

Application of the "Ideal Types" Methodology of M. Weber in Modern Biopolitics

Sergey Nekrasov

Moscow State Technical University of Civil Aviation
(MSTU CA)
Moscow, Russia
E-mail: sinekrasov@mail.ru

Nina Nekrasova

Russian University of Transport (MIIT)
Moscow, Russia
E-mail: sinekrasov@mail.ru

Andrey Nekrasov

Russian University of Transport (MIIT)
Moscow, Russia
E-mail: andrnek@mail.ru

Valeriy Remarchuk

National Research University
Bauman Moscow State Technical University (BMSTU)
Moscow, Russia
E-mail: dekan.fsgn@bmstu.ru

Abstract—The article reviews the methodology of "ideal types" proposed by M. Weber to the analysis of political relations and the transition to biopolitics. It is noted that M. Weber considered the types of political actions as a form of domination and subordination. Three types of political forms that M. Weber distinguishes (domination, charismatic type and rational domination) are analyzed. The internal mechanisms of the transformation of one form of domination into another are revealed. The use of the "ideal types" methodology of M. Weber in modern concepts of biopolitics is considered. The article considers three aspects of modern biopolitics (theoretical, practical and organizational) and their features.

Keywords—*biopolitics; methodology; "ideal types"; domination; subordination; human behavior; paradigm shift; sociobiology; eugenics*

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of the politics sphere as a specific area of social relations in the framework of the traditional Marxist methodology was limited to clarifying the essence and origin of politics. The main provision explaining the origin of politics was considered to be the product of the aggravation of economic contradictions, and as a result of these contradictions, the policy is formalized in the state apparatus. Therefore, politics is participation in the affairs of the state, defining the forms, directions, tasks and content of the state's activities from the standpoint of the interests of certain classes, social strata and groups of the population, as well as parties and public organizations. Drawing attention mainly to the nature and origin of politics, traditional Marxism did not sufficiently illuminate its shaping and functioning.

II. BASIC PROVISIONS OF M. WEBER'S CONCEPT

In contrast to Marxism, in particular, in the development of an approach to policy research Max Weber drew attention to how the attitude of political actors can influence the

change of its forms. Politics, according to M. Weber, is "the desire for power or influence on the distribution of power". Politics uses power or influence on power as a means of asserting one's will, and therefore it manifests itself as a form of people's domination over people. M. Weber deduces the form of political relations from the purposeful, conscious actions of people or large groups of people, correlated with the actions of others and oriented towards them. However, there are unconscious actions that are difficult to understand or interpret. To understand the actions performed on the basis of affectations, M. Weber proposes to present the situation in a clean, perfect way.

M. Weber introduces the mental structure as a means of researching the political sphere. For the application of "ideal types", the necessary prerequisites are intelligently oriented actions of people. Such actions, which are carried out repeatedly and turn into typical ones, M. Weber defines as borderline phenomena, because the majority of actions are affective and unconscious. "Ideal types" are borderlines in nature and therefore are not regularities. M. Weber considers the "ideal types" to be thought structures, although in some cases he recognizes the real nature of their manifestation in reality. Therefore, M. Weber makes a distinction between the "ideal type" and reality, but it is not definite enough.

Types of meaningfully oriented political actions exist as forms of domination and submission, when people under domination must obey authority and have internal bases to justify domination and the right to violence towards themselves. According to Weber, there are three types of political forms of the legitimacy.

Firstly, the type of dominance based on tradition; secondly, the charismatic type of domination, based on an unusual gift of personality, and, thirdly, rational domination by virtue of the necessity of legal establishment. Weber determines that the forms of political relations stem from

purpose-oriented actions and depend little on economic ones [1].

Max Weber traces the internal mechanism of turning one form of domination into another. Thus, the charismatic form of domination, determined by a person's characteristic, which causes trust, fear and submission, is separated from the person as the professional is involved in the conduct of business and goes to the apparatus, the bureaucratic machine.

The professionalization of the political sphere is caused by the desire of a charismatic personality to retain power and maintain subordination of vassals. The first necessary condition for the professionalization of politics, according to M. Weber, is the presence of trained people in various spheres of political activity. Weber has several types of such activities. Gradually, however, the professionalization of various policy areas leads to serving a system that requires the charismatic government to reckon with its features.

Political upheavals are caused by the confrontation of professional politicians and charismatic personalities. The final subordination of the charismatic personality to the political machine in the person of parties and movements takes place in the era of society's entry into parliamentarism. The charismatic form of domination led to the establishment of despotism, leaderism, monarchism, and only change to legal and legitimate party attitudes causes changes in the form of the rule of power. The political struggle will take place between political parties. This form is especially widespread in the era of the development of parliamentarism in Europe.

M. Weber considers that the reason of changing the forms of political domination is the change of forms of consciously oriented actions. The analysis of the changing forms of political relations is a positive moment in the concept of Max Weber. At the same time, along with the classical concept in the study of politics, in recent years philosophical and anthropological concepts of biopolitics are developing rapidly as an integral part of the phenomenon of politics, the basis of which is the study of human behavior. Let us consider this approach in more detail.

III. PHILOSOPHICAL AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASPECTS AND CONCEPTS OF BIOPOLITICS

A. Theoretical Aspect

It's necessary to combine the data of all sciences, which study human behavior in any way (pedagogy, psychology, criminology, ethnography, etc.) to develop politological concepts. The basis of this synthesis was the interest of Western philosophers, sociologists and political scientists to the empirical studies of political behavior. In the 1950s, for example, the approach that studies values and mental constructs of behavior dominated in US political science. The behavior of people during political elections was analyzed, and it was determined how they decided to prefer one candidate to another. The main difficulty was that the above sciences developed in the absence of a general theory of behavior. Instead of exploring the behavioral act and its

structure, they studied the consequences arising from human behavior;

A change of paradigms — the transition from positivistic models of scientific knowledge to biological models of science in philosophy, sociology and political science (consideration of otological, evolutionary-theoretical, comparative psychological research);

The rationale for the new paradigm. American biopolitics R. Masters identifies the following areas of contact between political science and biology: both sciences study the populations of organisms changing in time, and time is a variable decisive value; they use a teleological method of viewing systems; they describe complex systems with self-regulation mechanisms, feedbacks, etc.; there is no possibility to deliver a fully controlled experiment [2].

B. Practical Aspect

The interest of philosophers, sociologists and political scientists to the prospects for the use of biological approaches and methods in their research is due to new issues in the practice of planning and implementing policies. A number of problems of public policy in Western countries (the 60s of the 20th century) revealed a biological component. These are an increase in population growth in a number of vast regions of the world, the danger of an atomic crisis and its possible biological and medical aspects, problems of genetic engineering, relative aging of the population, etc., problems that are now called global and require political solutions.

C. Organizational Aspect

Biopolitics originated in 1967 at the Congress of the Southern Political Science Association (USA), where two biopolitical reports were presented. In 1970, the International Association of Political Sciences admitted that biopolitics was a special area of research, and since 1975 it received the status of a permanent research area in the program of the association congresses. At the end of the 70s, the Executive Committee on Biology and Politics was formed, and since 1981 the Association of Politics and Life Sciences has been functioning in the USA. The most intensive research in this area of political science was conducted in the United States and German Federal Republic. Currently, the bibliography of works on biopolitics has hundreds of titles (in most foreign). Separate thematic issues of philosophical, sociological and political science journals are devoted to biopolitics, and since 1982 a specialized journal has been published in the USA.

The subject and method of biopolitics: the most common definition of biopolitics is the use of biological theories, methods and results for political science research. The philosophy of most political thinkers is distinguished by the recognition of the biological bases that constitute human nature. The first consecutive attempts to use biological theories for explication of the political belong to the XIX century. (works of G. Spencer, P.A. Kropotkin, F. Galton, and other social Darwinists). Modern biopolitics are critical to social Darwinism, considering this approach to discredit the idea of the influence of biological characteristics on the

social and political behavior of people. One of the goals of biopolitics is to clarify the possibilities and limits of application of biological sciences for the study of political problems [3] [4].

The essence of biopolitics can be revealed through the description of the biopolitical research program, which includes: a) attempts to use modern evolutionary theory and historical and anthropological research to analyze the evolution of political relations between people and the origin of the state and society; b) using the results and methods of ethology and sociobiology to decide the main question: is a person identical to other biological species in his behavior; c) a study of the psychophysiological aspects of political behavior; d) the transfer of research techniques, methods, originally arisen in biology, to political, sociological, and other studies; e) development of recommendations based on biopolitical studies for solving practical problems in politics.

Evaluation of the biopolitical approach by the biopoliticians themselves: biopolitics is associated with the study of the political elite, features of the holding of elections and participation in them; international politics and the functioning mechanism of political power; political behavior in conflict situations. Biopolitics serves as a means of evaluating various socio-political conceptual systems from Plato and Aristotle to Marx and Popper according to the biological nature of man. A biopolitic should pose the following question regarding all political programs and projects: to what extent do they take into account the biologically explainable behavioral tendencies of the relevant groups of people?

Ethological concepts in political science: biopolitics that focus on ethology - the science of animal behavior, draw attention to the political behavior of people. The main idea of the ethological approach is that the behavior of humans and animals (highly organized forms, such as primates) is determined by the same laws (heredity, variability, natural selection) and physiological processes.

For example, R. Masters considers social relations to be a natural property of a man and defines a certain picture of the social hierarchy as a basis for political behavior - the presence of domination and submission, competition for a place, etc. Hence, the definition of politics as a sphere of dominance relations is derived, in which people strive to create, maintain and change social rules [5]. The specificity of human political relations is affirmed by the understanding of politics as behavior, which simultaneously demonstrates the properties of domination and submission (common to humans with other mammals), as well as any property of the organization of social life through laws or customs. As a political one, one can characterize such behavior in which there is competition for the successful defense of positions in the social hierarchy that provide influence on the legislative or existential norms of the group. With this interpretation of politics, this logical approach in political science is considered to include the study of not only "agonistic" relations in social systems (threats, attacks, wars, etc.), but also the study of "attention structures" (the ability of an

individual to pay attention to themselves in acute situations), non-verbal communication, "transfer mood", etc. [6]

The problem of difference in the non-verbal behavior of politicians has practical importance, gestures and various signs have the decisive significance here. The perspective of the ethological approach is that through this kind of research one can show the difference between the voters, which consists in the perception of the personal domination of the political leader. Such differentiation is especially effective for those voters who have a minimum amount of political information or are subject to influence associated with political rivalry [7].

Attention should be paid to the phenomenon that social scientists have not been interested in for some time. It is the feeling of political health that a subordinate is experiencing in close proximity to a political leader. In the animal world, such a desire is found in individuals of lower rank (in case of danger they move in the direction of the leader). The gestures of politicians are the reason for soothing rituals, which give subordinates confidence and facilitate the achievement of social unity. To a person from the crowd, these gestures give a sense of closeness to the leader. The closer an individual is to the dominant leader, the less their judgments differ.

Domestic analogues of biopolitical research in the 20s of the 20th century are the works of such Soviet geneticists, supporters of eugenics, as N.K. Koltsov [8], Yu.A. Filippenko [9], A.S. Serebrovsky, who upheld the idea of creating a new humane person, an active builder of communism by perfecting the human race by selection methods. This approach is called the concept of genetic determinism of human behavior.

Psychological and pedagogical research in the 30-60s of the XX century, based on the idea of forming a new Soviet man by creating appropriate social conditions, was called the concept of the primacy of education in determining human behavior.

Political discussions on the issue of nature-upbringing (the 70s) were a manifestation of the clash of political conservatism and liberalism, where anti-Stalinists and anti-dogmatists were advocates of nature, and party functionaries and opponents of genetics were advocates of upbringing. The sociobiological approach in political science is an expression of status sex. The concept of Yu.I. Novozhenova on the socio-biological motives of political behavior (status sex and hierarchy, status sex and crime, status sex and the struggle for power) [10].

The philosophical assessment of biopolitics is associated with two main, but different approaches in understanding the specifics of political life: political life as an institutional, historically determined form and political life (people's behavior). Biopolitics refers to the second approach, when political relations are derived from the fundamental laws of human biology [11]. At the same time, naturalistic versions of philosophy, sociology and political science arise at the junction with ethology and human ecology, sociobiology — disciplines that are not biological in the strict sense.

But the problem of researching politics will be incomplete if we do not take into account the interconnection and interdependence of politics with morality and law, as independent and essential components of public life and the spiritual sphere of people's activities.

From the recent works devoted to the relationship of politics with law and morality, it should be noted that morality, law and politics in public life manifest as an ethical sphere [12]. They explain that the reasons for the economic order cannot be considered the only fundamental principle of all changes in the social life of people. After all, economic factors do not act directly. In order to begin to determine the people's behavior, firstly, these factors must pass through people's consciousness and be transformed into ideas and rules, goals and programs. A conscious way of life can be called an ethos, an ethical sphere.

The ethical sphere, in its turn, falls into three main, narrower spheres: morality, law and politics. Any social phenomenon that can make a change in the forms of social relations is certainly either a moral, legal or political phenomenon [13].

Most often it is the one and the other, and the third at the same time, but only in different proportions. Thus, morality, law, and politics form those three basic forms in which all social progress is expressed, and that trinity of basic forces that it directs towards the achievement of its goals. Usually attention is paid only to morality and the right. Numerous manuals on the theory of law set forth in detail all that relates to these concepts [14].

The situation is different with politics. There are many theoretical studies in the field of politics, individual chapters of which are devoted to the relation of politics to law and morality. However, even in the most profound of these studies there is little substantiation of the peculiar social nature of politics and its social functions.

Therefore, a gap has formed in modern social science and in public consciousness, thanks to which not only politics itself, but also morality and law, appear in a completely distorted light.

On the contrary, it is enough to put politics on par with morality and law and give it the same importance as them, as many things in the social life of people become incomparably clearer.

The connection of politics with morality and law indicates that human society requires the norms of threefold order at all times. The purpose of one of them is to consolidate and reflect the most constant and least changeable in society. These norms are "eternal" –they are the most common and accepted for the most sublime and sacred.

Other norms are suitable only in a certain historical period and require replacement or abolition as soon as the historical situation has changed.

But changes in the historical situation occur not only from epoch to epoch, but even day by day, every minute, and mostly almost imperceptible. The norms of the third type are

changeable to the same extent as the phenomena, the ethical meaning of which they reveal. Despite this, they are no less necessary in the public life of people than all others.

All the norms described are morality, law, and politics in their most dramatic difference from one another. Morality satisfy the needs of social life in absolute terms. The law satisfies its need for norms of behavior applicable for a certain period. The policy seeks to reflect what is fair in every completely individual set of circumstances and that can hardly be represented in the form of a certain rule [15, 16].

Morality is an area of such fair or due, which is perceived as eternal, timeless or absolute. The law is fair and due for a certain period of time and under certain concrete conditions. Politics is an absolutely necessary area of fair and due at the moment and for the moment.

Everything is different in morality, in law and in politics: their goals, functions, nature of norms, sanctions, psychological sources from which they flow.

IV. CONCLUSION

From the above, it can be concluded the following: the policy should become rational. Politics, subject at the same time to opposite influences, consisting of countless elements, always striving in different directions and always changing, is one of the main sources of the irrational in history, since latter is due to unforeseen actions of people. This is one of the most important requirements of the modern world process.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Moscow, Bizneskom, 2013, P. 221.
- [2] R. Masters, *Swim where madmen drown: travel notes of wanderers on the worlds of the subconscious*. Moscow, Sofia, 2006, P. 59.
- [3] E. Durkheim, *Sociology. Its subject, method, purpose*. Moscow, Terra-Book Club, 2008, P. 199.
- [4] M. Foucault, *The birth of biopolitics: A course of lectures given at the Collège de France in the 1978-1979 school year*. Saint-Petersburg, Science, 2010, P. 440.
- [5] R. Masters, *Swim where madmen drown: travel notes of wanderers in the worlds of the subconscious*. – Moscow, Sofia, 2006, P. 57.
- [6] N.I. Gubanov and N.N. Gubanov, "Criminal behavior: biological, social and personal conditionality," *Vestnik slavianskikh kultur – bulletin of slavic cultures-scientific and informational journal*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 53-66, 2018.
- [7] I.I. Komissarov and V.A. Nekhamkin, "The Models of Historical Cognition: Current Status and Prospects of Development," *Istoriya-Elektronnyi nauchno-obrazovatelnyy zhurnal*, vol. 8, no 2, 2017. DOI: 10.18254/S0001779-5-1.
- [8] N.K. Koltsov, *Selected Works*. Moscow, Science, 2006, P. 184.
- [9] Yu.A. Filipchenko, *An Evolutionary Idea in Biology: A Historical Review of 19th Century Evolutionary Doctrines*. - 4th Ed. Moscow, LIBROKOM, 2011.
- [10] Yu.I. Novozhenov, *Mysterious libido: Sociobiological analysis of human sexuality*. Ekaterinburg, Bank of Cultures. inform., 1999.
- [11] A.V. Oleskin, *Biopolitics in the context of the history of biology and philosophy*. – Moscow, Humanitarian, 2011.

- [12] R.S. Karpinskaya and S.A. Nikol'skii, "Sociobiology: Critical Analysis," *Philosophy of Science*, no. 1 (24), 2005, p. 110.
- [13] N.N. Gubanov and N.I. Gubanov, "Mental Bases of Social Solidarity," *Proceedings of the International Conference on Contemporary Education, Social Sciences and Ecological Studies (CESSSES 2018)*. Series "Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research", vol. 283, pp. 998-1002, 2018. DOI: 10.2991/cesses-18.2018.219.
- [14] V.Yu. Ivlev, M.B. Oseledchik, "Methodological principles for the introduction of modality categories in modern scientific cognition," *Proceedings of the 3-rd International Conference on Arts, Design, and Contemporary Education (ICADCE 2017)*. Series "Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research", vol. 144, pp. 541-545, 2017. DOI: 10.2991/icadce-17.2017.128.
- [15] M.B. Oseledchik, V.Yu. Ivlev, M.L. Ivleva, "Knowledge as a non-equilibrium dynamic system," *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Contemporary Education, Social Sciences and Humanities (ICCESSH2017)*. Series "Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research", vol. 124, pp. 1-5, 2017. DOI: 10.2991/iccessh-17.2017.1.
- [16] N.N. Gubanov, N.I. Gubanov and L.O. Rokotyanskaya, "Prospects for the Development of a Universal Theory of Truth," *Proceedings of the International Conference on Contemporary Education, Social Sciences and Ecological Studies (CESSSES 2018)*. Series "Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research", vol. 283, pp. 801-805, 2018. DOI: 10.2991/cesses-18.2018.177.