morality and freedom by the doctrine of the hidden Divine will which determines the real political activity of the ruler and does not depend on his own ideas and desires. They regarded all the wills of the sovereign as justified by the supreme intelligence, the awareness of which is not subject to the ordinary human mind. This vision erased the moral framework of the individual behavior, endowed with absolute power, and purely human arbitrariness and self-will hidden under God's Providence. The Jesuits introduced the concept of 'Machiavellianism' (Aglayev, 2012).

One of the philosophers who studied at Jesuit schools in France, Giovanni Botero, seeking to refute Machiavelli's views on the relationship of politics and morality, in fact, shares some of his key ideas. These mainly concern the state-making and the nature of power. Discussing this issue, Botero recons on clearly Machiavellian classical representations in the Jesuit literature, according to which the main incentive in political actions is fear. It is the fear for personal security (rather than the pragmatic desire for a prosperous and comfortable life) that determines a person's willingness to live with other people and obey the authorities and laws. Another Machiavelli's theory, that Botero shares, regards the understanding of religion as a tool of social control and manipulation. All religions are used by rulers to develop the main virtues, from the point of view of those who have power, in their subjects: obedience and conservatism. Botero believed moderatism and prudence to be the main sovereign psychological features. He was critical of valor and ambition, treating them as fuss. The political and philosophical concept of Botero follows in many ways the concept proposed by Machiavelli and in some aspects is even more radical. Botero believed that the government leader's professional qualities are more important than his beliefs not from a moral, but from a pragmatic point of view, in their attempts to achieve political success (Markhinin, 2017).

English philosopher T. Hobbes (2017), like Machiavelli, had a low view of human beings. We are all basically selfish, driven by fear of death and the hope of personal gain. All of us seek power over others, whether we realize this or not. He considered fear of force is the cause of rational thinking. The consequence of its development is the decision to move from a natural (natural) state to a social or civil state, the

phenomenon of power and the chance of manipulating others in their own interests (Hobbes, 2017).

In the 20th century, a significant contribution to understanding the problem of manipulation of human consciousness was made by representatives of the Frankfurt school (Markuze, 2003; Fromm, 2017; Adorno, 2011; Horkheimer, Adorno, 1997; Habermas, 2011). From their point of view, the realization of the disparity, between the external social success of society and the difficulty of self-actualization and self-realization of the individual in it, was impossible because of human consciousness being formed by political, ideological and cultural attitudes imposed on him by manipulative influence.

According to the British philosopher Z. Bauman's (2005) interpretation, the phenomenon of manipulation is based on the awareness of the finiteness of human existence. This causes the desire for transcendentality. Every culture creates and transmits the meanings of life from generation to generation, and every social order is maintained by manipulating the desire for transcendental experience. But the energy generated by this desire can be used in a positive or negative sense, and the benefits of its use are disproportionately distributed among people. Studying the modern mass media and communication, Z. Bauman (2005) concludes that public manipulation of the desire for transcendental experience is inevitable if/given the life of the individual must be lived, and the life of society is to continue. But there is also a tendency for excessive manipulation, which distracts from the opportunities offered by life rather than attracts to them. Such excessive manipulation is possible due to the fundamental conflict in the modern society, which involves transferring from the state's fault for damaging life values created by society and culture onto the individual and make him experience the sense of guilt. In such a situation, institutions called upon to address social problems become institutions that create such problems. The blame transfer from institutions to individuals, who are inadequate, contributes to the dispersion of potentially damaging irritation, or to transforming it into the desire to self-censorship and self-flagellation (Bauman, 2005).

N.Ya. Danilevsky (2017), a Russian philosopher, sociologist, political thinker and publicist, interrupted the 19th century Russian philosophy tradition with his consideration of the ethical position to everything political from the standpoint of Christian universalism, and proposed a new understanding of the essence of political ethics for Russian discourse in his political and philosophical work 'Russia and Europe'. His position was that the law of love and self-sacrifice is inappropriate in politics, and that the properly understood benefit, which is obviously insufficient and unsuitable from a morality stand point should yield much better results as a principle of political activity, because it is here that it is the most appropriate (Danilevsky, 2017). Subsequently, this thesis has allowed the investigators of the researcher's works to claim his Machiavellianism view. N.Ya. Danilevsky's (2017) political ethic concepts focused primarily on the sphere of foreign policy, the main core was associated with the principles of efficiency and moral expediency, which were previously specifically formulated in Machiavelli's political and philosophical writings. N.Ya. Danilevsky (2017) anticipated possible accusations against his theory and was forced to note that it does not justify Machiavellianism; still, he argued that 'every man to his trade', that every person or phenomenon should be judged individually, i.e. people should get what they deserve. 'An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a rigid rule and a classic principle of utilitarianism, i.e. an adequately understood benefit, is the law of politics, the law of special state-to-state relations (Polyakova, 2017).

In 1925, Russian philosopher I. Il'in (2017) published a book entitled On Resistance to Evil by Force. The book generated a bitter polemic among Russian thinkers, which constitutes probably the most thorough debate on the justification of the use of force

ever conducted among Russian scholars. I. Il'in (2017) argued that war was sometimes necessary, but never 'just', approaching Machiavelli's views.

Justifying the theory of 'righteous wrongdoing ', or 'just versus unjust', I. Il'in (2017), on the one hand, recognizes that violence is wrong, or unjust, because one is always at least partially responsible for the situation which made violence necessary; on the other hand, justifies the need to use it. He speaks of a conscientious compromise, in which a person, aware of being unjust, yet does wrong things because is sure that it is necessary. People are forced to fight the villains by not the best means. And these statements actually can be traced to the thesis of Machiavelli that 'the end justifies the means', but calls to make a compromise with God (Il'in, 2017). But, as it was noted by S.A. Nizhnikov (2014), methodological fallacy of I. Il'in (2017) is to try to reach a compromise with his conscience and stay right, or be forced to recognize one's own villainy and the need for some sort of violence, i.e. from the very first moment to recognize the need of the shameless deed to be done, and later repent of it (Nizhnikov, 2014).

The literature review showed that Machiavellianism and manipulation of consciousness are the urgent issues worth discussing in social philosophy. Manipulation is most directly related to human survival, and Machiavellianism based on it is related to power and management. On the one hand, Machiavellianism and manipulation are caused by the external environment of human habitat, and on the other – by intrapersonal reasons. Whether one is going to manipulate somebody or not going to do it depends on the whole complex of external and internal reasons (Yurenkov, 2013).

3.3. Social and Psychological Understanding of Machiavellianism and Manipulation in Interpersonal Interaction

For the first time the idea of using the concept of 'Machiavellianism' in psychology belongs to the two American social psychologists from Columbia University, Richard Christie and Florence L. Geis. The basis of the definition of the concept for them was the way of thinking, persuasion, attitudes towards other people, as well as behavior, possible and acceptable ways of doing things in interpersonal interaction, which were considered by Niccolo Machiavelli. Scientists conducted a content analysis of 'The Prince', political treatise by Machiavelli, published in 1513, and developed a psychological questionnaire, they called it 'the Machiavellianism Scale', a personality inventory that is still used as the main assessment tool for Machaivellianism, now called 'the Mach-IV test". The questionnaire was widely used in Western social psychology and personality psychology and was adapted for Russia by Russian psychologists (Znakov, 2006). Machiavellianism is a personal trait that reflects a person's desire and desire to manipulate other people in interpersonal interaction. There have been case studies performed for persons performing the manipulative acts, hiding their true intentions, and, thus, using false and distraction techniques to make the partners unconsciously change their initial goals (Znakov, 2000).

From a psychological point of view, a Machiavellist is the one that manipulates others on the basis of value attitudes, a set of life principles, that allow oneself to justify his manipulative behavior and prove himself right in his own eyes. The position of such a person is to prove that the manipulation of other people is initially inherent in the nature of human and therefore is not anything shameful. Just using other people to achieve their goals is the most effective way in fulfilling one's self-assertive ambition. V.V. Znakov (2002) emphasizes that the distinctive feature of a Machiavellianist is that he always manipulates consciously and always for personal gain. And, of course, a Machiavellianist never feels guilty for the techniques he uses, rather approves them and considers appropriate. He never feels any compunction about the action; he does not have any internal conflicts, because he understands

manipulation towards other people as a normal action and effective way of interacting with people. The fact that a Machiavellist unconditionally believes in the correctness of the actions performed, comes across as charming and confident, and has a strong impact on people communicating with him, makes it attractive to them. People, under the psychological impact of the Machiavellist' patience, are less likely to experience unpleasant sensations that manipulation victims feel, as the Machiavellist does not occur to have any moral hesitation about ethics and legitimacy of his actions. Manipulating, a Machiavellist does not lose contact with other people. There is no loss of contact because such a person behaves naturally. The reason for this natural behavior is in his conviction that manipulation is an ordinary and quite adequate element of interpersonal interaction. Due to this, the Machiavellinist's communication partners have a false sense of mutual understanding. Effective manipulation of others is always based, on the one hand, on the skillful concealment of the manipulator's true intentions, motives and life aspirations. And on the other hand, is founded on the minimum understanding of his partner's psychology. Therefore, one can only discuss one-sided understanding of the partner on behalf of the Machiavellist (Znakov, 2002). According to V.V. Znakov (2002), Machiavellianism is a set of specific attitudes and beliefs that justify the possibility for a person to use other people for their own purposes, without paying attention to the consequences of manipulation for other people, his interaction partners (Znakov, 2002).

Machiavellianism has long been looked upon as a success factor, a predictable and positive characteristic of an employee working with a large company. Some companies directly report that they prefer so called 'high Machs', focused on their own wellbeing and going ahead. They are pragmatic, emotionally distanced, and able to make their own decisions (Carlin, 2011). Machiavellian manipulative abilities combined with low neuroticism, high psychoticism and extraversion were considered to be predictors of successful business (Skinner, 1983). Machiavellians are often described as ambitious, intelligent, persistent, more sociable and convincing no matter what they say to the other person, i.e. the truth or a lie (Zentsova, 2009; Znakov, 2002). Such persons are more purposeful and competitive; they are focused only on achieving the goals they set, but not on interaction with partners (Znakov, 2002). Machiavellianism is also seen as a leader trait (Kohyar et al., 2010). And nonmanipulative behavior, on the contrary, is regarded as weakness, social incompetence, inability to achieve the desired goal (Carlin, 2011).

In social psychology, there is the Machiavellian intelligence hypothesis, the intelligence evolved in social circumstances. The individuals who are favored are the ones who are able to use and exploit others in their social group, without causing disruption and potential group fission liable to result in naked aggression. Their manipulations might as easily involve co-operation as conflict. in each case the end is exploitative and selfish. It necessarily requires predicting the consequences of their own actions, actions of other people and taking into account the ratio of benefits and losses. Such prediction cannot be based only on the inductive knowledge (obtained through trial and error). Putting forward the social brain hypothesis, R.I. Dunbar (2006) writes that brains evolved to process factual information about the world. Most attention has therefore been focused on such features as pattern recognition, color vision, and speech perception. By extension, it was assumed that brains evolved to deal with essentially ecological problem-solving tasks (Dunbar, 2006). A number of other researchers argue that Machiavellian traits, such as suspicion, hostility, cynicism, and belief in manipulating others, have become the driving force of evolution (Znakov, 2002). Machiavellian intellect is understood as a kind of high social intellect, metacognitive abilities and highly organized skills of effective understanding of others, providing competitive benefits in a sophisticated society (Carruthers, 2009). Machiavellianism is a variable that mediates the influence of high

social and emotional intelligence on his decision to choose between selfish or prosocial behavior (Côté et al., 2011).

Machiavellianism manifests itself as a kind of value-semantic subtext of human decisions: movement towards the goal despite the possible obstacles, neglects sincerity and trustfulness of interpersonal relations, - the vision of man and society as a value that is not always to be considered. In its extreme manifestation, such a strategy of behaviour often is an inadequate method of decision-making. Though, in some situations the adequacy of decisions depends to some extent on the level of being prone to Machiavellianism. Machiavellianism might be a natural result of adaptation to society. As a result of the existence in society there is a tendency for a person to develop suspicion and cynicism, the desire to beat a possible opponent, which is associated with a higher level of Machiavellianism (Stepura, 2016).

We have presented generalized psychological characteristics used by Western scientists to describe a strongly pronounced type of Machiavellian personality: smart, brave, ambitious, dominant, persistent, selfish. A weakly expressed type is characterized by such features as: coward, indecisive, influenced, honest, sentimental, and reliable. Any strongly expressed Machiavellist wants to produce impression on others, for example, intelligent and generous man, that's how they try to show themselves in communicative situations. People with a low level of Machiavellianism, in fact, have such positive traits as honesty, reliability, and more developed skills and behavior that make it possible for them to hide the lack of these qualities (Cherulnik et al., 1981).

The severity of such a personal characteristic as Machiavellianism, most often entails manipulative forms of behavior that are specific and mediated by a certain complex of traits. These characteristics include dismissive, devaluing, humiliating attitude towards other people, depersonalization, narcissistic separation of oneself from others, a deficit of emotional contact, and empathy. The content of Machiavellianism phenomena and manipulation from a psychological point of view unites the human desire for total control and management of thoughts, feelings, and behavior of the interaction partner using any means and in disregard of the peculiarities of inner world of a partner, raising the pragmatic effect to the rank of a goal in itself (Sokolova, Ivanishchuk, 2013).

Coining of a new term Machiavellianism in the category list of social psychology, along with the previously existing concept of 'manipulation' naturally caused a question regarding the similarity and difference of socio-psychological phenomena designated by these terms. The appearance in the categorical apparatus of social psychology, along with the previously existing concepts of 'manipulation and 'Machiavellianism', was the reason for formulating the natural question concerning the similarity and difference of socio-psychological phenomena designated by these terms.

The American sociologist L.F. Ward (2002) associates manipulating with handling intellectual activity. L.F. Ward (2002) wrote that, despite the importance of sensitive (affective) ability, or intelligence, it is little studied by science compared to thinking ability (objective). These two areas are the basis for the allocating two areas in psychology: subjective and objective psychology. Phenomena of subjective psychology, namely the set of feelings, are a dynamic element of social power. And the main element of objective psychology, namely intelligence, or intuition, is the leading factor of society and the only means of managing social forces. Intelligence was formed to ensure the achievement of goals that cannot be achieved only by will without its management. L.F. Ward (2002) writes that deception is a necessary element of intellectual domination over typical actions of the intellect studied separately from emotions, although it is thanks to them that the intellect achieves the most significant results. Therefore, deception is the key to success. From Ward's point

of view, every person has ever cheated. Most people practice deception in a mild form, but for some it takes a hard destructive form – a form of manipulation. L.F. Ward (2002) calls such people 'parasites' of society and believes that the intuitive mind does not force a person to harm others.

R. May (2016) compares manipulation with a strong will and a desire for power. Manipulation can manifest itself in different forms: the individual is able to manipulate not only other people but also himself. But in both cases manipulation does not contribute to the increase of power, but, on the contrary, it undermines it. This kind of 'willpower' itself is used as a way to restrain the desires and irrational impulses. A man with 'willpower' manipulating himself manipulates others in the same way: changing himself, he indirectly changes others.

The concept of E. Shostrom's (2008) manipulative behavior considers it as an attribute of interpersonal relations under the influence of market mechanisms of the modern society economics that force people to accept each other indifferently, like things. E. Shostrom (2008) concludes that manipulation is universal, but at the same time considers it to be a catastrophe for the modern human who does not have the ability to rely on himself and because of this is forced through various tricks and techniques to establish control over others and use them to acquire benefits for himself. E. Shostrom (2008) sees the reason for manipulating in the inability of people to understand and respect the individuality of others. The source for manipulation, according to E. Shostrom (2008), is the social situation in which a modern person often feels himself helpless, especially in cases when there is a need to make an informed, conscious, individual choice. Playing on the weakness and helplessness of others induces, creates, a passive manipulator. The reason for the appearance of such a person is connected with the persistent fear of a difficult problem situation which can be created by close interpersonal contacts. According to the theory, personality engaged in manipulative activity is both a subject and an object of its own manipulation. A human, being forced to adapt to social and interpersonal relationships, simultaneously manipulates both themselves and others. Manipulative activity binds these two components of the individual (manipulator and manipulated) into a single whole because through the suppression of their own self a person seeks to get the desired benefits, and the main method here is the covert use of other people, influence them and control over them (Shostrom, 2008).

V.P. Baryshkov (2010) focuses on the fact that during the manipulation the manipulator performs hidden programming of the addressee's thoughts and intentions, and on the other hand, the addressee does not realize the impact and does not know the ultimate goal of the manipulator. Manipulation is resorted to when direct coercion or deception is impossible or undesirable. A manipulation success depends on the extent of the responsibility for the event that the manipulator manages to shift onto the addressee. However, the responsibility cannot be simply transferred; it must be adopted as a result of free choice. However, it is freedom that the manipulator doesn't want to provide. Instead, he arranges the impacts so that the addressee had the illusion of his own freedom in this decision making.

Discussions

The phenomena of Machiavellianism and manipulation refer to the topics studied in different sciences: philosophy, political science, sociology, psychology. But at the same time, these phenomena, especially the phenomenon of Machiavellianism, notwithstanding the fact that they have recently attracted close attention of many scientists, still do not have an unambiguous definition that would identify them as a single, holistic subject of study.

The phenomenon of manipulation is broader and, as noted by most researchers, has become the basis for the emergence of Machiavellianism. Manipulation is directly associated with the human survival, and Machiavellianism based on it is associated

with power and governance. Machiavellianism manifests itself when manipulation is used not to obtain a certain personal benefit but as the main means of achieving the goals.

Despite all the contradictory approaches to understanding the phenomena of Machiavellianism and manipulation, some common points can be identified in the existing definitions: these phenomena have a certain format of expression and organization; there is at least a structure consisting of two elements including the subject of manipulative influence, the object of manipulative influence and, if any, an outside observer (the subject of observation and assessment). With Machiavellianism and manipulation it is always possible to note the psychological impact of the subject on the object. Machiavellianism and manipulation refer to the quality of action and always have features related to instrumentality and pragmatism. Manipulative behavior is not always defined as contradicting the norms and rules of adequate coexistence of people in society; there is a positive manipulation aimed at good, sometimes altruistic, goals. There is a comprehensive dependence on the context of the situation and its agents when considering the quality of behaviour as manipulative. Machiavellianism as a manipulative strategy of social behavior manifests mainly in the dyadic socio-psychological interaction of people with different levels of Machiavellianism. Machiavellianism, or Machiavellian manipulation, can be seen as an intermediate one between imperative (direct, direct) and manipulative (hidden, indirect, indirect) strategies. Characteristics, combining Machiavellianism with an imperative strategy are dogmatism, pragmatism, rationalism, determination, perseverance, independence, friendliness and commitment to leadership. With a purely manipulative strategy, Machiavellianism comprises such characteristics as mistrust, social competence, conjunctural behavior, the use of other people's weaknesses in their own interests, the extraction of personal benefits from interaction, cunning and hedonism. The characteristics inherent directly in Machiavellian strategy involve cynicism, skepticism, neglect of social desirability, nonconformism, sense of superiority, self-centeredness and narcissism. Manipulative strategy, on the other hand, has a number of characteristics that combine it with anti-Machiavellianism (low level of Machiavellianism). These include covert effort to influence another person, change its internal structure: values, motives, goals, beliefs, mental state, etc.

Machiavellianism manifests itself from a strong position in the achievement of global, socially significant goals and in order to achieve practical achievements and results; while anti-Machiavellianism is a manipulation from a position of weakness in close interpersonal interactions in order to establish good relations and take fancy of others. And if Machiavellianism and manipulation are being studied though not actively enough, unfortunately, anti-Machiavellianism has not yet been the subject for a scientific research.

Conclusion

The article discusses viewpoints and ideas of Niccolo Machiavelli and his followers from the social and philosophical, as well as the evolution of these concepts from social and political philosophies that consider their global manifestations in politics and implementation of political power to social psychology that studies their interpersonal interaction aspects. It is established that at the macrosocial level the Machiavellian picture of the world is based on three main ideas: the source of power is the ruler's will, desires and personal qualities; the ends always justify the means; good and evil are interconnected and interpenetrating; and evil can be committed for good. At the microsocial level, the worldview is based on the notion that other people are objects to the goal. The system of norms at the macro-social level includes the idea that norms and values are not an absolute for the ruler, morality is a means of achieving goals, and the principles of efficiency and expediency are put forward in the

first place. At the micro-social level, only norms that promote one's own goals are accepted, so actions that do not meet the accepted norms and values, interests and goals of other people. Both macro-social and micro-social levels are dominated by: unconditional confidence in the correctness of their actions; confidence that people believe what they think, so it is important to play a social role, wear a mask that causes people's sympathy, and never show their true self; postulate the importance of understanding other people, their way of thinking and desires in order to easily manage them. On the microsocial level, a Machiavellist's cooperation with others is characterized by mistrust and weak willingness to positive emotions while communicating with another person. The main motive for Machiavellian behavior on the macro level is to maintain and strengthen the power, the expand power and responsibilities, gain support and trust from citizens. At the microsocial level, the motivating idea is to strive for success in confronting others.

The materials of the article might be of theoretical and practical value for all those professionals who are engaged in the development of educational and methodological programs on social philosophy, political science, sociology and social psychology, as well as programs aimed at preventing Machiavellianism, manipulative and authoritarian behavior in society in order to normalize the processes of social adaptation and socialization, and reduce the risk of destructive tendencies.

In the course of the research, new questions and problems arose that currently need to be solved. It is necessary to continue research on the socio-philosophical understanding of the phenomena of Machiavellianism and manipulative behavior, their characteristics in various social and age groups, study their formation and deformation both at the theoretical and empirical levels as they are one of the important components of modern social processes and interpersonal interaction and, in their extreme manifestations, might become a factor in the destabilization of social groups and society as a whole.

Bibliographic references
ADORNO, T. 2011. Negative dialectics. Moscow: Akademicheskiy proyekt. ISBN: 978-5-8291-1250-9.
AGLAYEV, Ya.A. 2012. N. Makiavelli i makiavellizm: key ideas. Vistnik Dnipropetrovs'kogo universitetu. In: Filosofiya, vol. 9, n. 2, pp.146-149. ISSN 9125-0912.
ALEKSEYEV, P.V. – PANIN, A.V. 2003. Phylosophy. Moscow: Prospekt. ISBN 5-98032-164-0.
ANTSIBOR, L. 2014. Machiavelli against Machiavellianism: psychology, ethics, politics. In: Studia universitatis Moldaviae, vol. 5, pp. 143-152. ISSN 1857-2103.
ARISTOTLE. 2018. Policy. Moscow: Ripol-Classic. ISBN: 978-5-386-09429-4.
BARYSHKOV, V.P. 2010. Machiavellianism and stratagem as methods of political and daily activities. In: Proceedings of the Saratov University, vol. 10, n.1, pp.116-120. ISSN: 1818-9601.
BAUMAN, Z. 2005. Individualized society. Moscow: Logos. ISBN 5-98704-075-2.
CARLIN, F. 2011. The art of influence. In: Psychology Today, vol. 44, pp. 64-69. ISSN: 0033-3107
CARRUTHERS, P. 2009. How we know our own minds: The relationship between mindreading and metacognition. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, vol. 32, pp. 121–138. ISSN: 0140-525X

CHERULNIK, P.O. – WAY, J.H. – AMES, S. – HUTTO, D.B. 1981. Impressions of high and low Machiavellian men. In: European Journal of Personality, vol. 49, n. 4, pp. 388-400. ISSN: 0890-2070.

CÔTÉ, S., DECELLES, K.A., MCCARTHY, J.M., VAN KLEEF, G.A., HIDEG, I. 2011. The Jekyll and Hyde of emotional intelligence: emotion-regulation knowledge facilitates both prosocial and interpersonally deviant behavior. In: Psychological Science, vol. 22, pp. 1073–1080. ISSN: 0956-7976

DANILEVSKY, N.Ya. 2017. Russia and Europe. Moscow: Eksmo. ISBN: 978-5-04-089260-0

DOTSENKO, Ye.L. 1997. Psychology of manipulation: phenomena, mechanisms and protection. Moscow: CheRo. ISBN: 5-88711-088-4.

DUNBAR, R.I. 2006. Putting humans in their proper place. In: Behavioral and Brain Sciences, vol. 29, pp. 15-16. ISSN: 0140-525X

FROMM, E. 2017. Escape from freedom. Moscow: ACT. ISBN: 978-5-17-091681-8.

GNATENKO, P. 2015. Machiavelli about the nature of a human. Humanities and Social Sciences, vol. 22, n. 1, pp. 25-32. ISSN: 2300-9918.

GUSEYNOV, A.A. 2014. Morality and politics: the lessons of Machiavelli. Philosophical journal, vol. 2, pp. 5-23. ISSN: 2072-0726.

HABERMAS, Yu. 2011. Between naturalism and religion. Philosophical articles. Moscow, 336 pp. ISBN: 978-5-7777-0386-6.

HOBBES, T. 2017. Leviathan. Moscow: Ripol-Classic. ISBN: 978-5-386-09587-1.

HORKHEIMER, M. – ADORNO, T. 1997. Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philos. fragments. Moscow. ISBN: 5-85691-051-6.

IL'IN, I.A. 2017. On the resistance to evil by force. Moscow: Dar. ISBN: 978-5-485-00497-2.

KALUTSKAYA, I.N. – PODDJAKOV, A.N. 2007. Representations of Machiavellianism: a variety of approaches and assessments. In: Cultural and historical psychology, vol. 4, pp. 78-90. ISSN: 1816-5435.

KOHYAR, K. – RESTUBOG, S.L. – ZAGENCZYK, T.J. – KIEWITZ Ch. – TANG, R.L. 2010. In pursuit of power: The role of authoritarian leadership in the relationship between supervisors' Machiavellianism and subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervisory behavior. In: Journal of Research in Personality, vol. 44, n. 4, pp. 512-519. ISSN: 0092-6566

KOKOSHKIN, A.A. 2010. Politics as a social phenomenon. Forms and types of politics, its actors, relations with ideology, military strategy and intelligence, Moscow: Librocom. ISBN: 978-5-397-01442-7.

MACHIAVELLI, N. 2013. The Prince. The Art of War. Moscow: Eksmo. ISBN: 978-5-699-64581-7.

MACHIAVELLI, N. 2017. The Prince. St. Petersburg: Azbuka. ISBN: 978-5-389-07365-4.

MACHIAVELLI, N. 2018. The Prince. The art of power. Moscow: ACT. ISBN: 978-5-17-983310-9.

MARKUZE, G. 2003. One-dimensional person. Moscow: Ermak. ACT. ISBN: 5-17-008282-7, 5-9577-0250-1.

MARKHININ, V.V. 2017. The political philosophy of Giovanni Botero: the moral emancipation of politics and (anti) Machiavellianism. In: Northern region: science, education, culture, vol. 1, pp. 84-88. ISSN: 2312-377X.

MAY, R. 2016. Love and will. Moscow: Ripol-Classic. ISBN: 978-5-88230-276-3.

NIZHNIKOV, S.A. 2014. The doctrine of the "conscientious compromise" of Ivan Il'in and the doctrine of Niccolo Machiavelli. In: Space and time, vol. 1, pp. 37-42. ISSN: 2219-4525.

PLATO. 2016. The State. Moscow: ACT. ISBN: 978-5-17-098343-8.

POLYAKOVA, N.V. 2017. To the question of "Machiavellianism" in the political ethics of N.Ya. Danilevsky. In: Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University, vol. 10, n. 2, pp. 123-129. ISSN: 2411-121X.

RUBINSTEIN, S.L. 2012. The Man and the World. St. Petersburg: Peter. ISBN 978-5-459-00888-3.

SHEYNOV, V.P. 2010. Manipulation of consciousness. Minsk: Harvest. ISBN: 978-985-16-6930-7.

SHEYNOV, V.P. 2014. Manipulation and protection from manipulation. St.Peterburg: Peter. ISBN 978-5-496-00472-5.

SHOSTROM, E. 2008. Man-manipulator. An inner journey from manipulation to actualization. Moscow: Aprel'-Press. ISBN: 978-5-903182-27-5.

SKINNER, N.F. 1983. Personality correlates of Machiavellianism, extraversion and toughmindness in business. In: Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, vol. 11, n.1, pp. 29-33. ISSN 0301-2212

SOKOLOVA, E.T. – IVANISHCHUK, G.A. 2013. The problem of conscious and unconscious manipulation. In: Psychological research, vol. 28, n. 3. Available online: http://psystudy.ru/index.php/num/2013v6n28/790-sokolova28.html ISSN 2075-7999.

STEPURA, E.V. 2016. Value aspects of Machiavellism. In: American Journal of Fundamental, Applied & Experimental Research, vol. 3, pp. 99-104. ISSN 2474-9397

WARD, L.F. 2002. Mental factors of civilization. St. Petersburg: Peter. ISBN: 5-318-00152-1.

YEVLAMPIEV, I.I. 2002. Niccolo Machiavelli is a thinker of the past and our contemporary. St. Petersburg: Russian Christian Humanitarian Institute. ISBN: 5-88812-165-7.

YURENKOV, V.V. 2013 Manipulation as a social and philosophical phenomenon. In: Theory and practice of social development, vol. 4, pp.21-23. ISSN: 1815-4964. ISSN: 1815-4964.

ZENTSOVA, N.I. 2009. Features Machiavellianism and Machiavellian intelligence in persons dependent on alcohol and heroin. In: Questions of narcology, vol. 4, pp. 66-73. ISSN: 0234-0623.

ZNAKOV, V.V. 2000. Machiavellianism: the psychological property of a person and the methodology of his research. In: Psychological journal, vol. 21, n. 5, pp. 16-22. ISSN: 0205-9592.

ZNAKOV, V.V. 2002. Machiavellianism, manipulative behavior and mutual understanding in interpersonal communication. In: Questions of psychology, vol. 6, pp. 22-53. ISSN: 0042-8841.

ZNAKOV, V.V. 2006. Methods of studying the Machiavellian personality. Moscow: Smysl. ISBN: 5-89357-064-2.

Words: 8817
Characters: 58 947 (32,75 standard pages)

Assoc. Prof. Ibragim D. Ibragimov, PhD in Education
Head of the Department of the Eastern Languages and Cultures
Pyatigorsk State University
9 Kalinin Avenue,
357532, Pyatigorsk
Russia
ibragimid@mail.ru

Prof. Badma V. Sangadzhiev, Doctor in Law
Department of Judiciary, Law Enforcement and Human Rights Activities of the Law Institute,
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University),

6 Miklukho-Maklaya Str.,
117198 Moscow,
Russia
lotos-75@mail.ru

Assoc. Prof. Sergey N. Kashurnikov, PhD in Political Science
Department of Risk Analysis and Economic Security,
Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation
49 Leningradsky prospect
125993 Moscow
Russia
snkashurnikov@fa.ru

Assoc. Prof. Ivan A. Sharonov, PhD in Technical Science
Department "Agro Technologies, Machines and Life Safety"
Ulyanovsk State Agrarian University named after P.A. Stolypin,
1 Bulvar Novy Venets,
432017 Ulyanovsk,
Russia
ivanshar2009@yandex.ru

Prof. Julia A. Krokhina, Doctor of Law
Department of Legal Disciplines, Higher School of State Audit (Faculty),
Lomonosov Moscow State University,
1/13 Vorobyovy Gory,
119991 Moscow,
Russia
jkrokhina@mail.ru