Social action and power At Max Weber

Dr. Ahmed Elguerri

University of Algiers 2 Abu El Kacem Saadallah (Algeria) Email:
a.elguerri72@gmail.com

ABSTARCT:

Max Weber's interest in power stemmed from his study of social action and the individual and their behavior within groups and human societies. For Weber, power is the sum of human behaviors, processes, and interactions that express human control over other human beings. The state is the geographical framework for this control and must hold a monopoly on coercive force. However, he emphasized the necessity of legitimizing the use of physical coercion, which also legitimizes the concept of control, thus making the use of force and violence a legitimate matter, the right to which belongs solely to the state.

Keywords: Social action; power; Max Weber.

Introduction

Max Weber's legacy and thought defy easy categorization, even though most researchers consider him a sociologist and one of the three founders of sociology (Durkheim, Weber, and Marx). Weber's work lies at the intersection of several fields of knowledge: sociology meets the philosophy of history, political science meets political economy, and culture and society intersect with ethics and economics, all aiming to interpret previous knowledge. Weber focused on power within his study of social action, and on the individual and their behavior within groups and human societies. Politics, he argued, is an activity that humanity has engaged in since antiquity, and as a field, he defined it as "the efforts we make to participate in governance or to influence the distribution of power, whether between states or between different groups within a state."

For Weber, politics is the sum of human behaviors, processes, and interactions that express human domination over other human

beings, and the state is the geographical framework for this domination, which must monopolize the power of coercion.[1]However, Weber stressed, with regard to the use of physical coercion, the need to legitimize this force, which also legitimizes the concept of control in such a way that the use of force and violence becomes a legitimate matter that only the state has the right to use, and with it, power becomes an honor to exercise this power.

Central concepts related to power
1. Power is the foundation of the political system.

Should we use force in politics and within the state? Julien Freund's perspective[1]This is a pointless linguistic question because humans naturally resort to force, and politics, by its very nature, cannot do without it. It is no less absurd than asking whether intelligence should be used in science. Humans possess and utilize power by virtue of their humanity and their intellect, sometimes employing it successfully and at other times in ways that evoke pity. Therefore, power is not something external to humanity, civilization, or culture. Nor is it something accidental or acquired that can

be abandoned or discarded. Furthermore, no state exists without power, and a truly powerful state is one that can conceal power within its structures, customs, and institutions without constantly brandishing it or using it as a tool to threaten and intimidate its citizens. In this way, coercion becomes almost imperceptible, and legality and legitimacy are conflated within it, such that power itself becomes a guarantee of security.

These are the same ideas of his mentor, Max Weber, who placed the concept of power at the center of political action, considering it the primary determinant of the state's existence. Through power, the state can manage the perpetual conflict, whether between individuals or groups, which is a characteristic of human existence. For Weber, power is "the probability that an individual, within the context of a social relationship, can carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis upon which this probability rests."[3]

fromFrom this definition, we conclude that power necessarily requires a will that can be exercised over other wills, capable of confronting their potential resistance. Thus, power can be a singular or isolated

characteristic of an individual, but it only exists within a framework of homogeneity between that individual and a number of others. However, Weber argued that societies are not, as some sociologists believe, homogeneous groups, such as Auguste Comte, who saw society as composed more of the dead than the living, based on the principle of consent. In reality, societies are composed more of conflicts than agreements. Indeed, conflict is a fundamental social relationship that, along with the concept of submission, forms the basis for the emergence of the state.[2]

For Weber, conflict is the state's mechanism for organizing the people; he believes that the means or subject of conflict can be modified, and that we can examine its direction.AThis is true, but we must not eliminate it altogether, for even peace merely signifies a transformation or modification of the form of conflict. And if economic conflict is waged mercilessly under the guise of free competition, then, according to Weber, this means that conflict is inevitable within the state, and even in the realm of international relations.

To justify his idea, Weber drew on Darwin's concept of "the struggle for survival" and the principle of "selection of the fittest." He also opposed vitalist theories that existed outside the field of social sciences, even calling them "miserable" because they spoke within the realm of politics.forThe concepts of social compassion, without linking them to the concepts of power, authority, and social selection.Y.FiberYHe believed that politics was a matter of power, and anyone who wanted to take on its responsibility had to have strong nerves. He must not let his emotions overcome him, for politics is the inevitable and constant struggle of man against man.onthe earth.

Weber believed in the idea of power and linked it to the existence of the state. Every political authority, whether rightwing or left-wing, liberal or socialist, communist or fascist, even if it declared that it would only rule according to the law, must use power. Trotsky says that all states are based on power..This is what Max Weber considered to be true. [3] (If there were only social structures that were free from all forms of violence, the concept of the state would disappear, and nothing would remain except what you call "chaos" in the specific sense of the word. Of course, violence is not the only

[2] - Ikram Adnani, previous reference, p. 148.

[3] - Max Weber, Science and Politics as a Vocation, translated by George Kettoura, Arab Organization for Translation, Beirut, 1st edition, 2011, p. 262.

ordinary means of the state – there is no doubt about that – but it is its qualitative means.)

Since ancient times, politics has been either a terrifying and rigid prize or a tolerant and flexible one, and it has used coercive tools that are either terrifying and disturbing or simple, common, and legally sanctioned penalties. But throughout the ages, it has not been proven that there has ever been a politics that does not use physical coercive tools or mechanisms of intimidation...The tendency to entrench the role of violence in the historical process as a defining and fundamental driving force of social development and the primary source of law and political authority has always been a characteristic of bourgeois thinkers since Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Spinoza. Bodin, etc. In modern times, power was presented as the basis of justice, and thanks to him, the theoretical concept of politics was freed from ethics, which means analyzing politics in an independent way.[4]

Julien Freund sought to justify the obligation of force and coercion, asserting that the profound meaning of coercion as a political tool is to allow each individual to conform to their inclinations within the group without

causing irreparable harm to other members.[7] For Weber, power was a

fundamental means and an important mechanism in defining the state and in political action. He even defined it as "a group of specific individuals within a defined geographical area who monopolize legitimate violence." Politics, in its essence, is inseparable from the essence of power; indeed, it is the very essence of politics.NThe use of force worries and confuses him.,Sun improvesAA!If he completely stops thinking about playing a key role, or putting his fingers in the wheels of history[5] To overcome the inherent evil that can sometimes accompany the concept of state power, Weber emphasized the necessity of the principle of legitimacy, which must be possessed by those who have the right to use and monopolize it. The violence Weber refers to is legitimate violence, linked to the principle of coercion, not violence in its general sense. However, the confusion that can arise between force within the law and the abuse of force has led to the absolute adoption of force, particularly by Nazis who distorted Weber's concept of legitimate power and disregarded the relationship of domination and

[4] - Ikram Anani, previous reference, p. 153.
[7]- The same reference, p. 156.

[5] Max Weber, previous reference, p. 355

submission that governs the relationship between the ruler and the ruled within the state.

2. **Control, the central concept of politics**

The state is the social framework through which social action can be studied. It brings together in its environment a number of conscious individuals who produce conscious actions and behaviors, and thus social relations worthy of study. However, Weber limited his definition of the state to the concept of power. For him, politics is the management of a particular political group of what we call the state today. It is also the sum of efforts made to participate in power and influence the distribution of power, whether between states or between different groups within the state.

The state, in the Weberian sense, is linked to power, especially the power of coercion, which it monopolizes without any other body within its borders. Weber says that those who govern the state...[6]They gather the means by which they can effectively manage the affairs of the people, and to that end, they monopolize the legitimate use of physical force, either to maintain internal order or to defend society against external threats. This makes the state a political entity of control, where specific individuals control others through this coercive power.

Consequently, the state cannot exist unless this social relationship between the rulers and the ruled is

realized. For Weber, the state is therefore the only entity that monopolizes, or should monopolize, the exercise of force, which is necessarily legitimate.

The question that arises in this case is: what are the cultural, political, social, and economic conditions that produce this relationship? To answer these questions, Weber developed a system of concepts, limiting them to three basic concepts: power, control, and organization, which he defined as follows:[7]:

    i- **Ability ((**puissanceThis means the possibility of a particular individual exercising power over another individual or individuals, even if they have an orientation contrary to the ruling authority.

b- Control ((dominationIt means the possibility of imposing a specific system of obedience, i.e., the obedience of an individual or a group of individuals to this system.

c) Discipline (discipline): This means the possibility of creating a specific system of obedience that is immediate and automatic on the part of a group of individuals who are subject to an authority imposed immediately.

[6] - Max Weber, previous reference, 263.

[7] - Ikram Adnani, previous reference, p. 158.

Weber distinguished between power and control, considering the latter as a distinct state of the former. He argued that the difference between power and control lies in the fact that in the former, rule is not necessarily legitimate and obedience is not obligatory, while in the latter, control is based on the existence of acceptable obedience to the ruler. This is evident in Weber's definitions of the concepts of power and control; for him, power means[8](The luck of imposing the will of one individual on another or others, even if they oppose this will. This definition contradicts the concept of control, which means the luck of finding individuals who are willing to accept obedience).

Weber's definition of authority appears to be a conceptual one, resulting from the circumstances and values prevalent in the historical period in which he lived. However, at the same time, it expresses the values that Weber preached and hoped would prevail in the future, especially the monopoly and centralization of the tools of violence by the state and its exclusive right to use them. Thus, violence becomes a mechanism for defending individuals within society and the entire state, and this can only be achieved by activating legitimate control.

Control with the presence of power is the essence of political action according to Weber, and it corresponds to

authoritarian rule, as it expresses the situation in which the controller controls the way the controlled behave, in a way that is compatible with the social interest. Thus, control is not a natural given, but rather an intellectual construct resulting from the interaction of a number of social behaviors and actions.

Weber's sociology of domination was based on the existence of obedience to a legitimate political system. In other words, domination is achieved when a certain number of people are willing and able to submit to and obey this domination. Therefore, it is not simply a matter of having a strong authority and imposing it on others, because this relationship requires a degree of will and desire on the part of the submissive and obedient individuals to achieve this relationship, based on the existence of an intrinsic and extrinsic interest that governs this will.[9] From this definition, we can deduce three characteristics of political organization according to Weber:

---

[8] - Max Weber, Economy and Society "Sovereignty", translated by Muhammad Al-Turki,

[9] - Max Weber, previous reference, 285.

FirstPolitical assembly involves continuous, permanent control, that is, the constant availability of obedience to the orders issued by the rulers.

Second,This continued luck of obedience comes only through the use of

the threat of force and coercion, which is monopolized by the ruling apparatus.

Third,This monopoly is linked to regulations and laws.

Weber believed that there are psychological motives that influence the political behavior of individuals and groups, mainly fear and hope.[10]The fear of the authority itself or of social and economic unrest, and the hope of changing the situation with possible political alternatives, then it moves to the tool by which political control can be strengthened, which lies in the administration, since the policy of control pursued by the state, whatever its form, requires a cohesive and continuous administrative apparatus, as well as material resources that control their distribution.

For him, politics is meaningless in the absence of control, as the latter represents the reality of politics, and therefore it is closely linked to it and connected to it in its multiple manifestations. Here the following question arises: Was Weber influenced by Hegel's master-slave dialectic? For Hegel, political relations reflect a continuous struggle for recognition. The master seeks recognition from the slave because, in the absence of this recognition, the master cannot be a true master. However, the slave's recognition

of the master may indicate that the slave wishes to remain a slave, and the slave's recognition of the master is, in reality, a consecration of his servitude.

This dialectical relationship connects parties with conflicting interests, but who have a common desire to be recognized. It reflects the reality of political relations. Weber's interest in political behavior and his disregard for political structures and mechanisms are in line with Hegel's philosophy, as he was interested in the forms of consciousness that accompany political action.

Hegel saw the state as a management of this endless struggle for recognition and understanding. The struggle for recognition and submission to the master constitutes the phenomenon that led humans to live together, and which also led to the formation of states. The state is the one that will play the role of mediator between the conflicting

---

[10] - Ikram Adnani, previous reference, p. 160.

parties and will manage the struggle for recognition.

This view of the dialectical relationship between the ruler and the ruled is found in Weber's philosophy, who defines domination as the ability to subjugate and influence others. Here, questions arise: Who has the right to rule or dominate? Why should I or individuals obey...?

Weber saw control as the ability to find people who are willing to submit or obey. Control has a strong connotation and may often mean dictatorial leadership, although it often reflects the convergence of political control with individuals who seem to want to obey and submit, and who voluntarily adopt the principles and goals declared by the controlling authority. If the motives that drive individuals to obey range from fear and personal interest to belief in certain values, then the authority is not sufficient with this relationship, but needs to be recognized as a legitimate authority. [11]

Here we encounter Hegel's idea, which is also that the ruling power is not satisfied with the motives that urge a person to obey based on their interests and personal convictions. It desires to be recognized as an authority that has the right to be in control, and it strives to appear legitimate to individuals.

Therefore, there must be a firm, deeprooted, and unwavering belief in the legitimacy that the ruling power promotes. Political legitimacy is a belief in the ruler's right to rule.

Weber's analysis of the concept of obedience revealed that other factors contribute to an individual's submission to a particular authority, regardless of the value of that authority. In other words, obedience is not always submission to

coercion, but can also be an endorsement and acceptance of an imposed system. This occurs because the individual subjected to obedience perceives the one imposing it as having full authority and legitimacy. Weber argues that no political society can truly exist, nor can it protect its members and property, without the mechanism of obedience to the dictates of law and justice. Furthermore, a place where obedience is absent not only lacks a civil society, but society itself.

Models of legitimate authority

Authority, or the opportunity for compliance/obedience to a particular order, can be based on various motivations of leadership: it can be based on pure self-interest, that is, on rational, practical considerations on the part of the obedient; or it can be based on simple habit, that is, on mere familiarity with the established practice; or it can be driven by

[11] - Ikram Adnani, previous reference, p. 162.

pure emotion, that is, finding its justification in the simple personal inclination of the governed. However, authority based solely on such foundations appears unstable, which is why authority, whether held by rulers or citizens, must be based on legal foundations, that is, internally supported by motives that justify its legitimacy. The erosion of this sense of legitimacy has dire consequences. [12] Generally speaking, for Weber, legitimate authority in its purest form comes in three models:

A -The legitimacy of charisma

Charismatic authority is usually created in opposition to tradition by people who are very similar to prophets, and in Latin it means "divine grace".[13]Weber says that he borrowed the concept of charisma from Rudolf Somme, and this type of legitimate authority occupied an important place in his thought, because he considered that charisma reveals politics in its true form, as it benefits absolute control over a group of people who strongly and firmly believe that the ruler possesses superior abilities that distinguish him from other people. Charisma, as Weber says, is a concept that we find in Christian theology, and it is the distinguishing characteristic of a gifted person who has supernatural and

superhuman abilities and qualities.[17]Therefore, submission is to the sacred and heroic quality or the ideal value of the ruling person.[14].

Max Weber says [15] ((The charismatic person picks up the task he sees as suitable for him, and demands obedience and loyalty by virtue of his mission. He will only reach his goal to the extent that success is his ally. If those to whom he

feels he has been sent do not acknowledge his mission, his demand falls away. But if they acknowledge him, he becomes their master as long as he knows how to maintain their acknowledgment of him through testing.))The basis of charisma is emotional rather than irrational, because the power of such activity depends entirely on blind and often fanatical trust and on faith in the near-total absence of criticism, because the subjects trust that he alone possesses those extraordinary qualities, and therefore recognition and submission are absolute, for charisma is absolute legitimate authority.

Charismatic authority is authority that uses various means to gain belief in it, and it buildsyBased on people's belief in representations of legitimacy, it strives to

---

[12] Max Weber, previous reference, p. 743.
[13] - Laurent Fleury, Max Weber, translated by: Muhammad Ali Muqallad, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Jadeeda Al-Muttahida, Lebanon, 1st edition, 2008, p. 89. [17] - Max Weber, previous reference, p. 500.

[14] - Julian Freund, Max Weber, translated by George Abi Saleh, National Development Center, Lebanon, 1998, p. 222.
[15] - Max Weber, previous reference. p. 500.

push individuals to believe in the ruler's right to rule. Here we recall Machiavelli, who saw power as an illusion for the people to achieve the goals and objectives of the public.[16] However, although Weber agrees with Machiavelli on this point, he believed that authority should not delude the people who believe in it, but rather there should be a spontaneous encounter between the ruler and the ruled, and an automatic correspondence between the obedience of individuals and their interest, which makes authority seem as if it is a result of their personal will. The charismatic control society is an emotional society dominated by emotion and passionate feelings towards the ruling person. In this society there are no administrators or employees and no administrative hierarchy, but rather special representations and beliefs, disciples and followers, and the only law that is applied is the will of the ruling person. Throughout history there have been many examples of charismatic figures, the most important of which are the figures of the prophet, the army commander, the priest, the magician, and the demagogue who took on the role of party leader in the modern state.

This does not mean that charismatic authority is a bad form, if a leader is found who aligns with the values and interests of society. Perhaps the best form of authority

accompanies rapid change without shattering the unity of society. Charisma, as Freund says, "is the suspension of continuity, whether legal or traditional; it dismantles institutions and reconsiders the existing order and ordinary coercion, in order to call for a new approach to understanding relationships between people. It is both destruction and construction, and the limits and controls are those that the

leader sets without reference to anyone else, according to what he believes to be his calling. Thus, he derives his legitimacy from within himself, independent of any external standard."[17].

Given the history of charisma, it seems to lack continuity. When a ruler's charisma begins to wane, so does the end of power. It is a quality that cannot be institutionalized, which is why it oscillates between extreme strength and extreme weakness. Every charismatic policy is an adventure, not only because it risks failure, but also because it is compelled to constantly seek new inspiration and offer further incentives to reaffirm its power. Thus, we understand that such power is at odds with...Authoritylegal orAuthorityTraditional, but it may become traditional when power is

---

[16] - Laurent Floré, previous reference, p. 113.

[17] - The same reference, p. 114.

inherited by others, and it may become rational when it becomes subject to certain controls and rules, or when a charismatic ruler creates legal institutions within the state.[18].

What is noteworthy about charismatic legitimacy is that the charismatic ruler has no limits to his power; rather, he himself sets those limits. This type of rule can easily escalate into dictatorship. Many scholars and researchers have pointed out that Weber's studies of the charismatic personality, his interest in it, and his attempts to justify its necessity, served as a psychological preparation for the German people, who would later receive the most infamous charismatic leader in modern history: Hitler.,This led to Max Weber and his followers being accused of advocating dictatorship. They were heavily criticized for these ideas. However, Loren Fleury argued that while Weber did advocate for the rule of a single strongman, he did so within the framework of a state governed by the rule of law..

b- Traditional legitimacy

It is based on the belief in the legitimacy of traditions. Weber saw that in the human soul there is a part of faith that made it accept the legitimacy of a particular system since the emergence of the first unity of the state, and that generations inherited this belief until it became a custom or tradition. As it exists in ancient systems, it also exists in modern systems. In his view, the degree of stability of the political system depends on the degree of legitimacy it acquires as a result of a custom or tradition. Individuals submit to authority because they sanctify the traditions that obligate them to obedience, and these traditions may be unjustified, yet they are still submitted to. [19]The concept of loyalty

explains the reason for this submission to the traditional ruler. The traditional state may have administrative bodies and a system of laws, but these systems work to impose and respect established traditions.

While charismatic control begins to exert its influence from the outset, traditional control finds its legitimacy in the uncertainty surrounding its origins. Tradition, therefore, comprises a set of practices that have existed continuously since time immemorial. And while charismatic legitimacy is temporary, ending with the moral or physical demise of the charismatic figure, traditionalism endures as long as ancient traditions persist. The longer a system lasts, the greater its chance of survival, allowing it to remain in effect for generations and decades. A defining characteristic of

---

[18] - Ikram Adnani, previous reference, p. 166.

[19] - Laurent Floré, previous reference, p. 88.

traditional societies is their resistance to novelty and innovation. They accept only reforms that merely restore the previous state, which they perceive as having been corrupted by reprehensible deviations[20].

In the case of traditional legitimacy, power does not belong to a leader chosen by the people of the country, but rather to a man called to power by virtue of prevailing custom. He thus rules in a personal capacity, such that obedience is directed to him personally and becomes an act of piety. The governed are not citizens but equals in the case of the sheikh's rule, or followers, and they are not subject, as Freund says, to a personal law but to tradition or to orders legitimized by virtue of the traditional prerogative of the monarch.[21]This type of legitimacy has existed and continues to exist throughout history, but Weber restricted it to the European Middle Ages.

C- Rational legitimacy:

It is based on the belief in the legitimacy of the laws and regulations that constitute the law applied and practiced by a specific person or persons. Unlike charismatic legitimacy, obedience within it is not to the individual per se, but to the legal system, says

Weber. [22] Bureaucracy represents the purest, technically speaking, model of legal authority. That is, it rests on the belief in the effectiveness of the checks and balances to which all persons are subject, including those who exercise them. In this case, the belief is based on the conviction that the government has acquired its powers legitimately, and therefore, the people accept the constitution and legislation of that government as binding upon them, given their legitimacy. Legal legitimacy has

been considered the familiar basis of legitimacy in the modern era. [23] Weber precisely identifies that this type of organization is not unique to public administration, but also applies to large capitalist enterprises.[24].

Rational legitimacy is fundamentally at odds with charismatic authority, in which the charismatic person is above all laws within the state. Unlike traditional legitimacy, what distinguishes this legitimacy is the rationality of individual relations within society, where the law that has the authority applies to all individuals, including the head of state or the holder of power. Legal rules are

---

[20] Jean-Marie Duncan, Political Science, translated by Muhammad Arab Sasila, Beirut, University Foundation for Studies and Publishing, 1997, p. 118.
[21] Freund Julian, op. cit., p. 112.
[22] Max Weber, previous reference, p. 744.

[23] - Ibrahim Darwish, Political Science, Dar Al Nahda Al Arabiya for Printing, Publishing and Distribution, Cairo, 1975, p. 288.
[24] - Philip Caban, Jean-François Doerteh, Sociology, translated by: Iyas Hassan, Dar Al-Farqad for Printing and Publishing, Lebanon, 2010, p. 49.

abstract and come as a result of special principles recognized by a legal and administrative body. These laws are what govern and what is subject to them, which is what we find in modern systems, where the head of state is elected for a specific period of time and is himself subject to the law.

Rational legitimacy may overlap with traditional legitimacy when the ruler combines two powers: the power of the traditional ruler who inherits the rule according to traditions, and the power of the head of state who relies on referendums to issue laws. The most prominent form of rational legitimacy remains embodied in the bureaucracy, in which everyone is subject to the control of the administration and the laws of the administration, and whose implementation is supervised by some individuals who have competence and experience in this field, but obedience is not to these individuals in themselves, but to the laws and rules that they issue in the name of the administration in a way that allows for the possibility of changing them at any time while the laws and rules remain as they are. Weber saw that bureaucracy is the inevitable fate that will prevail in modern societies, according to the political and social developments that these societies have come to know.[25]

In contrast to Weber's models of legitimacy, we find three ideal models of political systems: monarchy, dictatorship, and national parliament. Monarchy is based on the traditional model in which rulers inherit power. Dictatorship corresponds to the charismatic model in which one individual monopolizes power within the state. National parliamentarianism, or the rule of administrators, corresponds to the rational model, in which power belongs to the law and the administration. Weber saw that these types of government move in a sequential direction, where power is transferred from the traditional system to

the modern bureaucratic system. However, it seems wrong to accept the sequential movement of these types of power, because the three models can coexist in a system.

Ultimately, Weber considered any civilization to be a struggle for survival, ending with the triumph of the strong. He also argued that this struggle objectively acts as a selective force, producing the powerful. Here, Weber appears to be influenced by Darwin's theory of evolution. In reality, this idea arose from his engagement with Nietzsche. The concepts of struggle and selection not only refer to nature and Darwinism but also lead to ethical consequences,

---

[25] - Ikram Adnani, previous reference, p. 170.

meaning that the struggle ends with the selection of those who are morally strong and possess firm convictions, which they strive to achieve by any means necessary.[26] Weber was convinced of the idea of selecting a strong politician, who must possess qualities that qualify him to carry out the task of leading the state and leading society.

Mechanisms of politics and leadership

If Weber defined the state as a political enterprise with an institutional character, what distinguishes this institution from other political organizations is that it is a framework for control, along with its monopoly and centralization of the instruments of coercion and its exclusive right to use this violence within what he called the legitimate use of violence. While Weber was greatly interested in the concepts of state power, control, and its monopoly on legitimate violence, he linked these to state institutions and systems, considering them to be the center of political action and relations.

If a state, with all its mechanisms, can only survive through continued obedience and submission, then this depends on the existence of a strong leadership capable of imposing its legitimacy and fostering belief in its right to exercise authority and possess the instruments of violence. This can only be achieved through a capable

and powerful statesman with both the talent and ambition for power.

The politician model

Max Weber considered conflict and submission to a single leader to be the foundation for the emergence of the state. Although the state is an ancient phenomenon, Weber discussed it as a form of modern organization, a result of the rationality that modern Western societies had come to know. For him, the modern state is one in which rational authority is exercised and within which the belief in the legitimacy of authority prevails, as well as the legitimacy of those who possess the right to a monopoly on

---

physical coercion, because there are laws and systems that govern᷆ This monopoly,Even those who implement it are subject to it, but the questions that arise here, fromDoes he have the right to rule? Why should he?yShould I obey? And what qualities should a politician possess?

Weber's interest in these problems givesNThe impression is that his studies ofandThe sociology of understanding and its focus on the individual and the social actor,It is for the purpose of explaining and interpreting these relationships, that is, the relationship of domination/obedience, ruler and ruled, along with the concepts that follow from

---

[26] - The previous reference, p. 171.

it: authority, power, coercion, legitimacy, and also the ruler or leader..

The development that transformed politics into a project required a special upbringing, or what Weber calls the political education of the politician, who must be ambitious to possess power, even if he makes a pact with demonic forces for that purpose. Here, the question arises about the problematic relationship between ethics and politics. Is there any relationship between these two spheres, as is said? Or is it the opposite, that the same ethics are suitable for political action or for any other kind of action?[27]

Weber denied the existence of standards capable of managing the conflict between politics and ethics, arguing that the relationship between them is intertwined and reciprocal. A responsible politician must manage this conflict between moral and political values. Julien Freund also considered ethics to be a form of discipline and education, while politics is one of obligation and coercion. [28] Therefore, if politics and ethics are two distinct activities, given the different goals they pursue, it is clear that this cannot be the case with respect to their respective means.

Pure moral conviction cannot guarantee effective political action; this is the basis of the contradiction Max Weber saw between the ethics of conviction and the ethics of responsibility.[29] He explains in particular that "honesty, chivalry, and good nature may prevent the achievement of goals. And politics, if we consider that only good begets good and that evil only brings evil, is flawed because experience and history refute this view, as it often happens that moral idealism leads to unfortunate, if not tragic and ominous, results, and that a morally reprehensible decision produces positive or at least favorable results. Whoever conceives of

the relationship between means and ends in politics except from a moral angle condemns himself to stagnation and impotence, since in this case he works to isolate himself and retreat into constant opposition, and he has no choice but to deny or abolish the world."[30]

Weber distinguishes between the ethics of conviction and the ethics of responsibility. The ethics of conviction, which approximates rational social action with values, makes the politician act according to values and principles he

[27] - Ikram Adnani, previous reference, p. 182.

[28] - This observation reveals the failure of the scholars of Islamic political jurisprudence, especially Abu al-Hasan al-Mawardi, because he relied on an ethical approach in dealing with major political issues that require means of obligation and

coercion, while preaching lacks the mechanism of compulsion and punishment.

[29] - The same reference, p. 188.

[30] - Julian Freund, The Essence of Politics, translated by Farouk Hamid, Dar Al-Farqad for Publishing and Distribution, Lebanon, 2016, p. 87.

believes in, regardless of the goals he wants to achieve, because this would have dire consequences.thatThe ethics of contentment carry zero political weight; they use politics to achieve a state of nothingness, and social classes and groups have no goal or interest in power, nor even in competing for it.,The ethics of responsibility are the only things that can create a strong politician who will be able to take the reins of power within the state.[31]

The concept of the state and the strong politician are ideal models and an intellectual construct of activities directed in a rational way. These models, which contain all the characteristics expected to exist in social phenomena, are methodological tools, meaning that they do not exist completely in reality, nor should they exist completely. However, the challenge facing the researcher in sociology and politics, who starts his study from these models, is to determine how close or far the characteristics of the ideal model are from the phenomenon he is studying.[32]

Conclusion

Max Weber focused on the sociology of politics within his study of social action, and on the individual and their behavior within groups and human societies. Politics, he argued, is an activity that humans have engaged in since ancient times, and he defined it as "the efforts we make to participate in governance or to influence the distribution of power, whether between states or between different groups within a state." To better understand Weber's work on politics, we can summarize his extensive theoretical efforts to answer a central question: Should we use force in politics?

Weber's study of political sociology can only be defined through a set of concepts: power and control, models of legitimacy, and also through the politician who lives for and by politics.

Control forms the sociological framework for the concept of power, as the fundamentals upon which it is based are the same. History cannot be understood without invoking the will to power as a fundamental driver of human action. Indeed, it can be said that Weber's sociology of politics is at the same time a sociology of control, given that forms of control and power are important, even necessary, mechanisms in the political landscape and in the management of political institutions, which are represented by a relationship of command and obedience, because the absence of this relationship means falling back into the state of nature.

[31] - Ikram Adnani, previous reference, p. 190.

[32] - The same reference, p. 190.

For Weber, politics is the sum of human behaviors, processes, and interactions that express human domination over other human beings. The state is the geographical framework for this domination and must hold a monopoly on coercive power. However, Weber emphasized the necessity of legitimizing the use of physical coercion, which also legitimizes the concept of domination itself. This legitimizes the use of force and violence, making it a legitimate right belonging solely to the state, and transforming power into an honor to exercise it.

the reviewer

- Ikram Adnani, Sociology of Religion and Politics: Max Weber, Al-Maaref Forum, Beirut, Lebanon, 1st edition.2013.
- Ibrahim Darwish, Political Science, Dar AlNahda Al-Arabiya for Printing, Publishing and Distribution, Cairo, 1975.
- Jean-Marie Duncan, Political Science, translated by Muhammad Arab Sasila, Beirut, University Foundation for Studies and Publishing, 1997.
- Julian Freund, Max Weber, translated by George Abi Saleh, National Development Center, Lebanon, 1998.
- Julien Freund, The Essence of Politics, translated by Farouk Hamid, Dar Al-Farqad for Printing and Publishing, Lebanon2016.
- Ali Saad Ismail, Theory of Power, University Knowledge House, Alexandria, Egypt, 1998.
- Philippe Caban, Jean-François Dortier, Sociology: From Grand Theories to Everyday Affairs, translated by: Iyas Hassan,Dar Al-Farqad for Printing and Publishing, Lebanon, 2010.
- Laurent Floré, Max Weber, translated by Muhammad Ali Muqallad, Dar Al-Kitab AlJadeeda Al-Muttahida, Lebanon, 1st edition, 2008.
- Max Weber, Economy and Society "Sovereignty", translated by Muhammad AlTurki, Arab Organization for Translation, Beirut, 1st edition, 2015.
- Max Weber, Science and Politics as a Vocation, translated by George Kettoura, Arab Organization for Translation, Beirut, 1st edition, 2011.