

**MAX WEBER'S CONCEPT OF POLITICAL PERSONALITY: AN APPRAISAL****Godswill-Philip Nnaemeka Agashi***Department of Philosophy, Religion and Peace Studies**Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria***Abstract**

Max Weber's concept of political personality and his endorsement of an ethics of responsibility including his view on ethical neutrality have attracted the attentions of many scholars. His theory of value conflict and his realistic comprehension of politics and also the manner he understands the relation between politics and ethics have influenced his concept of a political personality. He considers the two opposing ethics (ethics of conviction and ethics of responsibility) only when taken together can constitute the basic nature of human being. He emphasizes that a political personality must have three qualities; passion, a sense of responsibility and a sense of proportion. Most importantly, his idea of the two ethics constituting the basic nature of a human being and his emphasis of a politician having a sense of responsibility thereby arguing for an ethics of responsibility to be appropriate for politics remains a point of analysis. Moreover his emphasis on the ethics of responsibility for politics does not remove the inherent or intrinsic nature of ethics of conviction in a human being which a political personality is involved. The balancing nature of the two ethics remains fundamental for an ideal politician. It is necessary and can be of great importance for sustainable governance. Then not only that they are fundamental but they are the key factors for an ideal leader. Through critical analytical method, his ideas of ethical neutrality, political personality and the relation between politics and ethics would be considered.

**Keywords:** Political Personality, Ethics of Conviction, Ethics of Responsibility, Ethical Neutrality.

**1. Introduction**

The political thought of Max Weber has attracted the views of many popular scholars. That was why we have various opinions and analysis concerning his views. A person like Mommsen in the Essay, *Political and Social Theory of Max Weber, Collected Essays*, considers him as a liberal (Mommsen, 1989:23). Likewise Beetham is of the view too that he is a liberal in his Essay, *Max Weber and the Theory of Modern Politics* (Beetham, 1994:238). On a different perspective Mayer in his Essay, *Max Weber and German Politics: A Study in Political Sociology* considers him as a democrat (Mayer, 1994:72). While Chemiss in the Essay, *An Ethos of Politics Between Realism and Idealism: Max Weber's Enigmatic Political Ethics, The Journal of Politics*, states too that Max Weber is a democrat (Chemiss, 2016:708).

As a liberal and democrat, he is interested in the significance of politics concerning the whole life. That is why he considers politics as that which involves a way to share power or influence the distribution of power. He defines politics as "an independent leadership in action" (Weber, 2009:77). It means that a leader has a power to make basic decisions in order to lead well. A leader must be decisive in handling the affairs of the masses. Max Weber's advice in politics is not only important but generally paramount for good governance.

Absolutely, there is inherent idea of importance in his "*Politics as a Vocation*". He explores the growth of politics considering how it has led to the pattern of thinking in modern politics and also the reasons that

anchored on “why and how” people rule. In doing so, he contributes his idea for the development of politics. The fundamental question of how a politician should behave or carry out his or her duties has been an age long matter. It is very important and its important nature has generated divergent views different scholars. As it is very important for politicians themselves so as it is necessary to the citizens mainly for the good of political sphere.

Max Weber makes a great attempt to tackle this issue which his ideas are universally important notwithstanding the various criticisms from different scholars on his views. Through critical analytical method the following topics would be considered. Max Weber’s Concept of Politics Vis A Vis the Struggle of Opposing Value, Weber’s Politics and Ethics, Weber on Political Personality – Charismatic Leader, Weber on Ethics of Responsibility: A critical Analysis, Evaluation and Conclusion.

## **2. Max Weber’s Concept of Politics vis a vis the Struggle of Opposing Values**

Max Weber’s clear view of politics (realistic tradition) could be traced to few Greek sophists and Thucydides (Benjamin, 1996). The tradition is mainly known for sober and realistic view concerning political reality, human being inclusive and its moral flaw (Berg-Schlosser, 1995:25-26). The tradition involves the realist conception of politics. It sidetracks ‘ideal theory’ in favour of pure factuality. Then for the political realists, power is the basic feature both in the area of politics and for the comprehension of the political (Berg-Schlosser, 1995:25-26). According to Weber politics involves “striving for a share of power or for influence on the distribution of power either between the states or the groups of people in a single state (Bruun, 2007:239). Equally, he pinpoints that politics is associated with struggles (Tumer, 1984:10,7-27). Furthermore, political struggle for him is a part of a larger and major fight mainly due to the continuous struggle of opposing values and ideals.

In a more elaborate form, he explains that we must understand that “the highest ideals which move us most forcefully are always effective only in the struggle with other ideals which are just as sacred to others as ours are to us” (Weber, 1946:153). Politics for Weber involves the struggle of opposing values and this reminds us of the nature of modernity. The modern period in Philosophy involves a shift away from the dominance of religious dogma mainly a move towards reasoning, science and human experience as the primary source of knowledge. Modernity properly refers to a historical period and the societal changes associated with it which marks a move away of traditional ways of life emphasizing individualism, rationalization and the development of modern institutions like nations – states and capitalism.

The struggle was stopped by the religious dogma in Europe that gave rise to cultural unity. Then after some period of time it came up again. For Weber, it is a basic fact that modern man is preoccupied with the idea to live in godless and prophetess period of time (Weber, 1946:153). Then Max Weber’s theory concerning the value conflict could be traced to Nietzsche due to his popular statement that “God is dead”, illustrating that the belief in Christian God has become unbelievable (Nietzsche, 2001). Kant a modern philosopher also influences Max Weber’s methodology. His theory of value conflict states that societal values are subjective. They clash with one another thereby giving rise to ongoing tensions and struggles. He argues that these conflicts are intrinsic in social life that cannot be resolved through reasoning or rational means that can be obtainable in various spheres like in politics, economy and religion etc.

As that is obtainable in politics what are his reasons for endorsing the ethics of responsibility while in social sciences he advocates that the researchers should be impartial and avoid imposing their own values or biases when conducting and reporting on their studies. For him research findings should be free from distortion

even if those findings are antinomic to personal views or universally accepted beliefs. He acknowledges the difficulty in obtaining complete objectivity due to the inherent subjective views in studying human subjects and cultural influences.

Concerning the relation between politics and ethics, in his “Profession and Vocation of Politics”, he is of the view that politics and ethics are related thereby going against those that say that they are unrelated and that one particular ethics is able to guide all human conduct (Weber, 1994:357-368). He differentiates two kinds of ethically oriented activity and two corresponding approaches to ethics that are opposite. Human actions can follow the ethics of conviction or the ethics of responsibility (Weber, 1994:359). He argues that ethics of responsibility is most necessary for the sphere of politics than the ethics of conviction (Bruun, 2007:49,259). This attracts criticism on the ground that he contradicts his view of “ethical neutrality” or “value neutrality”.

The views of Max Weber on theory of value conflict have a link with the philosophies of Nietzsche and Machiavelli. Weber’s idea on intellectual honesty could be traced to Nietzsche (Nietzsche, 1989:155). Secondly Weber’s realistic understanding of politics as struggle has its source in Nietzsche’s idea of “will to power”. The will to power in Nietzsche’s views mainly is a fundamental driving force intrinsic in all living things to grow, expand and overcome obstacles. It is not only a desire or zeal to dominate or control. In him it is a basic driving force behind all human actions and motivations and it is beyond physical strength. According to Max Weber, it is a self-evident fact that the will to power is one of the driving motives of political leaders (Weber, 1994:354). The will to power is the mechanism for self- development and growth.

Likewise Weber’s dual views (the clash of irreconcilable values and his realist comprehension of politics) have a link too to Machiavelli. Machiavelli advocates for a pragmatic approach to politics, often known as real politics, where the acquisition and maintenance of power are necessary. He believes that a leader should be ready to act immorally if necessary to safeguard the state, considering the public good to be on top as defined by the states, survival and will being. This leads to total clash of values. The clash is between the ideal of moral governance and the practical realities of power politics. This highlights the tension between what is taken to be morally desirable and acceptable and also what is politically effective. According to Berlin, the basic achievement made by Machiavelli can be noticed on the pluralism and struggle of values as part of human situation and that ends equally ultimate, equally sacred and entire systems of value “come into collision without possibility of national arbitration (Nietzsche, 2005:225).

Furthermore, Nietzsche’s view is articulated in Zarathustra about the values and their origin. Zarathustra narrates:

Humans gave themselves all their good and evil. Indeed they did not take it, they did not find it, it did not fall onto them as a void from the heavens. Humans first placed values into things in order to preserve themselves – they first created meaning for things, a human meaning! That is why they call themselves ‘human’ (Nietzsche, 2006:43).

Nietzsche is against the view that God gives humans their values and moral commandments. The Plato’s version of ethical realism and cognitivism is also rejected by Nietzsche. Then against the position of Plato concerning good to be an objective moral reality about which moral knowledge can be achieved, Nietzsche believes that moral facts and also moral knowledge are not in existence. According to him there is nothing

like moral phenomena that the only thing in place is the moral interpretation of phenomena (Nietzsche, 1989:85). The only thing that is obtainable is the pluralism of values and of understanding of the good. Everything concerning values and meanings is centred on human interpretations and value judgements. Then according to the needs of the people that moral codes and values are invented and discovered. It is only in creation and invention that we can understand the world. Nietzsche further explains that various people have various cultural perspectives and moral codes and also values that only serve for their self-preservation. The bare characteristic of human being is anchored in creation or invention mainly as a valuator (Nietzsche, 2006:45-46). It is an appreciable claim that creating values is an important and major characteristic of human beings. Indeed it is a significant and remarkable view. The change of values is obtainable and such would automatically lead to constant destruction of old values.

This involves the change of creators therefore whoever must be a creator must always annihilates. As this change of values is important to human nature likewise it remains necessary for world history. Nietzsche states:

Opposing values “good and bad, ‘good and evil’ have taught a terrible battle for thousands of years on earth; and although the later has been dominant for a longtime, there is still no lack of places where the battle remains undecided. You could even say that in the meantime. It has reached ever greater heights but at the same time has become ever deeper and more intellectual so that there is today perhaps no more distinguishing feature of the “higher nature” the intellectual nature than to be divided in this sense and to be really and truly a battle ground for these opposites (Nietzsche, 1997:31-32).

The influence of Nietzsche on Weber’s view can easily be noticed. Weber in the “Profession and Vocation of Science” gives a summary of his views based on two concepts- Polytheism and conflict of values in line with his idea of ethical neutrality. For him:

“To scientifically” advocate practical views is impossible – except in the case of debating the means for a fixed given aim – due to more fundamental reasons. It is meaningless in principle because the various value spheres of the world stand in irreconcilable conflict with each other (Nietzsche, 1997:116).

His claims about value are xtrayed, that values or “value judgements” cannot be known scientifically either to be on the state of approvable or on the angle of objectionable. According to Weber, there is no stated “hierarchical ordering of values” (Weber, 1949:19). Moreso he explains that radical pluralism together with the conflict of values can be noticed on the most fundamental stage like in Plato’s philosophy.

Weber goes further to explain what he understands to be the consequence of the limits of the social science, philosophy and reason in general. Then as values or value judgements cannot be assessed scientifically, one has to go into decision which ones are desirable and which ones reprehensible. He considers this to be; decisionist view of the value choices one must make in life” (Turner, 1984:2). On the concept of decisionism, he says:

This proposition which I present here always takes its point of departure from the one fundamental fact, that so long as life remains immanent and is interpreted in its own terms, it knows only of an unceasing struggle of these gods [i.e these opposed value] with one another. Or speaking directly, the ultimately possible attitudes toward life are irreconcilable and hence their struggle can never be brought to a final conclusion. Thus, it is necessary to make a decisive choice (Weber, 1946:152).

Generally, Weber in his philosophy of science states that the ultimate rational, philosophical or scientific grounding of values including normative themes cannot be obtainable. On the empirical ground the social science should be able to study normative phenomena like values and ideals. Empirically, the scientific discipline should be capable of demonstrating which means and repercussions are inevitable for actions derived from practical political evaluations (Weber, 1946:152). He also considers not only the social sciences but philosophical disciplines like ethics and their connection to value judgement. Philosophical discipline (than empirical ones), for him:

Can go further (than empirical ones) and lay bare the ‘meaning of evaluations i.e. their ultimate meaningful consequences in order words, they can indicate their ‘place’ within the totality of all the possible ultimate evaluations and delimit their spheres of meaningful validity (Weber, 1946:18).

In elucidating his ideas, Weber highly considers the argumentative limits of both the social sciences and ethics concerning the rational or scientific grounding of values. On the ground of decision, he states that:

The social sciences which are strictly empirical sciences are the least fitted to presume to save the individual the difficulty of making a choice and they should therefore not create the impression that they can do so (Weber, 1949:18-19).

Now it would be nice to consider his idea of politics and its connection to ethics.

### **3. Max Weber’s Politics and Ethics**

Weber states that politics has to do with the exercise of any kind of leadership activity (Weber, 2004:32). Then he goes further to consider the following as they are necessary: “the leadership or the exercise of influence on the leadership of a political organisation in order words a state” (Weber, 2004:32). According to Weber the states as he defines it sociologically has to do with the communal body that, “lays claim to the monopoly of legitimate physical violence within a particular territory” (Weber, 2004:33). From the definition, it means that, the state is involved with the administration and legislative authority. It is on that ground that we can state that a state is the only source of legitimacy (or right) when it comes to the use of physical violence. The authority of the state is based on its right to enforce the said authority and any individual can only make use of violence in line with authority given by the state. Therefore, considering the fact that politics involves the exercise of leadership activity and the state is the body that monopolizes the idea of legitimacy in physical violence for power, then for one to be active in politics in a state means;

“to strive for a share of power or to influence the distribution of power, whether between states or between the groups of people contained within a state” (Weber, 2004:33).

So the relationship that is intrinsic in the notion of state is dual in nature that is a particular group of people exhibiting their leadership powers over another group. The source of the power of the first group is from the ability to commit violence without going against the required justice. The said state is known for different kind of people that involve in politics. Precisely, to be involved in politics is to advocate towards influencing the distribution of power, “between and within political structures” (Weber, 2004:39). As he advocates for a full time politician the question is what are the important qualities of a politician? A politician must be driven by a passionate dedication to a cause and the cause is not the one centred on vanity or power lust (Weber, 2004:77). The cause should be in a more traditional sense an actionable goal rooted in some ethical interpretation of justice and the ultimate good. The impact of this is that a politician that takes politics as a vocation needs not come from objective morality rather he or she must have a passionate dedication to a particular cause he or she had identified with. It is based on this angle that Weber can differentiate his view on what a vocational politician from any consideration what, makes an objectively just or ‘moral’ cause.

He describes as political a life that is highly grounded on the acquisition and exercise of political power for a purpose and for a cause as mentioned by David Morrison in contrasting with the ancient Greeks and stoics philosophers. Aristotle on the other hand considers political life as a life in promotion of the common goods (Morrison, 2001:222). Weber in his discussion believes that what Aristotle understands as that which makes the good is not the yardstick for the practice of politics as a vocation. A politician with a vocation must have a cause. The part of it is the discussion of what constitutes a just cause together with what constitute appropriate action in the ideal practice of politics once the cause has been established.

#### **4. Max Weber’s Concept of Political Personality – Charismatic Leader**

According to Weber the personality involves an ideal human being with a capability to be known as genuine and ethical man. For the fact that a vocation is a calling, it has to do with absolute human conviction and because of that there is no fundamental link between vocation and citizenship. For him, the state is just a conception of legality and a framework and has no inherent purpose while its citizens are members not in affiliation. For one to be a cultural being he must have a freedom of the personality or the freedom of purposive activity. Then it is through the intermediate group (a group formed collectively for the interests of the individuals) and its connection with the state that the individual can achieve the two types of freedom as Weber explains, “freedom of movement and freedom of conscience” (Turner, 1992:109) Weber explains the various characteristics of a true politician; a person in spite of the ethical struggle of leadership does what is needed to be done in order to succeed.

The person must be committed and apply violence vis a vis the state when the need arises for the good of the citizens. He must be ready to make decisions that may not be in line with the general opinion for the best of the state. Another important characteristic for a political personality is the capacity to keep the bureaucracy under proper check politically. In the politics as vocation, he articulates these views and emphasizes that this individual will have the calling in politics and an earthly knowledge with the practical mindset to tackle the challenges. It is only in the communities that these type of leaders are found associated with certain types of parliaments and with mass democracy.

Weber is interested on having a consistent political personality. His major target centred on conferring value upon a world that is known to be hard boards which requires fact and wisdom including headedness in handling. He differentiates three qualities of a man that is fit for the position, a person that is permitted to “put his hand in the spokes of the wheel of history” (Turner, 1992:112). The three qualities include passion, a sense of proportion and a sense of responsibility. The sense of responsibility guides the action of a political personality. For him a political personality must have a passionate dedication to a cause that is being “passion in the sense of a commitment to the matter in hand” (Weber, 2009:76). He emphasizes on an individual that has capacity or ability to pursue his calling notwithstanding the challenges of uncertainty and irrationality of his endeavour. Another quality is that a political personality must have a sense of proportion. This demands the application of the power of reasoning, that is the ability to act rationally and using discretion in handling the impulses. According to Weber, he says:

[What is needed] is that ability to allow realities to impinge on you while maintaining an inner calm and composure... in short, a distance from people and things. For the heart of the problem is how to forge a unity between hot passion and a cool sense of proportion in one and the same person (Weber, 2009:77).

By distance, he emphasizes of one being distant from things, human beings and oneself. It means that a leader or a political personality must keep a distance from these concrete areas of life which proper restriction is highly needed. He states that politicians should not allow romantic sensations to rule them. Those who do not genuinely feel what they take upon themselves thereby intoxicating themselves mainly destroy the avenue of objectively striving for the distance between themselves and value. The distance between us and the world enhances the relationship. Therefore, the distance that defines the political personality makes him or her to be confident and apply the idea of decision in handling the affairs of people. Again, a politician should not be everywhere other people are, in all the places where all things are or do everything he or she likes. The essence of a politician knowing or identifying with a cause would make him or her to distance himself from various things that would be inimical in achieving the cause of his mission. Identifying the cause is a necessary requirement for any full time politician. The cause would help him to know the boundaries (distance) in leading the people. A politician needs some distance from the people, things he governs including himself. This will help him not to be too passionate concerning a goal and allow what matters to be lost. Weber is so much interested on the balance between the passion and proportion. So without passion politics becomes a child play or a frivolous intellectual activity but in absence of proportion the politician is condemned to political impotence.

Another quality he considers is the sense of responsibility. It means a politician should have a sense of responsibility to the cause he has identified with. Weber’s view on the sense of responsibility is that: The politician will have a responsibility to a cause he is so passionate or devoted to without bias and the second aspect is that he means responsibility to future generation and the life standard of a political community. The dedication to a cause and the sense of responsibility can help a politician to be active in distancing from other people, things and himself. Importantly, these two types of responsibility of Weber recall the dualistic nature of culture; is culture meant to be comprehended in relation to individual autonomy or is it taken to be understood as the relationship between politics and ethics. Weber identifies three types of legitimate authority that is align with leadership, which includes; traditional, rational-legal and charismatic. His

concept of legitimate authority is very important for understanding how societies maintain order and how power is exercised.

The traditional authority is the type of leadership that involves the recognized traditions, customs and historical precedents. The legitimacy of the leader comes from the specific belief that their position is being guided by the long-standing norms. Examples are chiefs or monarchies. Rational-legal authority is a type of leadership that has its bases on the formal rules, regulations and laws. Examples are as follows; judges, elected officials managers etc. The last is the charismatic authority which Max Weber advocates as the best. This type of leadership is rooted from an individual's exceptional personal qualities like charm, charisma and the ability to inspire followers. The leader's legitimacy is based from the followers' belief in their extraordinary abilities and vision. Examples are revolutionary leaders or charismatic. CEOs.

Charismatic leaders arise mostly during the times of crisis or uncertainty projecting a vision of change and mobilizing followers through their gifts and capacities. A charismatic leader is seen as having unique, even supernatural qualities that make him to be different from ordinary individuals. Followers are drawn to and attached themselves to him. They obey charismatic leaders because they believe in his exceptional abilities and capacities, as divinely inspired and destined for a greater purpose in life. Most importantly, people trust in him as divinely sent for a great purpose. Then with the revolutionary force, he is associated with periods of social challenges, upheaval or change. He challenges the existing norms and offers a new idea for proper liberation and development. A charismatic leader derives his power and authority from his personal qualities not from inherited status.

For Weber charismatic leader excels over the two types because his domination is universal concerning time and space (Weber, 2009:80). In Contrast to other two types, charisma is unconditional. It comes from the charismatic leader himself, mainly his personality and qualities (Weber, 2009:79). In this type of domination, motives of political actions coming from the belief in the personality and qualities of a leader are rooted and have link from the figure of the leader and from the tradition of rationality. The submission of people to such leader is mainly of his unique feature as a leader – a purely individual whose charisma cannot be transferred. In this type of domination, its source and user is the same person. So, because of that a charismatic leader gets a unique personality that cannot be seen in other two types of domination. He has capacity to change and re-establish the political order for the good of the masses. The charismatic leader is highly obeyed due to his recognition as the inner called leader of men not solely of his knowledge or virtue. Weber explains three forms of the charismatic type of domination; a prophet, an elected warlord and a demagogue. He focused on the latter because of the context of the speech. The leader demagogue seems to have only one basic expression “the spoken or written word” (Weber, 2009:95). It means the word that transmits values.

##### **5. Weber on the Ethics of Responsibility: A Critical Analysis**

Weber is interested how a vocational political personality should engage in politics. His normative approach towards how a politician should be actively engaged in politics remains necessary. He differentiates two opposing ethics (ethics of responsibility and ethics of conviction). Ethically in terms of behaviour, human being can follow an ethics of conviction or an ethics of responsibility. Considering the two opposing ethics, is a conflict between a deontological and a consequentialist ethics (Broad, 1930:206). Weber states that it is the ethics of responsibility that is very necessary for the sphere of politics.

He defines an ethics of conviction as that which guides the action of the political personality in the manner that moral code like the Ten Commandments would guide the actions of the Christian. Bradley Starr emphasizes that “the ethics of conviction recognizes a given hierarchy of values as the context for moral endeavour” (Starr, 1999:407). It means that a man that operates in line with the ethics of conviction focuses justly with motivated action and not solely on the outcome of such action. Weber explains that “with an ethics of conviction one focuses on the flame of pure conviction should never be extinguished (Weber, 2009:95). The ethics of conviction does not involve the consequences of actions. Contemporarily, it corresponds to a deontological ethics.

Under the ethics of responsibility one “must answer for the foreseeable consequences of one’s actions”(Weber, 2009:83) When a man is being guided by an ethics of responsibility, he upholds morality or value obligations but the major fact is that he cannot sheepishly follow an action done out of pure conviction when that an action has evil consequences. Precisely, for Weber anybody adopting on ethics of responsibility “feels the responsibility he bears for the consequences of his own actions with his entire soul”(Weber, 2009:92). It means that an ethics of responsibility has an extension ground. The two ethical maxims, anybody guided by an ethics of conviction is purely concerned with doing what is just as predetermined by the guiding principles or values. While the ethics of responsibility is inherent with the tenets of morality and by extension includes a pure concern for the consequences of an action. Weber says:

We have to understand that ethically oriented activity can follow two fundamentally different, irreconcilably opposed maxims. It can follow the “ethics of principled conviction or the ethics of responsibility”. It is not that the ethics of conviction is identical with irresponsibility, nor that the ethics of responsibility means absence of principled conviction- there is of course no question of that. But there is a profound opposition .... between acting by the maxim of the ethics of conviction.... and acting by the maxim of the ethics of responsibility (Weber, 1994:359).

Weber denies that “the ethics of conviction is identical with irresponsibility and emphasize that the ethics of responsibility does not mean the absence of principled conviction. The person who decides to follow an ethics of conviction feels responsible for the purity of his intentions, inner principles and value. Then for the person that is oriented towards ethics of responsibility has certain convictions, goals and values but highly attached with his consequences of his actions. They are not absolutely opposite but complementary to each other. Weber’s validation of an ethics of responsibility for political personality remains a great topic of analysis.

In analysis, Weber’s understanding of politics is a realist one. For the political realists, politics has to do with power, struggle and conflict. The pic of Weber’s view is his refusal of the interpretation that both politics and ethics have “nothing to all to do with one another” and the view that “political action is subject to the same ethics as every other form of activity” (Weber, 1994:357-368). His refutation of the second statement is on the ground that human actions belong to heterogeneous spheres and because of that it is very hard to ethically regulate them in coherent manner. He says:

But is it in fact true that any ethics in the world could establish substantially identical commandments.... applicable to all relationships, whether erotic business, family or official to one's relations with one's wife greengrocer, son and competitor with a friend of an accused man? Can the fact that politics operates with a quite specific means, namely power backed up by the use of violence ... really be a matter of such indifference as far as the ethical demands placed on politics are concerned" (Weber, 1994:357).

The three qualities of a political personality together with the idea of decisionism in politics assist a political leader to apply violence or force when necessary. For Weber the tasks of politics can only be achieved through force (Weber, 1994:360) Notwithstanding his understanding of politics he believes that politics and ethics have something to do with each other. They are related. He states it clearly that the inescapable violence or force obtainable in political practice is the major reason of political ethics. That is to say that politics and ethics have something to do together. His realist understanding of politics is very important in understanding his view on the relation of politics to ethics. At this point, it is believed that Max Weber gets his inspiration from Machiavelli's views. Weber is much interested in Machiavelli's political ethics (Manuel, 2019:14). It centres on the tension that exists between traditional morality and politics and also the connection between the bad means and good ends. The main fact between Weber and Machiavelli centres on the relation of means and ends and in particular the question of the extent to which a good end will be able to sanction immoral means. The two are in agreement that it is possible to achieve knowledge about the means necessary to achieve given political ends and through the power of reason to calculate their usage. On the tension between morality and politics and relation between bad means and good ends, Weber states:

No ethics in the world can get round the fact that the achievement of good ends is in many cases tied to the necessity of employing morality suspect or at least morally dangerous means and that one must reckon with the possibility or even likelihood of evil side-effects. Nor can any ethics in the world determine when and to what extent the ethically good end sanctifies the ethically dangerous means and side-effects (Weber, 1994:360).

His interest and recommendation of ethics of responsibility begets a question; when and to what extend "a good end can justify and immoral or bad means instead of asking whether this is possible at all. For him the first question is among one of the ethical paradoxes" that no ethics can decide (Weber, 1994:365). In that critical situation every political personality has to go into decision – thereby considering his or her three qualities as mentioned by Weber and then proceed in making his or her individual decision which at the end he or she is morally responsible for the consequences. He considers the sense of responsibility to be paramount quality because it involves other two qualities.

## **6. Evaluation and Conclusion**

The ethics of conviction for him is not appropriate for a politician and for the sphere of politics because it does not require force or violence. It is on the ground that:

It seems that ethics of conviction is bound to founder hopelessly on this problem of how the end is to sanctify the means. Indeed the only position it can logically take is to reject any action which employs morally dangerous means (Weber, 1994:361).

The particular criticism that gives credence for his position is that ethics of conviction is “an ethic of indignity except for a saint” an ethics that asks one to turn his or her two cheeks to be slapped simultaneously. Another basic fact is that ethics of conviction is the essential part of ethics of responsibility. In other words the ethics of responsibility has an inherent of ethics of conviction. Ethics of conviction remains the basic part of ethics of responsibility. It assists political personalities to make decisions – difficult decisions and embrace the consequences. The inherent benefits are numerous. It allows for argument of the conflicts and for the fact that there is no scientific ultimate natural grounding, as a leader you take a balance action (neutral ground) and face the consequences for the fact that the two ethics are not in absolute antitheses and they complement with each other. It means that every political leader should structure his or her political action around the ethics of conviction and ethics of responsibility. Equally, acting in unison of the two ethics nullifies the criticisms of some scholars over his idea of value or ethical neutrality. A political personality cannot act in pure ethics of conviction and must always take responsibility for his actions. The ethics of conviction remains the bedrock that informs an ethics of responsibility which means the ethics of conviction enhances the level by which the political personality is concerned with the consequences.

Then whatever cause a politician is concerned with, the two ethics play important roles in enhancing and paving ways for proper understanding. The two ethics cannot be ruled out from the politician with a vocation. That is why a situation a politician cannot foresee all the consequences of his actions one of the ethics comes in. The situation a leader has no choice rather than to take a strong stand over a particular issue notwithstanding the unforeseen consequences does the right thing, is absolutely acceptable. In that case, he acts in unison. His idea of a politician being distance does not mean separation or detachment. Lack of distance may reduce his passionate cause. The essence of distance is to enhance what he has in mind for his people. A leader who gets close to people, things and himself cannot rule well.

Indeed Weber’s views on ethical neutrality, political personality, the relation between politics and ethics are highly insightful and deserves to be appreciated and put into practice. He discusses the pragmatic practice of politics. He likes the political practice with ethical life. A ruler can be appreciated by his good policies but he would still be lacking when he or she does not balance himself with the two ethics. He advocates a politics that is in line with the classical philosophies of Aristotle, Plato etc and in pragmatic approach of Machiavelli. His views have an inherent ideas that can be of great benefits for the development of the third world countries and for better democratic system.

For the good of the masses, the political personality in leadership with strong sense of responsibility and a commitment to a cause leads without bias mind. In democracy, there is a need of a leader who is not only an administrator but has strong sense of responsibility and a willingness to take decisive action even in the face of uncertainty and potential opposition. A leader must activate a sense of political responsibility and ethical conduct.

## References

- Beetham, D. (1974). *Max Weber and The Theory of Modern Politics*, London: Allen and Unwin.
- Benjamin Frankel (1996). *The Roots of Realism* London: Routledge.
- Berg – Schlosser Dirk and Theo (1995). *Stammen Einfuhrung in die Politikwissen Schaft* Munich: Beck.
- Broad, C.D. (1930). *Five Types of Ethical Theory*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner & Co; Ltd.
- Bruun, Hans Henrik (2007). *Science, Values and Politics in Max Weber's Methodology, New Expanded Edition* Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Chemiss, J. (2016). *An Ethos of Politics Between Realism and Idealism Max Weber's Enigmatic Political Ethics. The Journal of Politics.*
- Friedrich Nietzsche (1989). *Beyond Good and Evil* trans. W Kaufmann New York: Vintage Books.
- Friedrich Nietzsche (1997). *On the Genealogy of Morality* trans. C. Dlethe Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Friedrich Nietzsche (2001). *The Gay Science* trans. J. Nauckhoff, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Friedrich Nietzsche (2005). *Twilight of the Idols*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Friedrich Nietzsche (2006). *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* trans. M K., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
- Manuel Knoll (2019). "Machiavelli's Consequentialist Ethics of Responsibility" *History of Political Thought.*
- Mayer, J. (1994)). *Max Weber and German Politics. A study in Political Sociology* London: Faber and Faber.
- Mommsen, W. (1989). *The Political and Social Theory of Max Weber Collected Essays*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Morrison, Donald (2001). "Politics as a Vocation According to Aristotle" *History of Political Thought.*
- Starr, Bradley E. (1999). "The Structure of Max Weber's Ethics of Responsibility" *Journal of Religious Ethics.*
- Turner, Charles (1992). *Modernity and Politics in the Work of Max Weber* London: Routledge.
- Turner, Stephen P., and Factor, Regis (1984). *A Max Weber and The Dispute over Reason and Value. A Study in Philosophy Ethics and Politics*, London: Routledge.
- Weber M. (2009). *Politics as A Vocation* in H. Gerth and C. Mills (Ed.) *Max Weber Essays in Sociology*, New York: Routledge.
- Weber Max (1946) "Science as Vocation" from *Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, trans. and eds. H.H. Gerth and C. Wright (Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weber Max (1949). "Objectivity in Social Science and Social Policy," *Max Weber, The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, trans. and ed. Edward Shills and Henry Finch Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Weber Max (1949). "The Meaning of Ethical Neutrality in Sociology and Economics". "Max Weber, The Methodology of the Social Sciences, trans and eds. Edward Shills and Henry Finch, 1 – 47. Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe,
- Weber Max (1994). "The Profession and Vocation of Politics". *Weber. Political Writings*, eds. Peter Lassmann and Ronald Speirs Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weber, Max, David S. Owen, Tracy B. (2004). *Strong and Rodney Livingstone The Vocation Lectures*, Indianapolis: Hackett Pub.