

Sikandar Hayat

MAX WEBER'S CONCEPT OF CHARISMA AND CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP RECONSIDERED

Max Weber's concept of charisma and charismatic leadership has been used in the social sciences literature on political leadership in at least two important ways. First, charisma has been equated with 'popularity', indeed with the extent of popularity and the intensity with which the followers support their leaders.¹ Secondly, and more importantly, charisma has been identified with irrational behavior, flowing purely from emotions. The result of the first usage is that virtually all "popular" leaders, whatever the specific nature and form of their leadership, have been described as "charismatic leaders"² In the second usage those political leaders expressing organized and rational behavior have been explicitly denied the appellation "charisma". Thus, one noted writer, refused to consider a leader "charismatic", in spite of all other attributes of personal charisma, because he was a man "so different" from his followers. While his followers, he claimed, were "warmhearted" people, the leader, he believed, was "austere" and "remote", and thus could not be called a charismatic leader.³

The result of this usage of the concept of charisma and charismatic leadership has been that the concept — as distinct from the phenomenon — has come to be identified with the irrational, the emotional, and the 'popular' in politics. This denotation and connotation of the concept has not only made it extremely difficult to distinguish the charismatic leadership from other kinds of leadership, but indeed to suggest that the concept is connotatively specific and a meaningful construct.

Thus, many a critic of the concept⁴ not only did not hesitate to criticize it for its inherent vagueness, but even asserted that the concept is of little use in the analysis of political leadership.⁵ Attempts on the part of some proponents of the concept to salvage the concept, without making any serious effort to understand the real nature of the concept itself, not only failed to satisfy the critics, but also exposed them to a charge of "conceptual stretching".⁶

The trouble with both the critics and the proponents of the concept seems to be that they believe that charisma is in fact the embodiment of irrational behavior, involving an emotional form of communal relationship between the followers and the leaders and a this-worldly escape from institutional routines.⁷ In part, they are right. But while Weber in his first perspective on

charisma and charismatic leadership, expressing his anti-ascetic mood of the years immediately before World War I (1910-14), did suggest the irrational, the emotional, and the 'demagogic' aspects of charisma, in his second perspective, representing his ascetic-rationalism during and after the War, he emphasized a totally different view of charisma, emphasizing sobriety, rationality, and devotion to the "calling" of politics as the main attributes of the charismatic leadership.

Unfortunately, however, the second perspective on charisma and charismatic leadership could not get into the mainstream literature.⁸ Weber died before he could integrate the two perspectives in a final statement. Thus, one tragic aspect of Weber's writings is that they have not been integrated into an explicit framework by Weber himself. Weber put all his substantive ideas into the final text without making the relative importance of each explicit and clear.⁹ This difficulty was compounded by the fact that the first perspective on charisma and charismatic leadership reached the English-reading scholars first, and consequently the transformation of the concept in the second perspective failed to impress the already converted. Even countless references to the earlier formulation of the concept and its subsequent revision and modification could not move them. The concept had come to be irrevocably associated with the first perspective.¹⁰

Recognition of Weber's second and final perspective at this stage might be hard, even distressful for the conformist scholar. But then, if Weber's concept of charisma and charismatic leadership has to convey the meaning Weber himself assigned to it, there is no way but to take the second perspective into full account and to give it priority and preference over the first perspective to the extent that it stands modified or revised. The second perspective, like the first perspective, is the creation of Weber's own mind and cannot be thus ignored. It represents his own criticism or rejection of certain parts of the first perspective and also affirms some of its propositions. In fact, it outlines the necessary framework in which charisma and charismatic leadership should be understood.

This paper analyzes the concept of charisma and charismatic leadership as Weber himself understood it and not as it has come to be associated in the popular mind. In order to get an accurate rendering of the concept, however, an effort will be made to highlight the main elements of the first perspective first. The second perspective will follow. In presenting the second perspective, however, special effort will be made to quote from Weber directly. Only such comments will be made that the author could consider essential for an understanding of his statements. In the end, an attempt will be made to delineate a necessary framework upon charisma and charismatic leadership, as it evolves out of the exchange, and to suggest a general conclusion.

The First Perspective

The first perspective on charisma and charismatic leadership represents Weber's anti-ascetic perception of the "gift of grace" of "extraordinary", "supernatural", "divine", charismatic leaders. It is not only opposed to the rationalization of conduct and behaviour, but indeed considers the very idea of modernity and rationality a "cultural catastrophe". It expresses Weber's brief encounter with mysticism in 1910 and the influence of the flamboyant leadership of Wilhelm II in Germany, and remains in vogue until the beginning of World War I. It is manifested most clearly in the unfinished, posthumously, published work (2 vols), *Wirtschaft und Gassellschaft* (1925), which was translated in English as *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (1947) and *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (1947).

Weber defines charisma as

... a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person but are regarded as a divine origin or as exemplary and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader.¹¹

Charisma, thus, according to Weber, depends on "recognition" on the part of the disciples and followers.¹² The followers recognize charisma because they are inspired by a "sign" or proof, initially always a "miracle", emanating from the person of the charismatic leader. Their recognition, therefore, consists in devotion to "the corresponding revelation, hero worship, or absolute trust in the leader". Psychologically this recognition, emphasizes Weber, is a matter of "complete personal devotion" to the charismatic leader born out of "enthusiasm, despair and hope".

The result of this recognition on the part of the followers, is that the charismatic leader must always manage to demonstrate charismatic power to his followers if he has to retain his charisma. Thus, if proof of charismatic power fails him for long, or he is for long unsuccessful, and above all, his leadership fails to benefit his followers, it is likely that his charismatic authority will disappear. This, in fact, is the genuine meaning of *gift of grace*.

But while the source of charisma is the "proving" of the charismatic quality through "miracles", and other successes, the charismatic leader-follower relationship is essentially "an emotional form of communal relationship". The charismatic leader and his followers live in a relationship where there is no established administrative hierarchy or definite sphere of authority and compe-

tence, and no appropriation of official powers. There is no appointment or dismissal, and thus no career or promotion. There is but only a "call" at the instance of the leader. Charismatic rule, thus, is not managed according to general norms, either traditional or rational, but in principle according to concrete revelations and inspirations from time to time. In this sense, the charismatic leader preaches, creates, and demands "new obligations", and the followers follow it. The followers subscribe to the proposition "It is written — but I say unto you. . .".

Since the charismatic authority is not bound to the existing order, it is specifically "outside the realm of every day routine and the profane sphere", and is thus "irrational" in the sense of being "foreign to all rules". It is sharply opposed both to rational and traditional authorities, which are obviously forms of every day routine control of action. The only basis for its legitimacy is personal charisma, so as long as it is proved and is recognized by the disciples and followers. Indeed, according to Weber, charisma is not only foreign to rules but also foreign to "economic considerations". While it does not always renunciate property or even its acquisition, it despises the every day economizing, the attainment of a regular income by continuous economic activity devoted to this end. In fact, it cannot accept any regular, systematic, acquisitive economy. In this sense, it is "a typical anti-economic force", and does not recognize appropriation of positions of power by virtue of the possession of the property, either on the part of the charismatic leader or of socially privileged groups.

In traditionally stereotyped periods, thus, charisma is "the greatest revolutionary force". While the equally revolutionary force of "reason" works from outside by altering the situation of action, and hence its problems, charisma concentrates upon "subjective" or internal orientation of attitudes born out of suffering, conflicts, or enthusiasm. It encourages men not only to alter their "central system of attitudes and directions of actions" but also helps acquire a new orientation of their attitudes towards the different problems and structures of the "world".

The trouble with Charisma, however, Weber points out, is that it is not an enduring force. The very fact that it has a character specifically foreign to every day routine and economic considerations, makes it, of logical necessity, "a purely transitory phenomenon". In order to take on the character of a "permanent" relationship, forming a stable community of disciples and followers, therefore, it is imperative for the charismatic authority to become radically changed. It cannot remain stable, and through a process of "routinization" of charisma, it becomes either traditionalized or rationalized, or a combination of both. In this transformation, it is helped, of course, by the ideal

and the material interests of the followers and disciples who want to continue the charismatic relationship for their own good.¹³

The Second Perspective

The second perspective on charisma and charismatic leadership represents the transformation of the concept of charisma into an ascetic rational code. Distressed by the disaster caused to imperial Germany by the irrational and irresponsible leadership of Wilhelm II during the War, and subsequently encouraged by the rise of "genuine" charismatic movements in post War Germany, Weber not only sees no necessary contradiction between charisma and rationalization but even considers the reconciliation of personal charisma and puritan asceticism both possible and desirable in modern Germany, and in the rest of the world. *Politik als Beruf* (translated into, "Politics as a Vocation", originally a speech at Munich University, 1918, published in 1919 by Duncker and Humblodt, Munich) and other later writings represent Weber's second perspective on charisma and charismatic leadership.¹⁴

While Weber still defines charisma as the authority of the extraordinary and personal *gift of grace*, the absolute personal devotion and personal confidence in revelation, heroism, or other qualities of leadership he strenuously rules out the possibility of any useful transformation of modern *Gesellschaft* through a charismatic hero, who is not sober and rational and who does not operate in the framework of contemporary organized economic life (*Alltag*). He dismisses as mere epiphenomena the "extraordinary" conditions in which the charismatic leader and his followers live outside of an ordered economy. He stresses that the charismatic leader must be economically independent of the income politics can bring him. He "must be wealthy, must have a personal position in life which yields sufficient income". The significance of the economy, he believes, is steadily increasing, and hopes that with increasing emphasis on organized political activity it may well be further augmented in future.¹⁵

The most significant aspect of this organised political activity, Weber feels, is a relation of men dominating men. There are men who dominate and there are men who obey. In general, men obey out of "highly robust motives of fear and hope". In the case of the charismatic domination, it implies that the leader is personally recognized as the innerly "called" leader of men. Men obey him because they believe in the "person" and his "qualities".

The charismatic leaders, however, Weber suggests, cannot become the decisive figures in political activity unless they have also at their disposal

auxiliary means to maintain their authority. That means, quite simply, if their authority is to exist, they must have means to force the followers to obey the authority they claim to represent. This, he believes, is not something peculiar to the charismatic domination. For the problem is precisely

How do the politically dominant powers, manage to maintain their domination? The question pertains to any kind of domination, hence also to political domination in all its forms, traditional as well as legal and charismatic. Organized domination which calls for continuous administration, requires that human conduct be conditioned to obedience toward those masters who claim to be the leaders of legitimate power. On the other hand, by virtue of this obedience, requires the control of the material goods which in a given case are necessary Thus organized domination requires control of the personal executive staff and the material implements of administration.

The inevitable result of the development of politics into an "organization", according to Weber, is that material means of organization like political parties, parliaments, and other political institutions are required not only to encourage struggles for "the patronage of office" and "subjective goals", but also to help attain the disciples and followers tied to the charismatic leaders specifically secure livelihoods in the form of "spoils". The material means of organization become indeed, in the final analysis "a means of the end being provided for in this manner".

Though the management of politics through political parties means essentially management through party officials in whose hands the regular business of party rests, these "officials" Weber asserts, "submit" relatively easily to the charismatic leaders's personality for many a reason. The party following

. . . expect that the demagogic effect of the leader's *personality* during the election fight of the party will increase votes and mandates and thereby power, and, thereby, as far as possible, will extend opportunities to their followers to find the compensation for which they hope. Ideally one of their mainsprings is the satisfaction of working with loyal personal devotion of a man, and not merely for an abstract program of a party consisting of mediocrities.

Yet, in spite of the fact that the charismatic leader is personally recognized by the party disciples and followers, one of the conditions necessary for the "success" of the charismatic leader, Weber insists, is "depersonalization" and "routinization" of charisma, indeed, in the interests of "discipline".¹⁶ This discipline, he points out, not only influences personal charisma but also brings

about the rational transformation of the society. For the content of discipline is

. . . nothing but the consistently rationalized, methodically trained and exact execution of the received order, in which all personal criticism is unconditionally suspended and the actor is unswervingly and exclusively set for carrying out the command. In addition, this conduct under orders is uniform. Its quality as the communal action of a *mass* organization conditions the specific effects of such uniformity. Those who obey are not necessarily a simultaneously obedient or an especially large mass, nor are they necessarily united in a specific locality. What is decisive for discipline is that the obedience of a plurality of men is rationally uniform.

Discipline, thus, Weber emphasizes, helps the charismatic leaders maintain their alertness and their superiority over their followers by means of "a very strict discipline". The strongly conscious and rationally intended character of discipline may even help the charismatic leaders, to "expand" their sphere of domination. Many a charismatic leaders in fact created strictly disciplinary organizations, which helped them build lasting dominations.¹⁷

Weber not only makes room for rational behavior of charisma, but even prescribes certain rational qualities to be found in a charismatic leader. He demands, in particular, the qualities of "responsibility" and "a sense of proportion". And although he likes to retain the demonic quality of "passion" of the first perspective, he wants it also to be tempered by reason. He explains it in the following words

. . . passion in the sense of *matter-of-factness*, of passionate devotion to a 'cause' It is not passion in the sense of . . . 'sterile excitation' . . . running into emptiness devoid of all feeling of objective responsibility. To be sure, mere passion, however, genuinely felt, is not enough. It does not make a politician, unless passion as devotion to a 'cause' also makes responsibility to this cause the guiding star of action. And for this, a sense of proportion is needed. This in the decisive psychological quality of the politician: his ability to let realities work upon him with inner concentration and calmness. Hence his *distance* to things and men . . . that firm taming of the soul, which distinguishes the passionate politician and differentiates him from the 'sterilely excited' and mere political dilettante, is possible only through habituation to detachment in every sense of the word. The 'strength' of a political 'personality' means, in the first place, the presence of these qualities of passion, responsibility and proportion.¹⁸

Weber, in fact, warns against some human traits a charismatic leader must, under all circumstances, overcome, and stresses, in particular, vanity, lack of objectivity and lack of proportion. He is especially critical of the all-too-human enemy — “vanity”. Vanity, he observes, is “the deadly enemy of all matter-of-fact devotion to a cause, and of all distance, in this case, of distance toward one’s self”.

The rational ingredient in the code of the charismatic leader is so pervasive in Weber’s account that he does not hesitate to refer to him as a “genuinely principled politician”, as opposed to a “professional politician” who works for the striving for power as an unavoidable means, and lacks in objectivity and responsibility, and is thus compelled

. . . to count upon ‘effect’. He therefore is constantly in danger of becoming an actor as well as taking lightly the responsibilities for the outcome of his actions and of being concerned merely with the ‘impression’ he makes. His lack of objectivity tempts him to strive for the glamorous resemblance of power rather than for actual power. His irresponsibility, however, suggests that he enjoys power merely for power’s sake without a purpose. Although, or just because, power is the unavoidable means, and striving for power one of the driving forces of all politics, there is no more harmful distortion of political force than the parvenu-like braggart with power, and the vain self-reflection in the feeling of power, and in general every worship of power *per se*. The mere ‘power politician’ may get strong effects, but actually his work leads nowhere and is senseless . . . inner weakness and impotence hides behind this boastful but entirely empty gesture. . . .

The final result of the political activity of a politician, therefore, Weber believes, is completely inadequate and often worthless. It has no relation whatsoever to ‘politics’, and, in fact, stands in “paradoxical relation” to its original meaning. For politics, he contends

. . . is a strong and slow boring of hard boards. It takes both passion and perspective. Certainly all historical experience confirms the truth—that man would not have attained the possible unless time and again he had reached out for the impossible. But to do that a man must be a leader, and not only a leader but a hero as well, in a very sober sense of the word Only he has the calling for politics who is sure that he shall not crumble when the world from his point of view is too stupid or too base for what he wants to offer. Only he who in the face of all this can say ‘In spite of all!’ has the calling for politics.

The ethos of politics as a 'cause' indeed suggest to Weber that in the person of the charismatic leader alone exists a "genuine" politician who represents the ultimate ends of politics and a sense of responsibility and objectivity, and thus has the "vocation" for politics in its deepest meaning.¹⁹

The Necessary Framework

The two perspectives discussed above reveal, not only extreme situations, harsh antitheses and antagonistic shifts of emphasis, but also a consensus on certain fundamentals. The two perspectives, for instance, affirm that charisma, in essence, means a personal attribute of a charismatic leader, and involves a relationship which is based on the validity and recognition of charismatic personal qualities. Charisma is a devotion born of distress and enthusiasm. The charismatic leader not only conveys a sense of mission but indeed helps the disciples and followers solve the different problems they are confronted with through a completely new orientation of attitudes and goals.

But while the first perspective suggests that charismatic leadership is not managed according to general rules and economic considerations, and is essentially "irrational" and "transitory" in nature, the second perspective leaves no doubt that the charismatic spirit is fully compatible with normal economy and every-day routine. The charismatic leader is not only reconciled to the economically and politically inevitable advance of modernity and modern life but is ready to give way to rational-legal form of authority, forming an institutional and permanent relationship with his disciples and followers. He is a rational, sober leader, and is endowed with rational qualities of heart and mind. He possesses "passion", "responsibility", and a sense of "proportion". In his matter-of-fact approach to his "cause", he not only seeks "distance" from others but even keeps "distance" from his own self. He is devoted to his "cause", and is notably indifferent about the "effect" and other trappings of power that characterize the "professional politician".

This clearly shows that Weber transformed the concept of charisma into an ethos of rational asceticism, and thus made a clean break from the original spiritual substance of the concept. He saw charisma in the realm of rationality and rational-legal order, and even prescribed ascetic-rational standards for charismatic behavior.

The revised and modified concept of charisma and charismatic leadership represents Weber's final analysis of charisma and charismatic leadership and remains predominant in his ideas until he died in 1920. Weber was, of course, not very happy with the inevitable triumph of "objective" over "subjective" spirit, and did express his personal predicament in an unmistakable way in the closing paragraphs of "Science as a Vocation":

The fate of our times is characterized by rationalization and intellectualization and, above all, by the 'disenchantment of the world.' Precisely the ultimate and most sublime values have retreated from public life either into the transcendental realm of mystic life or into the brotherliness of direct and personal human relations. It is not accidental that our greatest art is intimate and not monumental, nor is it accidental that today only within the smallest and intimate circles, in personal human situations, in *pianissimo*, that something is pulsating that corresponds to the prophetic *pneuma*, which in former times swept through the great communities like a firebrand, welding them together.²⁰

But then Weber admitted that "intellectual integrity" demanded that a man must obey the "demon who holds the fibers of his very life".²¹ Thus, in a personal world that was thoroughly disenchanted with the harsh consequences of rationalization, Weber did not hesitate to opt for a "realistic" solution of the problem. He recommended a union of personal charisma and puritan asceticism into ascetic rational code, and developed it into a contemporary facet of "extraordinary" charisma. Charisma was no more a quasi-mystical *pneuma* (spirit). Rationality was its precondition. This precondition, in fact, constitutes the necessary framework upon charisma and charismatic leadership.

The most striking feature of this framework is that a charismatic leader not only leads his followers out of their predicament but also endeavours to institutionalize his personal charisma in a rational system of authority. He is guided by the economic necessity of coping with the increasingly rationalized and organized politics of the modern age. Indeed, economy leads his way towards insitutionalization. The higher the level of economy, the greater the thrust toward institutionalization.²²

The key element in the institutionalization of charisma is, of course, that process of institutionalization which Weber called the "routinization" of charisma. Weber not only considers it crucial to the "success" of the charismatic leader in securing support for his political party in the struggle for power but also advances it to the level of a "pure type" of charismatic leadership in all ages, and possible even in a modern state in the form of popularly elected political leaders.

In emphasizing the institutionalization of charisma, however, Weber does not mean to surrender and lose the 'sovereignty' of the personal charisma. On the contrary, he tries to secure the rational "discipline" necessary for the uniformity of conduct. Besides, he also feels that the transformation of charisma into an institutional system of authority has one very general reason generic to charismatic leadership itself. The leader's disciples and followers

want to see that the charismatic relationship is not only preserved for the achievement of certain goals but also for the purposes of the manipulation and distribution of offices and favors. This vested interest, in Weber's view, is indeed the turning point in charismatic relationship.

The charismatic leaders, however, suggests Weber, not only make their home in institutions and help evolve new systems of authority and goals, but even routinize their charismatic qualities and orientations through the crystallization of new institutional centers and frameworks. In this, he believes, the nature of the problems confronting a society may well change under the very impact of different charismatic personalities, and of the new institutional systems set up by them.²³

There is no denying that Weber equated charisma with rationalization of conduct and perception. Nor can there be any doubt that Weber also cast into the outer oblivion of false charisma any kind of specifically irrational and vain behavior of the political leaders. He condemned in particular the leadership provided by the political leader interested in the "effect", "impression" and "glamorous resemblance of power" than actual power in the service of a "cause". He sought to draw the line between the genuine charismatic leadership and the irrational and false rise of "extraordinary" charismatic leaders, and made sobriety and rationality of the charismatic leadership the necessary condition for the "calling for politics".

Conclusion

The concept of charisma and charismatic leadership developed by Max Weber expressed two antithetical perspectives on charisma. The first perspective emphasized total freedom from any organized, every-day routine of life. The second perspective offered a rational, sober and organized conduct. In the first perspective charisma could not be an institutionally permanent structure. In the second perspective, it was both an institutional and a permanent structure.

The second perspective represented Weber's ideas of later years, when he had come to comprehend the significance of the irrational effects of the "extraordinary" charismatic leaders and had also suffered immense rational pressures to return to the ascetic-rational posture. Weber thus sought to safeguard rational legacy after fully exploring the other end of that legacy. The principle of rationalization had indeed guided Weber's intellect throughout his scholarly career, and thus he could not help but express ascetic posture in the final analysis of charisma.

Yet, Weber made it clear that the rational ethos of charisma inhered

essentially in the personal qualities of the charismatic leader. They could, of course, become resident in institutions, in varying degrees, but, in the final analysis, these personal qualities and orientations were superior instrument of new societal centers and institutional frameworks. It was only because of the unique personal qualities of the charismatic leaders that new institutional settings could find new appropriate answers to the problems of the society. Thus, he placed a great emphasis upon the person of charismatic leaders, and viewed them as truly "revolutionary forces" in history.

This is not to suggest, however, that Weber was possessed by the notion of 'personality'. On the contrary, he considered it "a profoundly irrational center of creativity, a center before which analytical inquiry comes to a halt". He thus combated this "poeticized and romantic element" of history, and even stated explicitly that he had nothing to do with 'the great figures of history'. Napoleon, Calvin, Cromwell and Washington appeared in his work only in passing. He tried to grasp what was valuable of their work in the institutional order and continuities of history. No Julius Caesar, but Caesarism, not Calvin, but Calvinism was Weber's concern.²⁴

This concern, however, was not as systematic and exact as one would expect in the modern parlance of social sciences,²⁵ and thus failed to provide a comprehensive and dynamic view of the institutionalization process as a whole. But then, Weber did not make an explicit case for the study of institutionalization. He explained "only the leadership or the influencing of the leadership,"²⁶ and on a less general level, institutionalization of charisma into the permanent institutions of a society. However, the significant thing was that Weber not only did not question the relevance of institutions in the influencing of charismatic leadership but even encouraged the transformation of personal charisma into a rational-legal form of authority.

While the concept of charisma and charismatic leadership has been readily identified with rationality and rational-legal forms of authority by writers like Edward Shils, David Apter, Ann Ruth and Dorothy Willner, Dankwart A. Rustow, Robert Tucker, and Richard Fagen,²⁷ their analyses, however, unfortunately, tend to focus primarily upon the rise and role of charismatic leaders in the processes of 'political modernization' and 'development' in the developing societies, historicizing, in effect, "a sequence" that runs from traditional through charismatic to rational-legal forms of authority.²⁸ (Tucker, however, utilizes the concept to explain revolutionary movements, Soviet Russia's in particular, but again in the context of a 'backward' society). These writers pay very little attention to the relation of the concept to the developed states.²⁹ The result, therefore, and quite erroneously, is still to associate charisma with 'development' and developing societies, permitting the over

indulgent scholar to use the concept in blanket fashion to describe the authority of virtually all governments and their leaders in the developing societies.³⁰

With Max Weber's necessary framework upon charisma and charismatic leadership we have come a long way from the irrational and false rise of charismatic leaders that dominated the first perspective. The radical transformation of the concept suggests that charisma and rationalization are not two antithetical processes, and thus demands that scholars and researchers should direct themselves to its explication not only in the perception of charisma and appreciation of its value for the developing societies but also for the more advanced and developed societies. Taking account of the developed societies would help not only explain why charismatic leadership exists or is produced, rather than simply describe it, but it would also help to differentiate between charismatic leadership in societies at different stages of socio-economic development and change. This may indeed turn out to be the most important event in the understanding of the concept of charisma and charismatic leadership since the formation of the concept itself many years ago.

NOTES

1. See K.J. Ratnam "Charisma and Political Leadership", *Political Studies*, Vol. XII, No. 3 (Oct. 1964), pp. 341-54; and Carl J. Friedrich, "Political Leadership and the Problem of Charismatic Power", *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (1961), pp. 3-25.

2. The list includes as different and diverse leaders as Nkrumah, Ataturk, Stalin, Hitler, Nehru, Kenyatta, Nasser, Churchill, Gandhi, de Gaulle, Sukarno, Castro, Peron, and Kennedy, to mention but a few more important ones. A study indeed grouped together all the political leaders of Southeast Asia as "charismatic statesmen" Sukarno, Tenku Abdul Rahman, Macapagal, Diem, Sihanouk, Kong Le, Ne Win, and the King of Thailand. See Willard A. Hanna, *Eight Nation Makers: Southeast Asia's Charismatic Statesmen* (New York: St. Martin's, 1964).

3. Khalid B. Sayeed, "The Personality of Jinnah and his Political Strategy", in C.H. Philips and Mary Doreen Wainright, *The Partition of India: Policies and Perspectives, 1933-1947* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970), p. 293. In this estimate, however, Sayeed was content to rely upon the inferences drawn by Harold D. Lasswell, Abraham Kaplan and Reinhard Bendix. These scholars are undoubtedly reputed authorities on the subject, but as the present author tries to argue in this article, their viewpoint may not be all that accurate. See Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, *Power and Society: A Framework for Political Inquiry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965) and Reinhard Bendix, *Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait* (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1960).

4. These criticisms have been discussed at length by the present author in an article on the subject of charisma and charismatic leadership, and need not be recounted here. See "On Charisma and Charismatic Leadership", *Scrutiny*, Vol. VI, No. 6 (Jan-June 1980), especially pp. 5-8.

5. D.L. Cohen, "The Concept of Charisma and the Analysis of Leadership". *Political Studies*. Vol. XX, No. 3 (1972), p. 305 *op. cit.*, K.J. Ratnam, *op. cit.*, and C.J. Friedrich, *op. cit.* It should be noted, however, that Friedrich's main criticism of the concept is related to the use of the concept to designate the kind of leadership represented by "secular" and non-religious forms of inspiration. To call secular forms of inspiration also

"charismatic" he contends, prevents effective analysis of the concept. He, therefore, insists that the charismatic typology "is basically unsound and should be discarded". It should not be out of place here to point out that Robert Tucker, one of the leading exponents of the concept of charisma and charismatic leadership, on the other hand, considers it "a very great merit" on the part of Weber to take the concept "out of the historical world of religion" and apply it to political life. He opines that not only the realm of religion and politics interpenetrate in so many ways but that the "secularization" of society does not mean the disappearance of religion. What it implies essentially, he suggests, is the weakening of the hold of religion *in its traditional forms*, alongwith the displacement of religious sentiments into other areas of life, particularly the political. Robert Tucker, "The Theory of Charismatic Leadership", *Daedalus*, Vol. 97, No. 3 (1968), pp. 732-33.

6. D.L. Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 300. He is indeed opposed to any rigorous sociologically inclined analysis of the concept of charisma and charismatic leadership.

7. Ratnam, in particular, seems to be convinced of this generalization of the concept. See Ratnam, *op. cit.*, pp. 346-49.

8. A preliminary effort in this regard has been made by this author in his article, "Development and Evaluation of the Concept of Charisma and Charismatic Leadership", *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. VII, 1 & 2 (Jan.-July-Dec., 1981), pp. 42-65.

9. One must also remember that Weber follows a stylistic tradition of the German language which is foreign to the tendency of modern English, and is thus quite "formidable and forbidding" for the readers. Not only that, Weber pushes this tradition to its extremes. The result is that his major theme often seems to be "lost in a wealth of foot-noted digressions, exemptions, and comparative illustrations". Not an easy job, even for the best of translators and editors of his works. See "Preface" to *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, translated, edited, and with an introduction by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958).

10. Not to talk of encyclopaedic articles and essays and general writings on the subject of charisma and charismatic leadership, even scholars of the caliber of Bendix and Eisenstadt failed to acknowledge the second perspective in their specialized accounts. Bendix, for instance, did not discuss it in his massive review of Weber's intellectual ideas, and Eisenstadt failed to include it in his meticulous collection of Weber's selected papers on charisma and institution building. Eisenstadt, however, discussed in great depth and detail the problem of the extension of "substantive rationality" to the nature of the charismatic in general and of the "routinization" of charisma as a major aspect of institution building in particular in his "Introduction", to the volume. See Reinhard Bendix, *op. cit.* and S.N. Eisenstadt, *Max Weber: On Charisma and Institution Building* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968).

11. Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* translated and edited by A.R. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: Free Press, 1947), p. 358.

12. Although the distinction between charismatic leadership and charismatic authority is implied in Weber's analysis, it is not quite systematic. The constant shifts in emphasis from charismatic leadership to charismatic authority and back again create not only a good deal of confusion but also obscure the full significance of the two terms. It is easier to understand, however, if these terms are seen in reference to the relation with the followers. In a leadership relation the person is basic. In an authority relation the person is merely a symbol, and if the legitimacy of the authority is recognized, the follower must obey the command even when he is unacquainted with the person who issues it. See Robert Bierstedt, "The Problem of Authority", in Morroe Berger, Theodore Abel and Charles Page, (eds), *Freedom and Control in Modern Society* (New York: D. Van Nostrand, Inc., 1954), pp. 71-72. Cited in Reinhard Bendix, *op. cit.*, p. 301.

13. Max Weber, *op. cit.*, pp. 324-64.

14. "Politics as a Vocation", and "The Meaning of Discipline" in H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, *op. cit.*

15. Gerth and Mills, "Politics as a Vocation", *op. cit.*, pp. 85-88.

16. *Ibid.*, pp. 103, 125.

17. Gerth and Mills, "The Meaning of Discipline", *op. cit.*, pp. 253-54.

18. Gerth and Mills, "Politics as a Vocation".

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 116-117, 127-128.

20. Gerth and Mills, "Science as a Vocation", *op. cit.*, p. 156.

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 156-157.

22. Thus, it cannot be said that with rapid environmental changes, economic growth and modernization the opportunities for charismatic leadership will become more and more limited. Rather, it could be very safely stated that with increasing rationalization of society charismatic leadership will become more and more the established pattern.

23. S.N. Eisenstadt, *op. cit.*, pp. LII (Introduction).

24. Gerth and Mills, "Intellectual Orientations", *op. cit.*, p. 55.

25. It should be remembered, however, that the concept of charisma and charismatic leadership was developed at a time when the tradition of modern analytical inquiry itself was beginning to take roots, ironically enough, in the hands of a man no other than Max Weber, the chief proponent of positivist thought, who wanted to give his concept of charisma and charismatic leadership and the social science methodology associated with it the same matter-of-fact approach that characterized the natural sciences. However, as W.G. Runciman points out, the very fact that Weber concedes the necessary distinction between natural and social science makes his claims for social science "better tenable, as well as more cautious" than anybody else. See W.G. Runciman, *Social Sciences and Political Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), p. 61.

26. Gerth and Mills, "Politics as a Vocation". *op. cit.*, p. 77.

27. See Edward A. Shils, "Charisma, Order, and Status", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (1965), and "The Concentration and Dispersion of Charisma", *World Politics*, Vol. XI, No. 1 (1958); David E. Apter "Nkrumah, Charisma, and the Coup", *Daedalus*, Vol. 97, No. 3 (1968); Ann Ruth and Dorothy Willner, "The Rise and Role of Charismatic Leaders", *Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, Vol. 358 (1965), and Ann Ruth Willner, *Charismatic Political Leadership: A Theory* (Princeton: Princeton University Center of International Studies (1968); Dankwart A. Rustow, "Ataturk as Founder of a State", *Daedalus*, Vol. 97, No. 3 (1968); Robert Tucker, "The Theory of Charismatic Leadership", *op. cit.*; Richard R. Fagen, "Charismatic Authority and the Leadership of Fidel Castro", *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. XVIII, No. 2, Part I. (June 1965). Also see an analysis of their contributions by this author in his article, "Development and Evaluation of the Concept of Charisma and Charismatic Leadership", *op. cit.*

28. The result is, of course, "a functional theory of charisma", according to which charismatic leadership is essentially a fulcrum of the transition from traditional society to modern society. R. Tucker, "Theory", *op. cit.*, p. 734.

29. More than a half century of events since the death of Max Weber, characterized by revolutions, wars, conflicts, and crises, and dominated mostly by leaders who were not rational, sober, objective, responsible, and devoted to a "cause" has in fact necessitated the need for re-discovering and applying the concept of charisma and charismatic leadership to the developed societies as well. This will not only help indicate how the concept should be more profitably used in the analysis of political leadership, but would also help expose the case of the application of the concept to some of the leaders of the developed societies in the past. For instance, the author of political study of the Nazi Party will now hardly find it easy to argue that Hitler could indeed be regarded as a "charismatic leader". See J. Nyomarkay, *Charisma and Factionalism in the Nazi Party* (University of Minnesota Press, 1967).

30. See, for instance, Willard A. Hanna, *op. cit.*, I. Wallerstein, *Africa: The Politics of Independence* (New York: Vintage Books, 1961); Jean Lacouture, *The Demigods: Charismatic leadership in the Third World* (London: Secker and Warberg 1970); Taketsugu Tsurutani, *The Politics of National Development: Political leadership in Transitional Societies* (New York, Chandler Publishing Co., 1973).