



Why People Want Power: Its Nature, Pathologies, and Alternatives

English

<https://prompting-query.com/books/year-2025/why-people-want-power/>

WHY PEOPLE WANT POWER: ITS NATURE, PATHOLOGIES, AND ALTERNATIVES

The complete book, bringing all the parts together

INTRODUCTION

The paradox of power in the modern world

Power is at once the most coveted and the most cursed of human conditions. We seek it, yet despise those who have attained it. We criticize rulers, yet secretly envy what they can do. We dream of a world without coercion, yet keep inventing new forms of control. This paradox runs through the whole of human history and is especially acute in our own time.

The twenty-first century has given us unprecedented opportunities to organize without hierarchies: the internet, blockchain, and social networks allow millions of people to coordinate their actions without centralized management. At the same time, we see authoritarian tendencies growing stronger, along with new forms of digital totalitarianism and algorithmic control over behavior. Why is this happening?

The usual explanations—economic interests, psychological insecurities, historical traditions—seem inadequate. They describe how power works, but do not explain why people keep craving it even when it brings suffering both to those who wield it and to everyone around them.

Perhaps we misunderstand the very nature of power. We think of it as a tool, a means of achieving our goals. But what if power is not a means, but a way of being? Not a tool, but a drug? Not a solution to our problems, but an escape from them?

The aim and method of this inquiry

This book is an attempt to understand power not through political science or sociology, but through existential philosophy. Our concern is not how political systems are organized, but what happens to a person who acquires the ability to govern other people's lives.

We begin with the assumption that the pursuit of power is often rooted not in rational motives, but in existential needs: the need for meaning, control, and significance. Power becomes a way to fill an inner void and create the illusion that one's existence matters.

The paradox, however, is that power, which was supposed to give life meaning, often takes it away. In gaining control over others, a person loses control over themselves. On reaching the summit, they discover that it is empty.

Our analysis rests on several principles:

Phenomenological honesty: we try to describe power as it is experienced by those who wield it, rather than as theories say it ought to be.

Historical perspective: we trace the forms of power from antiquity to the present, showing how its mechanisms change while its essence remains.

Critical analysis: we do not take conventional justifications of power on trust, whether religious, secular, or technocratic.

Thinking in alternatives: we take seriously the possibility of a society without traditional forms of power.

The structure of the book

The book consists of four parts, each exploring a different aspect of the problem of power.

Part I. The Nature of Power explores the biological, historical, and psychological roots of the desire to dominate. We will trace the evolution of power structures from animal hierarchies to modern states and show how social conditions shape the need for control.

Part II. Mechanisms of Control examines how power is exercised in practice. From the physical coercion of antiquity to the algorithmic management of today, we will trace the evolution of the technologies of power and their effect on human consciousness.

Part III. Crisis and Pathologies explores the dark side of power: its capacity to destroy both those who wield it and those who submit to it. We will examine how power loses its meaning and becomes an end in itself, as well as the forms of resistance and refusal it provokes.

Part IV. Alternatives and the Future considers possible ways of moving beyond traditional forms of power, from non-hierarchical communities and networks to a radical rethinking of the very idea of governance.

This book does not claim to offer final answers. Its aim is to ask the right questions. In an age when traditional forms of power are in crisis and new ones are still taking shape, we need to understand not only the mechanisms of governance, but also the deeper motives of those who seek to govern.

Perhaps, once we recognize the true reasons for our attraction to power, we can find healthier ways to meet our existential needs. Perhaps, once we understand the pathological nature of many forms of control, we can create more humane alternatives. Or perhaps we will simply acknowledge honestly that the desire for power is an inseparable part of human nature, and that we must learn to live with it.

This book is an invitation to have that conversation with ourselves.

PART I. THE NATURE OF POWER

Chapter 1. Biological and historical roots

The instinct to dominate

When we watch a wolf pack, we see what anthropologists call a “natural hierarchy.” The leader is not chosen by a democratic vote: it wins its position through strength, cunning, or charisma. The other members of the pack not only submit to it, but also defend this hierarchy against outside challenges.

Human beings are the heirs of millions of years of evolution, and the instinct to dominate is as deeply rooted in us as the need for food or reproduction. A hierarchy emerges spontaneously in any group, from a kindergarten to a board of directors. Some become leaders; others become

followers. This happens automatically, without conscious decisions.

Yet human power differs from animal dominance in one fundamental respect: it can exist without the ruler being physically present. An alpha male must constantly reaffirm its dominance. A human ruler can govern an empire from thousands of kilometers away.

This is possible because of the uniquely human capacity to create symbols. Power is transformed from physical force into a symbol: a crown, a throne, a seal, a signature. This symbolic nature is precisely what makes human power both more potent and more fragile than animal dominance.

From tribe to state

In a prehistoric tribe, power was personal and limited. A chief could make decisions about war and peace, but could not force a fellow tribesman to surrender his wife or children. His authority rested on personal qualities: strength, wisdom, and a connection with the spirits.

The agricultural revolution changed everything. Surplus production, private property, and social stratification emerged. Power ceased to be a temporary role and became a hereditary privilege. Kings appeared who ruled not because they were the strongest or wisest, but because they had been born into the right family.

Ancient Egypt gives us history's first model of total power. The pharaoh was not merely a ruler: he was a god. His power extended over the dead as well as the living. The pyramids are more than tombs; they are the idea of absolute control over time and space made solid.

The Greek city-state offered an alternative: democracy. Yet power did not disappear there either. It simply became collective. A popular assembly could condemn Socrates to death as readily as a tyrant could condemn an unwelcome courtier. Democracy did not abolish power; it redistributed it.

The Roman Empire brought all the earlier forms together. The emperor was at once a military commander, a high priest, the embodiment of law, and the symbol of the state. Roman power was total, but also rational. It created a legal system that remains in use today.

The Middle Ages brought a new idea: power as service to God. A king ruled not because he was the strongest, but because he was God's anointed. This made power both more legitimate and more limited. The monarch was accountable not only to his subjects, but also to the Almighty.

The modern era secularized power. The Enlightenment replaced divine right with the social contract. Power became a rational arrangement, created by people to solve their shared problems. The paradox is that making power rational did not reduce its scope. On the contrary, the modern state controls its citizens' lives far more comprehensively than any medieval monarch did.

Power as a means of group survival

Why do people create hierarchies even when they have nothing to gain from them? Why does a poor person defend the system that oppresses them? Why do revolutionaries, having overthrown the old authorities, immediately establish new ones, often still more ruthless?

The answer may lie in understanding power as a means of group survival. When resources are limited and threats come from outside, a group without a leader is doomed to fall apart. Power is

not only a means of exploitation; it is also a form of coordination.

Imagine a tribe under attack. It has two possible strategies: either everyone fights for themselves, or everyone follows a single command. The first may work if the enemy is weak. The second is essential if the enemy is strong. And because groups that chose the second strategy were more likely to survive, natural selection ingrained in us a willingness to submit.

Yet that same willingness leaves us vulnerable to manipulation. Politicians throughout history have used real or imagined threats to strengthen their own power. “The enemy is at the gates” is the most effective way to make people surrender freedom for security.

Modern research shows that people are more willing to accept authoritarian decisions under stress, uncertainty, or threat. The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated how quickly democratic societies can agree to restrictions on basic rights in the name of collective safety.

But is there an alternative? Can a group survive without a hierarchy? Anarchist communities show that it can, but only under very specific conditions: a small group, a high degree of trust, and no serious external threats. As soon as even one of these conditions fails, the group either creates a hierarchy or falls apart.

Chapter 2. The social foundations of power

Fear of chaos and the need for order

“Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains,” wrote Rousseau. But what if these chains were not imposed by others, but chosen by us? What if we create power ourselves because we are afraid to live without it?

Chaos is more than disorder. It is a condition in which we cannot predict the consequences of our actions. There are no rules in chaos, and therefore no safety. Anyone can become a victim or an aggressor at any moment. Under such conditions, it is impossible to plan for the future, build relationships, or create anything that will last.

Power offers an alternative to chaos: order. That order may be unjust, and it may restrict freedom, but at least it is predictable. In a state with a strong government, people know that if they follow the rules, they are likely to stay alive and keep their property.

Hobbes called this exchange of freedom for security the social contract. People voluntarily give up the right to do whatever they want in return for a guarantee that others, too, will face limits on their actions. Power becomes the arbiter of this agreement.

But what happens when those in power break their side of the contract? When they fail to provide security yet continue to demand obedience? Logic suggests that the agreement should then be terminated. In practice, however, the opposite happens: people often cling to dysfunctional authorities because they fear chaos even more than tyranny.

Contemporary Russia is a striking example. Many Russians are critical of those in power, yet vote for them because they remember the chaos of the 1990s. “At least there is order” becomes the main political argument. What this overlooks is that stability without development is a slow death.

Scarce resources and competition

If resources were unlimited, would we need power? In a world of abundance, everyone could take as much as they wanted without depriving anyone else. Conflicts would disappear, and with them the need for arbiters.

But resources are limited. Always. Even in the wealthiest societies, something is scarce: time, attention, status, meaning. Where there is scarcity, there is competition. And where there is competition, there is a need for rules and for people to uphold them.

Power is an institutionalized way of distributing scarce resources. It determines who gets what, and on what grounds. In traditional societies, that distribution often rested on birth: aristocrats received more simply because they had been born into the right family.

Capitalism offered a new principle: meritocracy. Resources should go to those who earn them through talent and effort. In practice, though, meritocracy often becomes a new form of hereditary privilege. The children of wealthy parents get a better education, better connections, and a better start in life. “Equal opportunity” remains a myth.

Socialism tried a radical solution: abolish private property and distribute resources according to need. But who defines those needs? Who decides whether building factories matters more than building hospitals? Inevitably, a planning authority emerges and acquires immense power over people's lives.

The modern digital economy creates new forms of scarcity. Attention becomes the central resource: it can be monetized, directed, and competed for. Platform owners gain power not because they control land or factories, but because they control the flow of information.

Cultural narratives about power

Power needs a justification. Coercion alone is not enough: people must be persuaded that it is just. Every age creates its own stories of legitimacy.

In antiquity, power was justified by divine descent. The pharaoh was the son of a god, the Chinese emperor the Son of Heaven, and the Roman caesar a descendant of the gods. These narratives worked because people believed in gods and accepted a hierarchical picture of the world.

Christianity changed the narrative, but did not abolish it. Power still came from God, but the ruler was merely his representative on earth. This made power both more legitimate and more accountable. A king had to serve not only his own interests, but also the will of the Almighty.

The Enlightenment secularized power. It now came not from God, but from the people. Rulers received their mandate through elections or revolutions. The paradox is that democratic power can be no less totalitarian than power derived from the divine. “The will of the people” is as much an abstraction as “the will of God.”

The twentieth century brought new narratives: scientific, technocratic, and ideological. Power was justified not by tradition or will, but by knowledge. Communists claimed to know the laws of history; liberals, the laws of economics; technocrats, how society works.

The twenty-first century is creating algorithmic narratives. Power passes to those who possess data and can process it. Artificial intelligence knows us better than we know ourselves, so it can make decisions for us. This is the most seductive narrative of all, because it promises power without

responsibility.

Chapter 3. The psychology of the desire for power

Compensating for inner emptiness

“Someone hungry for power is someone who does not know who they are,” a wise man once observed. There is more truth in this remark than might first appear. The desire for power often springs not from an abundance of strength, but from a lack of it.

Imagine someone who lacks confidence, does not know their place in the world, and doubts their own worth. Power offers a simple solution to every problem. Once they gain control over others, they automatically become important. If people obey them, surely they must amount to something.

But this is an illusion. Power does not create a self; it disguises one. Beneath a ruler's robes may hide an insecure child, afraid to be left alone with their doubts. That is why rulers cling so fiercely to their authority: without it, they risk discovering their own emptiness.

History is full of rulers who compensated for private insecurities with public grandeur. Perhaps Napoleon conquered Europe to prove to himself that his short stature did not make him inferior. Perhaps Stalin killed millions to forget his provincial origins and physical shortcomings.

Modern research supports this hypothesis. People with low self-esteem are more likely to seek positions that give them power over others. They are also more ruthless in exercising that power, as though trying to prove to themselves and the world that they really are strong.

But compensation does not work. The more power an insecure person gains, the more anxious they become. They begin to suspect everyone of plotting against them, see threats where there are none, and surround themselves with flatterers and informers. The power that was supposed to give them confidence makes them paranoid.

Power as self-affirmation

Another motive for seeking power is the need for recognition. People want to feel that they matter, that they are needed and important. In traditional societies, this came through skill, wisdom, and service to the community. In the modern world, these paths have lost their prestige.

Power remains one of the few ways to gain public recognition. A politician on television, a chief executive on a magazine cover, a blogger with millions of followers: all receive what every person longs for—attention and respect.

But this recognition is illusory. People respect not the ruler as a person, but the position they hold. The moment that power is lost, respect evaporates. Yesterday's flatterers become tomorrow's mockers. Former presidents know this only too well.

Moreover, power often destroys the very qualities that might earn genuine respect. Rulers stop growing because those around them are afraid to criticize them. They lose touch with reality because they live in a world of controlled information. They lose the ability to form sincere relationships because they cannot tell who befriends them out of self-interest and who out of genuine loyalty.

It is especially tragic when people of truly exceptional ability come to power. Power does not strengthen their gifts; it destroys them. A brilliant scientist who becomes a minister stops doing science. A talented writer who takes political office loses the ability to create.

The illusion of control and meaning

Perhaps the deepest reason for seeking power is existential anxiety. Human beings are the only animals aware of their own mortality. That knowledge brings a fear they try to overcome in different ways.

One of these is the illusion of control. If I can govern other people, then I am not helpless before fate. If the lives of millions depend on my decisions, then my own life must have meaning.

Power offers a unique opportunity to feel like the master of the world. A ruler can pass a law, and millions of people will change their behavior. They can declare war, and history will take a new turn. They can build a monument, and their name will live on for centuries.

But this illusion, too, is deceptive. The more power someone gains, the more clearly they see its limits. They can govern people, but they cannot govern time. They can change laws, but they cannot change death. They can make their mark on history, but they cannot escape their own finitude.

What is more, power often strips life of meaning instead of giving it meaning. Rulers become hostages to their position. They cannot afford to be natural, sincere, or vulnerable. They must constantly play a role, wear a mask, and live up to an image.

As a result, someone who sought power to find meaning discovers that they have lost themselves. What was supposed to be a means of self-fulfillment has become a prison. The power that seemed to promise liberation has turned out to be another kind of slavery.

This explains why many rulers feel profound disappointment at the end of their lives. They have achieved everything they pursued, yet have not found what they were seeking. They wanted to become gods, but became functions. They dreamed of immortality and gained only a subtler reminder of their mortality.

PART II. MECHANISMS AND PATHOLOGIES

Chapter 4. Why people want power: philosophical reflections

The desire for power is one of humanity's oldest and most enduring motives. Its roots reach into both history and biology: the instincts to dominate, establish a hierarchy and control resources make power desirable and, to many, necessary. Throughout history, this desire has taken shape in heroes, chiefs and monarchs, figures around whom not only states but entire systems of values have been built.

Yet however enduring this motive may be, changing social conditions keep forcing us to reconsider the reasons for power. Scarce resources, competition and fear of chaos create a need to justify it: why this particular authority, why now, why in this form? This is where culture and upbringing exert their strongest influence. They teach us to see power as a goal, an attainable position, a sign of success. These reasons settle into myths, pass from parents to children and become part of what

we are taught.

And still a question arises: what if the history of humanity had never made the pursuit of power necessary? Imagine a world whose social order has no hierarchies, where horizontal ties take the place of vertical ones. Life in such a world would be radically different—perhaps more flexible, perhaps more chaotic, but certainly unlike the life we know. Our understanding of legitimacy would change just as profoundly: if power needed no justification, no explanation, we might see it as natural or, on the contrary, absurd.

Here, a reason becomes what keeps power from turning arbitrary. We want to believe that power has grounds, that it is neither an accident nor a whim nor a mistake. This belief gives us a sense of predictability, moral stability and trust. Without it, power looks like tyranny or chaos, depending on who is looking.

But what if this reason, too, is merely a justification invented after the fact? Then it does not precede power; it accompanies it, like an ornament or an outer shell. Such a realization unsettles our sense of justice: if the reason is an illusion, power itself may prove to be a form of self-deception.

A reason is often used to justify moral superiority. It is more than a logical explanation: it is a claim to truth, to the right to decide what is good and what is bad. Political rhetoric rests on this foundation: ‘We have the right because...’ Such words carry a force that makes power lasting, transferable and legitimate. Yet sometimes they are only a shell concealing brute force, control and coercion. When we can see through that shell, power loses its magic and becomes a mere mechanism.

If power had no justification, even in the form of a myth, it would be hollow. People would obey only out of fear or habit. As long as some reason remains, however questionable, power can endure. But there is a danger here: when that reason loses its substance, power becomes manipulation. It is sustained by helplessness rather than conviction.

Some researchers believe that fear is the basic reason people seek power. Fear of anarchy, disorder and a world without boundaries drives people towards submission. Power promises safety and stability, even when that stability comes at the cost of freedom. Other motives—envy, charisma, a desire to assert oneself—also play a part. Sometimes power is simply a means of self-protection. Sometimes it is a way to quiet an inner anxiety.

Imagine that power arose from love rather than fear. In such a society, leadership would mean care rather than domination: power as service, not mastery. Is this possible? In theory, yes. In practice, such forms of power are rare and fragile. A desire for power grounded in love must be sustained by the community, not only by the person who holds it.

If power arose from protest, it would seek to overturn the status quo rather than preserve it. Power itself would then express a revolutionary impulse, a constant renewal and a refusal of settled hierarchies. In this setting, it would lose its stabilizing role and become an instrument of change—and, with it, a source of instability.

In reality, however, we encounter a paradox: the more power a person gains, the more often they lose themselves. The existential crisis that comes with gaining control lays bare an inner emptiness. Power, it turns out, does not necessarily bring meaning; it can destroy it. Then a person feels that

power is not a summit but an abyss.

Chapter 5. The meaninglessness of power and cultural parody

The feeling that power is meaningless can arise not only from a personal crisis but also from failures within the system: unsuccessful reforms, corruption, ideological exhaustion. Where power produces no results, it comes to seem ineffectual, a piece of theatre. People lose trust, withdraw and turn away from politics. Power becomes a joke—a farce rather than an instrument.

Imagine a society in which power always seemed full of meaning. Perhaps no philosophy of doubt would have emerged there, no search for other ways of governing. Yet this very doubt drives intellectual and social development. It gives rise to criticism, protest and fresh thought.

If the meaninglessness of power awakens people instead of making them apathetic, a new relationship with power becomes possible. They rethink their involvement, look for ways to participate and demand accountability. But this can also lead to radicalization. A person who seeks meaning through power risks falling into self-deception, using power to fill an inner void.

Such a person may come to believe that only power can make them matter. The lack of meaning does not disappear; titles, influence and subordinates merely conceal it. Behind them often lies an anxious question: ‘What if none of this means anything?’ That anxiety can eat away at the structure from within. Power then grows unstable, and a crisis of legitimacy begins.

Sometimes this takes the form of cultural parody: power becomes an object of ridicule and satire. Rituals that once seemed important turn hollow. When the purpose of power no longer matches its results, its foundations begin to crumble. People stop believing its promises, and power loses its future.

Another important question emerges here: the grounds on which power rests. Without them, power becomes violence. In some cultures, power simply ‘is’, like a force of nature. It needs no explanation. In other settings, especially democratic ones, power without grounds is seen as a threat.

This is why narratives arise: of divine right, of tradition, of a contract between the people and their rulers. Such grounds give power legitimacy. Legal rules codify it, culture protects it and education explains it. Together, they create a sense of justice. People feel they are submitting to a coherent order rather than an arbitrary will.

But what if these grounds are merely a smokescreen? What if they conceal reality instead of reflecting it? Power then becomes manipulation, especially when its justifications change too often—from religion to progress, from progress to security, from security to survival. This endless search for new grounds erodes trust. Power loses its stability.

When those grounds are unclear, a struggle over interpretation begins. Some say power protects them; others say it threatens them. The winner is not whoever is right, but whoever speaks loudest. Institutions break down, populism takes hold and consensus disappears.

If charisma takes the place of solid grounds, power depends on one person. This is dangerous: charisma dies with its bearer, and succession is uncertain. Power becomes a performance. When the performance ends, people are left alone before the void.

Sometimes the foundation is simply habit. 'It has always been this way.' Here lies the strength of tradition, but also its weakness: it leaves no room for renewal. Power stiffens like a mummified body. It continues to exist, but no longer lives.

And yet, for all its fragility, having grounds strengthens the sense of justice. When people understand and share the reason power exists, they accept it even in difficult times. Without that, only fear remains. Or indifference. Or revolt.

Chapter 6. The anatomy of power: from instinct to illusion

Power as an inescapable paradox

Power is an inescapable yet tragic paradox of human society. It arises as a rational instrument for overcoming chaos and ensuring survival, but inevitably produces irrational pathologies of its own: alienation, total control, and existential emptiness. This, in turn, compels humanity to keep seeking freedom from it through acts of refusal and alternative forms of organization. Yet those alternatives are themselves always in danger of becoming new, more sophisticated hierarchies.

The inescapable temptation

This book is about the strongest and most dangerous temptation humanity has ever known: power. We seek it, fight for it, suffer under it, overthrow it, and... create it again in new forms. It is like fire: it can warm us and give us light, but it can also burn everything to the ground.

Why is power so compelling? And why, after attaining it, do people so often find only disappointment and emptiness? This book is an attempt to journey to the very roots of power. We will begin in the dark, instinctive depths of our biology, where the urge to dominate was born. Then we will see how fear of chaos led humanity willingly to create a force above itself capable of keeping it in check. We will examine the great narratives and illusions, from divine right to popular sovereignty, that turn power from mere force into a legitimate right.

But our journey will not end there. We will look behind power's grand façade and see its pathologies: the ruler's existential crisis, the obsession with total control, and the stifling meaninglessness of ritual. Finally, we will explore paths to freedom, from quiet acts of individual refusal to bold experiments in building societies free of hierarchy and coercion.

This is a journey from instinct to illusion and back again. Its purpose is not to give final answers, but to ask the right questions. Understanding the anatomy of power is the first step toward avoiding enslavement to it.

PART III. ALTERNATIVES AND RESISTANCE

Chapter 7. The philosophy of refusal: from the Stoics to the digital detox

When a system of power becomes total, repressive, or meaningless, the first and most intimate act of resistance is refusal. It is not always a loud revolt with flags on the barricades. More often, it is a quiet, inward gesture: a decision to say "no" to what everyone else takes for granted. Refusal is a way to reclaim sovereignty over one's own life, to draw a boundary where the system is trying to erase it.

The Stoics and the Cynics

The philosophers of antiquity were the first to recognize the strength of refusal as a way of life. In a world full of tyrants, wars, and the whims of fate, they sought a way to preserve inner freedom and peace of mind.

The Stoics—Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius—offered a brilliant formula: divide everything in the world into what lies within our power and what does not. Only our thoughts, judgments, and responses are within our power. Everything else—our bodies, health, wealth, reputation, and other people's actions—is beyond our control. For the Stoics, a wise person should concentrate entirely on what they can control and regard everything external with complete indifference, or *apatheia*.

The Cynics went further. Their refusal was not only inward, but also openly displayed. The best-known of them, Diogenes of Sinope, lived in a large earthenware jar, or *pithos*, and scorned wealth and every social convention. His famous encounter with Alexander the Great captures the essence of refusal: when the conqueror said, “Ask me for anything you want,” the philosopher replied, “Do not block my sunlight.”

Asceticism and the hermit's life

Almost every world religion has a tradition of asceticism: the deliberate renunciation of worldly goods, pleasures, and social ties in the pursuit of spiritual enlightenment. Monks, hermits, and saints radically reject the values of this world—power, wealth, and fame—for the values of another: salvation of the soul, nirvana, union with God.

Political refusal and disobedience

In the twentieth century, refusal became a powerful political instrument. Mahatma Gandhi turned passive resistance and civil disobedience into a strategy that ultimately led to India's independence. His idea of *satyagraha*—“holding firmly to truth”—is a refusal to cooperate with an unjust authority.

Modern forms of refusal

In post-industrial society, where the main forms of control are no longer physical violence but the race to consume and the overload of information, new forms of refusal emerge:

- Downshifting—giving up a well-paid but stressful career
- Minimalism—consciously rejecting excessive consumption
- A digital detox—stepping away from being constantly online

Chapter 8. Non-hierarchical alternatives: in search of a new society

An act of refusal frees the individual, but leaves them alone in the face of the system. The logical next step is for those who have said “no” to come together in new kinds of community, built on principles that offer an alternative to power, hierarchy, and coercion.

Anarchism as an alternative

The most consistent and radical alternative to power is anarchism. Contrary to popular belief, anarchy is not chaos, but a complex system of self-organization based on voluntary cooperation,

mutual aid, and the absence of coercion.

During the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939), extensive areas of Catalonia and Aragon came under anarcho-syndicalist control. Factories and land were collectivized and placed under workers' and peasants' committees. Money was abolished, and decisions were made at general assemblies.

Contemporary experiments

- Ecovillages and communes—thousands of small communities experimenting with consensus-based decision-making
- The Zapatista movement in Mexico—autonomous municipalities living by the principle of *mandar obedeciendo*, or “governing by obeying”
- DAOs (Decentralized Autonomous Organizations)—an attempt to use blockchain technology to build a fully transparent and democratic system of governance

The paradox of structurelessness

All these experiments face a fundamental paradox. In her essay “The Tyranny of Structurelessness,” the American feminist Jo Freeman showed that rejecting formal structures does not bring equality. Instead, power becomes invisible and informal.

CONCLUSION: INEVITABILITY OR CHOICE?

We began this journey with a simple question: why do people want power? We found its roots in our biology, in the primal fear of chaos, and in the enduring desire for order. Power is not a passing whim of history, but a fundamental response to the challenges of human existence.

Yet, as we have seen, this answer raises new and still more difficult questions. An instrument created to protect becomes a mechanism of control. A structure meant to give life meaning plunges people into existential emptiness. We have traced the evolution of power from the personal authority of a chief to an impersonal algorithm, but its inner tragedy remains unchanged.

In response to this tragedy, humanity has always sought paths to freedom. We have considered the strength of individual refusal, from the Stoic retreat into the self to the modern digital detox. We have examined bold experiments in building societies without hierarchies, from anarchist communes to decentralized networks.

And here we return to our central paradox. Is every refusal or alternative merely the seed of a new, more sophisticated form of power? Will today's revolutionary manifesto become tomorrow's state doctrine, and a non-hierarchical community turn into a new bureaucracy?

The book offers no final answer to that question. Perhaps none exists. But it does suggest several key conclusions:

- Awareness as protection: Understanding the nature and pathologies of power is our first and most important safeguard against its abuses.
- The value of alternatives: Even if utopias are unattainable, their very existence as ideas and experiments prevents the dominant system from hardening into immobility.

- Power in the future: The future of power will probably depend on its capacity to limit itself and work with non-hierarchical systems.

The history of power, then, is not a straight line, but an endless cycle of struggle between the instinct to dominate and the longing for freedom. Perhaps our true task is not to win that struggle once and for all, but to learn to live with this irresolvable contradiction while preserving our dignity and our right to choose.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[A list of the works consulted should appear here]

SUBJECT INDEX

[An alphabetical index of the main concepts and names should appear here]