

*Max Weber*

# ECONOMY AND SOCIETY

AN OUTLINE OF INTERPRETIVE SOCIOLOGY

*Edited by* Guenther Roth  
*and* Claus Wittich

University of California Press  
Berkeley • Los Angeles • London

University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, California

University of California Press, Ltd., London, England

This printing, Copyright © 1978 by The Regents of the University of California

1st printing, Copyright © 1968 by Bedminster Press Incorporated, New York.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 74-81443

ISBN: 0-520-02824-4 (cloth)

0-520-03500-3 (paper)

Printed in the United States of America

*Economy and Society* is a translation of Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Grundriss der verstehenden Soziologie*, based on the 4th German edition, Johannes Winckelmann (ed.), Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1956, pp. 1-550, 559-822, as revised in the 1964 paperback edition (Köln-Berlin: Kiepenheuer & Witsch), with appendices from Max Weber, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, 2nd rev. edition, Johannes Winckelmann (ed.), Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1951, pp. 441-467 (selected passages), and Max Weber, *Gesammelte politische Schriften*, 2nd expanded edition, Johannes Winckelmann (ed.), Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1958, pp. 294-394.

The exclusive license to make this English edition has been granted to the University of California Press by the German holder of rights, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen.

The English text includes (with revisions and with addition of notes) material previously published and copyrighted by these publishers:

*Beacon Press:*

Ephraim Fischhoff, trans., *The Sociology of Religion* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), pp. 1-274. Copyright © 1963 by Beacon Press. Reprinted by arrangement with Beacon Press.

*Oxford University Press:*

Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills, trans. and eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 159-244, 253-262. Copyright 1946 by Oxford University Press, Inc. British Commonwealth rights by Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. Reprinted by permission.

*The Free Press of Glencoe:*

Ferdinand Kögler, trans., "The Household Community" and "Ethnic Groups," in Talcott Parsons et al., eds., *Theories of Society* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), vol. 1, pp. 296-298, 302-309. Copyright © 1961 by The Free Press of Glencoe. Reprinted by permission.

Talcott Parsons, ed. (A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons, trans.), *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964; originally published by Oxford University Press, 1947), pp. 87-423. Copyright 1947 by The Free Press of Glencoe. Reprinted by permission.

*Harvard University Press:*

Max Rheinstein, ed. (Edward Shils and Max Rheinstein, trans.), *Max Weber on Law in Economy and Society* (20th Century Legal Philosophy Series, Vol. VI; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), pp. 11-348. Copyright, 1954 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. Reprinted by permission.

Correspondence about these sections of the English translation should be directed to the above publishers. See editors' preface for details about their location in this edition.

the organization has been established by its own members on their own authority, regardless of how this has taken place in other respects. In the case of heteronomy, it has been imposed by an outside agency. Autocephaly means that the chief and his staff are selected according to the autonomous order of the organization itself, not, as in the case of heterocephaly, that they are appointed by outsiders. Again, this is regardless of any other aspects of the relationship.

A case of heterocephaly is the appointment of the governors of the Canadian provinces by the central government of the Dominion. It is possible for a heterocephalous group to be autonomous and an autocephalous group to be heteronomous. It is also possible in both respects for an organization to have both characters at the same time in different spheres. The member-states of the German Empire, a federal state, were autocephalous. But in spite of this, within the sphere of authority of the Reich, they were heteronomous; whereas, within their own sphere, in such matters as religion and education, they were autonomous. Alsace-Lorraine was, under German jurisdiction, in a limited degree autonomous, but at the same time heterocephalous in that the governor was appointed by the Kaiser. All those elements may be present in the same situation to some degree. An organization which is at the same time completely heteronomous and completely heterocephalous is usually best treated as a "part" of the more extensive group, as would ordinarily be done with a "regiment" as part of an army. But whether this is the case depends on the actual extent of independence in the orientation of action in the particular case. For terminological purposes, it is entirely a question of convenience.

### 13. *Consensual and Imposed Order in Organizations*

An association's enacted order may be established in one of two ways: by voluntary agreement, or by being imposed and acquiesced in. The leadership in an organization may claim a legitimate right to impose new rules. The "constitution" of an organization is the empirically existing probability, varying in extent, kind and conditions, that rules imposed by the leadership will be acceded to. The existing rules may specify that certain groups or sections of the members must consent, or at least have been heard. Besides this, there may be any number of other conditions.

An organization's order may be imposed not only on its members but also on certain non-members. This is especially true of persons who are linked to a given territorial area by virtue of residence, birth, or the performance of certain actions. In this case the order possesses "territorial validity" (*Gebietsgeltung*). An organization which imposes its order in principle on a territory will be called a "territorial organization" (*Gebiets-*

*verband*). This usage will be employed regardless of how far the claim to the validity of its order over its own members is also confined to matters pertaining to the area. (Such a limitation is possible<sup>28</sup> and indeed occurs to some extent.)

1. In our terminology, an order is always "imposed" to the extent that it does not originate from a voluntary personal agreement of all the individuals concerned. The concept of imposition hence includes "majority rule," in that the minority must submit. For that reason there have been long periods when the legitimacy of majority rule has either not been recognized at all, or been held doubtful. This was true in the case of the Estates of the Middle Ages, and in very recent times, in the Russian *obshchina*. (This will be further discussed in the Sociology of Law and of Domination.)

2. Even in cases where there is formally voluntary agreement, it is very common, as is generally known, for there to be a large measure of imposition. (This is true of the *obshchina*.) In that case, it is the actual state of affairs which is decisive for sociological purposes.

3. The concept of constitution made use of here is that also used by Lassalle. It is not the same as what is meant by a "written" constitution, or indeed by "constitution" in any sort of legal meaning.<sup>29</sup> The only relevant question for sociological purposes is when, for what purposes, and *within what limits*, or possibly under what special conditions (such as the approval of gods or priests or the consent of electors), the members of the organization will submit to the leadership. Furthermore, under what circumstances the administrative staff and the organized actions of the group will be at the leadership's disposal when it issues orders, in particular, new rules.

4. The major cases of the territorial imposition of an order are criminal law and various other legal rules the applicability of which depends on whether the actor was resident, born, performed or completed the action within the area controlled by a political organization. (Compare the concept of the "territorial corporate organization"—*Gebietskörperschaft*—as used by Gierke and Preuss.)<sup>30</sup>

#### 14. Administrative and Regulative Order

Rules which govern organized action constitute an administrative order (*Verwaltungsordnung*). Rules which govern other kinds of social action and thereby protect the actors' enjoyment of the resulting benefits will be called a regulative order (*Regulierungsordnung*). So far as an organization is solely oriented to the first type, it will be called an administrative organization; so far as it is oriented to the second type, a regulative organization.

1. It goes without saying that the majority of actual organizations partake of both characteristics. An example of a merely regulative organization would be a theoretically conceivable state based purely on the upholding of public order (*Rechtsstaat*) and committed to absolute laissez-faire. (This would imply that even the control of the monetary system was left to private enterprise.)

2. On the concept of organized action see above, sec. 12:3. Under the concept of administrative order would be included all the rules which govern not only the action of the administrative staff, but also that of the members in their direct relation to the organization; hence these rules pertain to those goals the pursuit of which the administrative order seeks to facilitate through prescribed and coordinated action on the part of the administrative staff and the members. In a completely communist economy almost all social action would be of this character. In an absolute laissez-faire state (*Rechtsstaat*) only the functions of judges, police authorities, jurors and soldiers, and activity as legislator and voter would be included. The distinction between administrative and regulative order coincides in its broad lines, though not always in detail, with the distinction between public and private law. (All further details are treated in the Sociology of Law.)

### 15. *Enterprise, Formal Organization, Voluntary and Compulsory Association*

Continuous rational activity of a specified kind will be called an *enterprise*; an association with a continuously and rationally operating staff will be called a *formal organization*.

An organization which claims authority only over voluntary members will be called a *voluntary association* (*Verein*); an organization which imposes, within a specifiable sphere of operations, its order (with relative success) on all action conforming with certain criteria will be called a *compulsory organization* or *association* (*Anstalt*).

1. The concept of the enterprise covers business conducted by political and ecclesiastic organizations as well as by voluntary associations insofar as it has rational continuity.

2. Voluntary as well as compulsory associations are organizations with rationally established rules. More correctly, insofar as an organization has rationally established rules, it is either a voluntary or a compulsory association. Compulsory organizations are, above all, the state with its subsidiary heterocephalous organizations, and the church insofar as its order is rationally established. The order governing a compulsory association claims to be binding on all persons to whom the particular relevant criteria apply—such as birth, residence, or the use of certain facilities. It makes no difference whether the individual joined volun-

tarily; nor does it matter whether he has taken any part in establishing the order. It is thus a case of imposed order in the most definite sense. Compulsory associations are frequently territorial organizations.

3. The distinction between voluntary and compulsory associations is relative in its empirical application. The rules of a voluntary association may affect the interests of non-members, and recognition of the validity of these rules may be imposed upon them by usurpation and the exercise of naked power, but also by legal regulation, as in the case of the law governing corporate securities.

4. It is hardly necessary to emphasize that the concepts of voluntary and compulsory associations are by no means exhaustive of all conceivable types of organizations. Furthermore, they are to be thought of as polar types, as are sect and church in the religious sphere.

## 16. Power and Domination

A. "Power" (*Macht*) is the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests.

B. "Domination" (*Herrschaft*)<sup>31</sup> is the probability that a command with a given specific content will be obeyed by a given group of persons. "Discipline" is the probability that by virtue of habituation a command will receive prompt and automatic obedience in stereotyped forms, on the part of a given group of persons.<sup>32</sup>

1. The concept of power is sociologically amorphous. All conceivable qualities of a person and all conceivable combinations of circumstances may put him in a position to impose his will in a given situation. The sociological concept of domination must hence be more precise and can only mean the probability that a *command* will be obeyed.

2. The concept of discipline includes the habituation characteristic of uncritical and unresisting mass obedience.

C. The existence of domination turns only on the actual presence of one person successfully issuing orders to others; it does not necessarily imply either the existence of an administrative staff or, for that matter, of an organization. It is, however, uncommon to find it unrelated to at least one of these. A "ruling organization" (*Herrschaftsverband*) exists insofar as its members are subject to domination by virtue of the established order.

1. The head of a household rules without an administrative staff. A Bedouin chief, who levies contributions from the caravans, persons and shipments which pass his stronghold, controls this group of changing individuals, who do not belong to the same organization, as soon and as

long as they face the same situation; but to do this, he needs a following which, on the appropriate occasions, serves as his administrative staff in exercising the necessary compulsion. (However, it is theoretically conceivable that this type of control is exercised by a single individual.)

2. If it possesses an administrative staff, an organization is always to some degree based on domination. But the concept is relative. In general, an effectively ruling organization is also an administrative one. The character of the organization is determined by a variety of factors: the mode in which the administration is carried out, the character of the personnel, the objects over which it exercises control, and the extent of effective jurisdiction. The first two factors in particular are dependent in the highest degree on the way in which domination is legitimized (see ch. III).

### 17. *Political and Hierocratic Organizations*

A "ruling organization" will be called "political" insofar as its existence and order is continuously safeguarded within a given *territorial* area by the threat and application of physical force on the part of the administrative staff. A compulsory political organization with continuous operations (*politischer Anstaltsbetrieb*) will be called a "state" insofar as its administrative staff successfully upholds the claim to the *monopoly* of the *legitimate* use of physical force in the enforcement of its order. Social action, especially organized action, will be spoken of as "politically oriented" if it aims at exerting influence on the government of a political organization; especially at the appropriation, expropriation, redistribution or allocation of the powers of government.

A "hierocratic organization" is an organization which enforces its order through psychic coercion by distributing or denying religious benefits ("hierocratic coercion"). A compulsory hierocratic organization will be called a "church" insofar as its administrative staff claims a monopoly of the legitimate use of hierocratic coercion.

1. It goes without saying that the use of physical force (*Gewaltsamkeit*) is neither the sole, nor even the most usual, method of administration of political organizations. On the contrary, their heads have employed all conceivable means to bring about their ends. But, at the same time, the threat of force, and in the case of need its actual use, is the method which is specific to political organizations and is always the last resort when others have failed. Conversely, physical force is by no means limited to political groups even as a legitimate method of enforcement. It has been freely used by kinship groups, household groups, consociations and, in the Middle Ages, under certain circumstances by all those entitled to bear arms. In addition to the fact that it uses, among other

means, physical force to enforce its system of order, the political organization is further characterized by the fact that the authority of its administrative staff is claimed as binding within a territorial area and this claim is upheld by force. Whenever organizations which make use of force are also characterized by the claim to territorial jurisdiction, such as village communities or even some household groups, federations of guilds or of workers' associations ("soviets"), they are by definition to that extent political organizations.

2. It is not possible to define a political organization, including the state, in terms of the end to which its action is devoted. All the way from provision for subsistence to the patronage of art, there is no conceivable end which *some* political association has not at some time pursued. And from the protection of personal security to the administration of justice, there is none which *all* have recognized. Thus it is possible to define the "political" character of an organization only in terms of the *means* peculiar to it, the use of force. This means is, however, in the above sense specific, and is indispensable to its character. It is even, under certain circumstances, elevated into an end in itself.

This usage does not exactly conform to everyday speech. But the latter is too inconsistent to be used for technical purposes. We speak of the foreign currency *policy*<sup>33</sup> of a central bank, the financial *policy* of an association, or the educational *policy* of a local authority, and mean the systematic treatment and conduct of particular affairs. It comes considerably closer to the present meaning when we distinguish the "political" aspect or implication of a question. Thus there is the "political" official, the "political" newspaper, the "political" revolution, the "political" club, the "political" party, and the "political" consequences of an action, as distinguished from others such as the economic, cultural, or religious aspect of the persons, affairs or processes in question. In this usage we generally mean by "political," things that have to do with relations of authority within what is, in the present terminology, a political organization, the state. The reference is to things which are likely to uphold, to change or overthrow, to hinder or promote, these authority relations as distinguished from persons, things, and processes which have nothing to do with it. This usage thus seeks to bring out the common features of domination, the way it is exercised by the state, irrespective of the ends involved. Hence it is legitimate to claim that the definition put forward here is only a more precise formulation of what is meant in everyday usage in that it gives sharp emphasis to what is most characteristic of this *means*: the actual or threatened use of force. It is, of course, true that everyday usage applies the term "political," not only to groups which are the direct agents of the legitimate use of force itself, but also to other, often wholly peaceful groups, which attempt to influence the activities of the political organization. It seems best for present purposes to distinguish this type of social action, "politically oriented" action, from political action as such, the actual organized action of political groups.



3. Since the concept of the state has only in modern times reached its full development, it is best to define it in terms appropriate to the modern type of state, but at the same time, in terms which abstract from the values of the present day, since these are particularly subject to change. The primary formal characteristics of the modern state are as follows: It possesses an administrative and legal order subject to change by legislation, to which the organized activities of the administrative staff, which are also controlled by regulations, are oriented. This system of order claims binding authority, not only over the members of the state, the citizens, most of whom have obtained membership by birth, but also to a very large extent over all action taking place in the area of its jurisdiction. It is thus a compulsory organization with a territorial basis. Furthermore, today, the use of force is regarded as legitimate only so far as it is either permitted by the state or prescribed by it. Thus the right of a father to discipline his children is recognized—a survival of the former independent authority of the head of a household, which in the right to use force has sometimes extended to a power of life and death over children and slaves. The claim of the modern state to monopolize the use of force is as essential to it as its character of compulsory jurisdiction and of continuous operation.

4. In formulating the concept of a hierocratic organization, it is not possible to use the character of the religious benefits it offers, whether worldly or other-worldly, material or spiritual, as the decisive criterion. What is important is rather the fact that its control over these values can form the basis of a system of spiritual domination over human beings. What is most characteristic of the church, even in the common usage of the term, is the fact that it is a rational, compulsory association with continuous operation and that it claims a monopolistic authority. It is normal for a church to strive for complete control on a territorial basis and to attempt to set up the corresponding territorial or parochial organization. So far as this takes place, the means by which this claim to monopoly is upheld will vary from case to case. But historically, its control over territorial areas has not been nearly so essential to the church as to political associations; and this is particularly true today. It is its character as a compulsory association, particularly the fact that one becomes a member of the church by birth, which distinguishes the church from a "sect." It is characteristic of the latter that it is a voluntary association and admits only persons with specific religious qualifications. (This subject will be further discussed in the *Sociology of Religion*.)

## NOTES

Unless otherwise noted, all notes in this chapter are by Talcott Parsons. For Parsons' exposition and critique of Weber's methodology, see his introduction to *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* and his *Structure of Social Action*.

Council. The standard work in English is W. C. Guillebaud, *The Works Council. A German Experiment in Industrial Democracy* (Cambridge University Press, 1928).

26. Weber's term here is *Nahrungsspielraum*. The concept refers to the scope of economic resources and opportunities on which the standard of living of an individual or a group is dependent. By contrast with this, *Erwerbsspielraum* is a similar scope of resources and economic opportunities seen from the point of view of their possible role as sources of profit. The basic distinction implied in this contrast is of central importance to Weber's analysis later on (see chapter II, sec. 10ff.).

27. The term "corporate group" for *Verband*, as used by Parsons, is open to misunderstandings on both the common-sense and the historical level since Weber's term includes more than either economic groups or self-governing, often professional bodies. Parsons' alternative term, "organized group," has been retained. The term "organization" should be understood literally in the sense of a group with an "organ," but not necessarily of a rationalized kind; the latter would make it an "enterprise" or a "formal organization" (see sec. 15). —For Weber's older definition of *Verband* and *Verbandshandeln* see Appendix I. (R)

28. The concept "objective possibility" (*objektive Möglichkeit*) plays an important technical role in Weber's methodological studies. According to his usage, a thing is "objectively possible" if it "makes sense" to conceive it as an empirically existing entity. It is a question of conforming with the formal, logical conditions. The question whether a phenomenon which is in this sense "objectively possible" will actually be found with any significant degree of probability or approximation, is a logically distinct question.

29. See Ferdinand Lassalle, "Über Verfassungswesen" (1862), in *Gesammelte Reden und Schriften*, Eduard Bernstein, ed. (Berlin: Cassirer, 1919), 7–62. (R)

30. See Otto Gierke, *Geschichte des deutschen Körperschaftsbegriffs* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1873), 829; Hugo Preuss, *Gemeinde, Staat, Reich als Gebietskörperschaft* (1889). Preuss, one of Gierke's pupils, exerted decisive influence on the making of the Weimar constitution, to which Weber also contributed at about the same time that he worked intermittently on these definitions. (W and R)

31. In his translation Parsons pointed out that "the term *Herrschaft* has no satisfactory English equivalent. The term "imperative control," however, as used by N. S. Timasheff in his *Introduction to the Sociology of Law* is close to Weber's meaning" (Parsons, ed., *op. cit.*, 152). Therefore, he borrowed this term "for the most general purposes." At a later time, Parsons indicated that he now preferred the term "leadership." For more specific purposes, however, he used the term "authority." In objecting to "domination" (as used by Bendix and Rhein-stein/Shils) Parsons noted: "It is true to be sure that the term *Herrschaft*, which in its most general meaning I should now translate as "leadership," implies that a leader has power over his followers. But "domination" suggests that this fact, rather than the integration of the collectivity, in the interest of effective functioning (especially the integration of the crucial *Verband* or corporate group), is the critical factor from Weber's point of view. I do not believe that the former interpretation represents the main trend of Weber's thought, although he was in certain respects a "realist" in the analysis of power. The preferable interpretation, as I see it, is represented especially by his tremendous emphasis on the importance of legitimation. I should therefore wish to stick to my own decision to translate *legitime Herrschaft*, which for Weber was overwhelmingly the most significant case for general structural analysis, as authority." (See T. Parsons' review article

of Reinhard Bendix, *Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait*, in *American Sociological Review*, 25:5, 1960, 752.)

I prefer the term domination in this section because Weber stresses the fact of mere compliance with a command, which may be due to habit, a belief in legitimacy, or to considerations of expediency. However, Weber emphasizes here as later that, in addition to the willingness of subjects to comply with a command, there is usually a staff, which again may act on the basis of habit, legitimacy or self-interest. Sociologically, a *Herrschaft* is a structure of superordination and subordination, of leaders and led, rulers and ruled; it is based on a variety of motives and of means of enforcement. In ch. III, Weber presents a typology of legitimate *Herrschaft* where the term "authority" is indeed feasible. However, in ch. X, he deals extensively with both faces of *Herrschaft*: legitimacy and force. It should be clear to the reader that both "domination" and "authority" are "correct" although each stresses a different component of *Herrschaft*. Moreover, in Part Two a *Herrschaft* is quite specifically the medieval *seigneurie* or manor or similar structures in patrimonial regimes. This is also the historical derivation of the term. For a major, and sociologically valuable, study see Otto Brunner, *Land und Herrschaft: Grundfragen der territorialen Verfassungsgeschichte Österreichs im Mittelalter* (Vienna, 1959). (R)

32. For the earlier discussion of discipline, see Part Two, ch. XIV:iii:1, "The Meaning of Discipline."

33. The German is *Devisenpolitik*. Translation in this context is made more difficult by the fact that the German language does not distinguish between "politics" and "policy," *Politik* having both meanings. The remarks which Weber makes about various kinds of policy would have been unnecessary, had he written originally in English.

favor the continuity of at least some of the functionaries. Hence, there always exists the probability of the rise of a special, perennial structure for administrative purposes, which of necessity means for the exercise of rule. As mentioned before, this structure may be one of *honoratiores*, acting as equal "colleagues," or it may turn out to be "monocratic," so that all functionaries are integrated into a hierarchy culminating in one single head.

### 3. *Organizational Structure and the Bases of Legitimate Authority*

The predominance of the members of such a structure of domination rests upon the so-called "law of the small number." The ruling minority can quickly reach understanding among its members; it is thus able at any time quickly to initiate that rationally organized action which is necessary to preserve its position of power. Consequently it can easily squelch any action of the masses (*Massen- oder Gemeinschaftshandeln*) threatening its power as long as the opponents have not created the same kind of organization for the planned direction of their own struggle for domination. Another benefit of the small number is the ease of secrecy as to the intentions and resolutions of the rulers and the state of their information; the larger the circle grows, the more difficult or improbable it becomes to guard such secrets. Wherever increasing stress is placed upon "official secrecy," we take it as a symptom of either an intention of the rulers to tighten the reins of their rule or of a feeling on their part that their rule is being threatened. But every domination established as a continuing one must in some decisive point be *secret rule*.

Generally speaking, however, the specific arrangements for domination, as they are established by association, show the following characteristics:

A circle of people who are accustomed to obedience to the orders of *leaders* and who also have a personal interest in the continuance of the domination by virtue of their own participation and the resulting benefits, have divided among themselves the exercise of those functions which will serve the continuation of the domination and are holding themselves continuously ready for their exercise. (This is what is meant by "organization.")<sup>13</sup> Those leaders who do not derive from grant by others the powers of command claimed and exercised by them, we shall call *masters*; while the term *apparatus* shall mean the circle of those persons who are holding themselves at the disposal of the master or masters in the manner just defined.

The sociological character of the *structure* of any particular case of domination is determined by the kind of relationship between the master or masters and the apparatus, the kind of relationship of both to the ruled, and by its specific *organizational structure*, i.e., its specific way of distributing the powers of command. There can also be considered, of course, a good many other elements, which may then be used to establish a great number of varying sociological classifications. For our limited purposes, we shall emphasize those basic types of domination which result when we search for the ultimate grounds of the *validity* of a domination, in other words, when we inquire into those grounds upon which there are based the claims of obedience made by the master against the "officials" and of both against the ruled.

We have encountered the problem of *legitimacy* already in our discussion of the *legal order*. Now we shall have to indicate its broader significance. For a domination, this kind of justification of its legitimacy is much more than a matter of theoretical or philosophical speculation; it rather constitutes the basis of very real differences in the empirical structure of domination. The reason for this fact lies in the generally observable need of any power, or even of any advantage of life, to justify itself.

The fates of human beings are not equal. Men differ in their states of health or wealth or social status or what not. Simple observation shows that in every such situation he who is more favored feels the never ceasing need to look upon his position as in some way "legitimate," upon his advantage as "deserved," and the other's disadvantage as being brought about by the latter's "fault." That the purely accidental causes of the difference may be ever so obvious makes no difference.

This same need makes itself felt in the relation between positively and negatively privileged groups of human beings. Every highly privileged group develops the myth of its natural, especially its blood, superiority. Under conditions of stable distribution of power and, consequently, of status order, that myth is accepted by the negatively privileged strata. Such a situation exists as long as the masses continue in that natural state of theirs in which thought about the order of domination remains but little developed, which means, as long as no urgent needs render the state of affairs "problematical." But in times in which the class situation has become unambiguously and openly visible to everyone as the factor determining every man's individual fate, that very myth of the highly privileged about everyone having deserved his particular lot has often become one of the most passionately hated objects of attack; one ought only to think of certain struggles of late Antiquity and of the Middle Ages, and quite particularly of the class

struggle of our own time in which such myths and the claim of legitimate domination based upon it have been the target of the most powerful and most effective attacks.

Indeed, the continued exercise of every domination (in our technical sense of the word) always has the strongest need of self-justification through appealing to the principles of its legitimation. Of such ultimate principles, there are only three:

The "validity" of a power of command may be expressed, first, in a system of consciously made *rational* rules (which may be either agreed upon or imposed from above), which meet with obedience as generally binding norms whenever such obedience is claimed by him whom the rule designates. In that case every single bearer of powers of command is legitimated by that system of rational norms, and his power is legitimate insofar as it corresponds with the norm. Obedience is thus given to the norms rather than to the person.

The validity of a power of command can also rest, however, upon *personal authority*.

Such personal authority can, in turn, be founded upon the sacredness of *tradition*, i.e., of that which is customary and has always been so and prescribes obedience to some particular person.

Or, personal authority can have its source in the very opposite, viz., the surrender to the extraordinary, the belief in *charisma*, i.e., actual revelation or grace resting in such a person as a savior, a prophet, or a hero.

The "pure" types of domination correspond to these three possible types of legitimation. The forms of domination occurring in historical reality constitute combinations, mixtures, adaptations, or modifications of these "pure" types.

*Rationally regulated* association within a structure of domination finds its typical expression in *bureaucracy*. *Traditionally* prescribed social action is typically represented by *patriarchalism*. The *charismatic* structure of domination rests upon individual authority which is based neither upon rational rules nor upon tradition. Here too we shall proceed from the type that is the most rational and the one most familiar to us: modern bureaucratic administration.

## NOTES

1. Unless otherwise indicated, all notes are by Rheinstein.

2. Among numerous German dialects and ways in which the language was used in poetry, literature, and polite parlance, acceptance as the standard was achieved by that form which was used in the late fourteenth and fifteenth cen-

# CHAPTER XI

## BUREAUCRACY

### 1. *Characteristics of Modern Bureaucracy*

Modern officialdom functions in the following manner:

I. There is the principle of official *jurisdictional areas*, which are generally ordered by rules, that is, by laws or administrative regulations. This means:

(1) The regular activities required for the purposes of the bureaucratically governed structure are assigned as official duties.

(2) The authority to give the commands required for the discharge of these duties is distributed in a stable way and is strictly delimited by rules concerning the coercive means, physical, sacerdotal, or otherwise, which may be placed at the disposal of officials.

(3) Methodical provision is made for the regular and continuous fulfillment of these duties and for the exercise of the corresponding rights; only persons who qualify under general rules are employed.

In the sphere of the state these three elements constitute a bureaucratic *agency*, in the sphere of the private economy they constitute a bureaucratic *enterprise*. Bureaucracy, thus understood, is fully developed in political and ecclesiastical communities only in the modern state, and in the private economy only in the most advanced institutions of capitalism. Permanent agencies, with fixed jurisdiction, are not the historical rule but rather the exception. This is even true of large political structures such as those of the ancient Orient, the Germanic and Mongolian empires of conquest, and of many feudal states. In all these cases, the ruler executes the most important measures through personal trustees, table-companions, or court-servants. Their commissions and powers are not precisely delimited and are temporarily called into being for each case.

II. The principles of *office hierarchy* and of channels of appeal (*Instanzenzug*) stipulate a clearly established system of super- and subordination in which there is a supervision of the lower offices by the higher ones. Such a system offers the governed the possibility of appealing, in a precisely regulated manner, the decision of a lower office to the corresponding superior authority. With the full development of the bureaucratic type, the office hierarchy is *monocratically* organized. The principle of hierarchical office authority is found in all bureaucratic structures: in state and ecclesiastical structures as well as in large party organizations and private enterprises. It does not matter for the character of bureaucracy whether its authority is called "private" or "public."

When the principle of jurisdictional "competency" is fully carried through, hierarchical subordination—at least in public office—does not mean that the "higher" authority is authorized simply to take over the business of the "lower." Indeed, the opposite is the rule; once an office has been set up, a new incumbent will always be appointed if a vacancy occurs.

III. The management of the modern office is based upon written documents (the "files"), which are preserved in their original or draft form, and upon a staff of subaltern officials and scribes of all sorts. The body of officials working in an agency along with the respective apparatus of material implements and the files makes up a *bureau* (in private enterprises often called the "counting house," *Kontor*).

In principle, the modern organization of the civil service separates the bureau from the private domicile of the official and, in general, segregates official activity from the sphere of private life. Public monies and equipment are divorced from the private property of the official. This condition is everywhere the product of a long development. Nowadays, it is found in public as well as in private enterprises; in the latter, the principle extends even to the entrepreneur at the top. In principle, the *Kontor* (office) is separated from the household, business from private correspondence, and business assets from private wealth. The more consistently the modern type of business management has been carried through, the more are these separations the case. The beginnings of this process are to be found as early as the Middle Ages.

It is the peculiarity of the modern entrepreneur that he conducts himself as the "first official" of his enterprise, in the very same way in which the ruler of a specifically modern bureaucratic state [Frederick II of Prussia] spoke of himself as "the first servant" of the state. The idea that the bureau activities of the state are intrinsically different in character from the management of private offices is a continental Euro-



pean notion and, by way of contrast, is totally foreign to the American way.

IV. Office management, at least all specialized office management—and such management is distinctly modern—usually presupposes thorough training in a field of specialization. This, too, holds increasingly for the modern executive and employee of a private enterprise, just as it does for the state officials.

V. When the office is fully developed, official activity demands the *full working capacity* of the official, irrespective of the fact that the length of his obligatory working hours in the bureau may be limited. In the normal case, this too is only the product of a long development, in the public as well as in the private office. Formerly the normal state of affairs was the reverse: Official business was discharged as a secondary activity.

VI. The management of the office follows *general rules*, which are more or less stable, more or less exhaustive, and which can be learned. Knowledge of these rules represents a special technical expertise which the officials possess. It involves jurisprudence, administrative or business management.

The reduction of modern office management to rules is deeply embedded in its very nature. The theory of modern public administration, for instance, assumes that the authority to order certain matters by decree—which has been legally granted to an agency—does not entitle the agency to regulate the matter by individual commands given for each case, but only to regulate the matter abstractly. This stands in extreme contrast to the regulation of all relationships through individual privileges and bestowals of favor, which, as we shall see, is absolutely dominant in patrimonialism, at least in so far as such relationships are not fixed by sacred tradition.

## 2. *The Position of the Official Within and Outside of Bureaucracy*

All this results in the following for the internal and external position of the official:

### I. OFFICE HOLDING AS A VOCATION

That the office is a "vocation" (*Beruf*) finds expression, first, in the requirement of a prescribed course of training, which demands the entire working capacity for a long period of time, and in generally

breaking up of the opposing local and feudal privileges have in modern times frequently benefitted the interests of capitalism or have been carried out in direct alliance with capitalist interests; witness the great historical alliance of the absolute princes with capitalist interests. In general, a legal leveling and destruction of firmly established local structures ruled by notables has usually benefitted the scope of capitalist activity. But, on the other hand, there is also an effect of bureaucratization that meets the petty-bourgeois interest in a safe traditional "living," or even a state-socialist effect that strangulates opportunities for private profit. This has undoubtedly been active in several cases of historically far-reaching importance, particularly during Antiquity; it is perhaps also to be expected in future developments in our world.

The very different effects of political organizations which were, at least in principle, quite similar in Egypt under the Pharaohs, in Hellenistic, and in Roman times, show the very different economic consequences of bureaucratization which are possible, depending upon the direction of other factors present. The mere fact of bureaucratic organization does not unambiguously tell us about the concrete direction of its *economic* effects, which are always in some manner present. At least it does not tell us as much as can be told about its relatively leveling *social* effect. Even in this respect one has to remember that bureaucracy as such is a precision instrument which can put itself at the disposal of quite varied interests, purely political as well as purely economic ones, or any other sort. Therefore, the measure of its parallelism with democratization must not be exaggerated, however typical it may be. Under certain conditions, strata of feudal lords have also put this instrument into their service. There is also the possibility—and often it has become a fact, as for instance in the Roman Principate and in some forms of absolutist state structures—that bureaucratization of the administration is deliberately connected with the formation of status groups, or is entangled with it by the force of the existing groupings of social power. The explicit reservation of offices for certain status groups is very frequent, and empirical reservations are even more frequent.

## 11. *The Power Position of the Bureaucracy*

### A. THE POLITICAL IRRELEVANCE OF FUNCTIONAL INDISPENSABILITY

The democratization of society in its totality, and in the *modern* sense of the term, whether actual or perhaps merely formal, is an especially favorable basis of bureaucratization, but by no means the only

possible one. After all, bureaucracy has merely the [limited] striving to level those powers that stand in its way in those concrete areas that, in the individual case, it seeks to occupy. We must remember the fact which we have encountered several times and which we shall have to discuss repeatedly: that "democracy" as such is opposed to the "rule" of bureaucracy, in spite and perhaps because of its unavoidable yet unintended promotion of bureaucratization. Under certain conditions, democracy creates palpable breaks in the bureaucratic pattern and impediments to bureaucratic organization. Hence, one must in every individual historical case analyze in which of the special directions bureaucratization has there developed.

For this reason, it must also remain an open question whether the *power* of bureaucracy is increasing in the modern states in which it is spreading. The fact that bureaucratic organization is technically the most highly developed power instrument in the hands of its controller does not determine the weight that bureaucracy as such is capable of procuring for its own opinions in a particular social structure. The ever-increasing "indispensability" of the officialdom, swollen to the millions, is no more decisive on this point than is the economic indispensability of the proletarians for the strength of the social and political power position of that class (a view which some representatives of the proletarian movement hold).<sup>8</sup> If "indispensability" were decisive, the equally "indispensable" slaves ought to have held this position of power in any economy where slave labor prevailed and consequently freemen, as is the rule, shunned work as degrading. Whether the power of bureaucracy as such increases cannot be decided *a priori* from such reasons. The drawing in of economic interest groups or other non-official experts, or the drawing in of lay representatives, the establishment of local, inter-local, or central parliamentary or other representative bodies, or of occupational associations—these *seem* to run directly against the bureaucratic tendency. How far this appearance is the truth must be discussed in another chapter, rather than in the framework of this purely formal and typological (*kasuistisch*) discussion. In general, only the following can be said here:

The power position of a fully developed bureaucracy is always great, under normal conditions overpowering. The political "master" always finds himself, vis-à-vis the trained official, in the position of a dilettante facing the expert. This holds whether the "master," whom the bureaucracy serves, is the "people" equipped with the weapons of legislative initiative, referendum, and the right to remove officials; or a parliament elected on a more aristocratic or more democratic basis and equipped with the right or the *de facto* power to vote a lack of confidence; or an

aristocratic collegiate body, legally or actually based on self-recruitment; or a popularly elected president or an "absolute" or "constitutional" hereditary monarch.

#### B. ADMINISTRATIVE SECRECY

This superiority of the professional insider every bureaucracy seeks further to increase through the means of *keeping secret* its knowledge and intentions. Bureaucratic administration always tends to exclude the public, to hide its knowledge and action from criticism as well as it can. Prussian church authorities now threaten to use disciplinary measures against pastors who make reprimands or other admonitory measures in any way accessible to third parties, charging that in doing so they become "guilty" of facilitating a possible criticism of the church authorities. The treasury officials of the Persian Shah have made a secret science of their budgetary art and even use a secret script. The official statistics of Prussia, in general, make public only what cannot do any harm to the intentions of the power-wielding bureaucracy. This tendency toward secrecy is in certain administrative fields a consequence of their objective nature: namely, wherever power interests of the given structure of domination *toward the outside* are at stake, whether this be the case of economic competitors of a private enterprise or that of potentially hostile foreign polities in the public field. If it is to be successful, the management of diplomacy can be publicly supervised only to a very limited extent. The military administration must insist on the concealment of its most important measures with the increasing significance of purely technical aspects. Political parties do not proceed differently, in spite of all the ostensible publicity of the party conventions and "Catholic Congresses" (*Katholikentage*).<sup>9</sup> With the increasing bureaucratization of party organizations, this secrecy will prevail even more. Foreign trade policy, in Germany for instance, brings about a concealment of production statistics. Every fighting posture of a social structure toward the outside tends in itself to have the effect of buttressing the position of the group in power.

However, the pure power interests of bureaucracy exert their effects far beyond these areas of functionally motivated secrecy. The concept of the "office secret" is the specific invention of bureaucracy, and few things it defends so fanatically as this attitude which, outside of the specific areas mentioned, cannot be justified with purely functional arguments. In facing a parliament, the bureaucracy fights, out of a sure power instinct, every one of that institution's attempts to gain through its own means (as, e.g., through the so-called "right of parlia-

mentary investigation")<sup>10</sup> expert knowledge from the interested parties. Bureaucracy naturally prefers a poorly informed, and hence powerless, parliament—at least insofar as this ignorance is compatible with the bureaucracy's own interests.

### C. THE RULER'S DEPENDENCE ON THE BUREAUCRACY

The absolute monarch, too, is powerless in face of the superior knowledge of the bureaucratic expert—in a certain sense more so than any other political head. All the irate decrees of Frederick the Great concerning the "abolition of serfdom" were derailed in the course of their realization because the official mechanism simply ignored them as the occasional ideas of a dilettante. A constitutional king, whenever he is in agreement with a socially important part of the governed, very frequently exerts a greater influence upon the course of administration than does the absolute monarch since he can control the experts better because of the at least relatively public character of criticism, whereas the absolute monarch is dependent for information solely upon the bureaucracy. The Russian Tsar of the *ancien régime* [before the appointment of a Prime Minister in 1905] was rarely able to put across permanently anything that displeased his bureaucracy and violated its power interests. His ministries, which were subordinated directly to him as the autocrat, represented, as Leroy-Beaulieu very correctly observed, a conglomerate of satrapies which fought among each other with all the means of personal intrigue and bombarded each other with voluminous "Memoranda," in the face of which the monarch as a dilettante was quite helpless.<sup>11</sup>

The concentration of the power of the central bureaucracy in a single pair of hands is inevitable with every transition to constitutional government. Officialdom is placed under a monocratic head, the prime minister, through whose hands everything has to go before it gets to the monarch. This puts the latter to a large extent under the tutelage of the chief of the bureaucracy. Wilhelm II, in his well-known conflict with Bismarck, fought against this principle, but had to withdraw his attack very soon.<sup>12</sup> Under the rule of expert knowledge, the influence of the monarch can attain steadiness only through continuous communication with the bureaucratic chiefs which is methodically planned and directed by the central head of the bureaucracy. At the same time, constitutionalism binds the bureaucracy and the ruler into a community of interests against the power-seeking of the party chiefs in the parliamentary bodies. But *against* the bureaucracy the ruler remains powerless for this very reason, unless he finds support in parliament. The

desertion of the "Great of the Reich," here the Prussian ministers and top Reich officials, brought a monarch into approximately the same situation in November 1918 as did the parallel event under the conditions of the feudal state in 1076.<sup>13</sup> This, however, is an exception, for the power position of a monarch is on the whole far stronger vis-à-vis bureaucratic officials than it was in any feudal or in a "stereotyped" patrimonial state. This is because of the constant presence of aspirants for promotion with whom the monarch can easily replace inconvenient and independent officials. Other circumstances being equal, only economically independent officials, that is, officials who belong to the propertied strata, can permit themselves to risk the loss of their offices. Today as always, the recruitment of officials from among propertyless strata increases the power of the rulers. Only officials who belong to a socially influential stratum which the monarch believes to have to take into account as support of his person, like the so-called *Kanalrebell*en in Prussia, can permanently and completely paralyze the substance of his will.<sup>14</sup>

Only the expert knowledge of private economic interest groups in the field of "business" is superior to the expert knowledge of the bureaucracy. This is so because the exact knowledge of facts in their field is of direct significance for economic survival. Errors in official statistics do not have direct economic consequences for the responsible official, but miscalculations in a capitalist enterprise are paid for by losses, perhaps by its existence. Moreover, the "secret," as a means of power, is more safely hidden in the books of an enterprise than it is in the files of public authorities. For this reason alone authorities are held within narrow boundaries when they seek to influence economic life in the capitalist epoch, and very frequently their measures take an unforeseen and unintended course or are made illusory by the superior expert knowledge of the interested groups.

## 12. *Excursus on Collegiate Bodies and Interest Groups*

Since the specialized knowledge of the expert became more and more the foundation for the power of the officeholder, an early concern of the ruler was how to exploit the special knowledge of experts without having to abdicate in their favor. With the qualitative extension of administrative tasks and therewith the indispensability of expert knowledge, it typically happens that the lord no longer is satisfied by occasional consultation with proven confidants or even with an assembly of such men called together intermittently and in difficult situations.