THE MESSIANIC CHARISMA: HOW AND FOR WHOM IT OPERATES

Ali Kemal ÖZCAN[1]

Özet

Politik oluşumlarda, karizma sahibinin kişiliğinden bağımsızlaştırılmış karizma gücünün kapsamı, bu makalenin temel temasıdır. Fenomenin bu özel 'aşama'sını 'rutinleşmş karizma' kavramsallaştırmasıyla Max Weber bir ölçüde ifadelendirmesine rağmen, karizma gücünün kişilik-ötesi boyutu ilgili literatürde hakkı ölçüsünde yer bulmamıştır. Bu makale, politik örgütlenmelerde karizma gücü üzerine yapılmış teorik çalışmalara, pratik güce dönüşmesinin ' nasıl'ı anlamında bir katkı yapmayı amaçlar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Karizma; Messianik (Kurtarıcılıksal); Weber; İktidar Gücünün Pratikleşmesi (Pratik Hayatta Somutlaşması); Rutinleşme*

Abstract

The extent of depersonalised power of charisma in political entities is the main theme of this article. Although Max Weber partly articulated the particular 'phase' of the phenomenon under 'routinized charisma', the non-individual aspect of the power of charisma has no deserving attention in the related literature. The paper aims to contribute to the theorisations on charisma in political organisations in terms of the 'how' of its functioning. It argues that the 'unbridled-awesome' power is in effect a non-individual phenomenon. The very power is reified both not by and not for the person of charisma but by and for a corporate body. The net-like organized body 'matures' as the actual Subject of depersonalised-bureaucratised hegemony under the person and persona of the charismatic leader whose 'remote' presence does not reach to the factual working of the power —just as it is in his/her absence.

Author Keywords: *Charisma; Messianic; Weber; Reification of Power; Routinization*

---

[1] alikozcan@yahoo.co.uk

Introduction

The 'unbridled' power of charisma tends to enjoy its political mastery for longer than might be expected. Having been aware of the overall globalizing world and of growing propensity towards civil society in which rather non-individual societal premises are to function, going 'back' to individual hegemonies owing 'chosen' person's 'supernatural' endowments may well seem uninteresting. I maintain here, however, that the genuine power of charisma is by no means individual in terms of the person of charisma. The power of the 'indispensable' leader is, in the beginning, to spark the inferior's motivation. At the end, it is to secure the superior's privileged status. This appears to be one of the chilling resistances of the post-industrial social working in the face of coming civil society.

Charisma is one of the precarious or, so to speak, slippery concepts of the sociology of politics —and, of course, of the sociology of religion as politics. A similar intellectual challenge dominates the atmosphere surrounding messianism. The ideational coverage of theorisation on both concepts encompasses a wide segment of human history. Messianism, for instance, ranges from God's messenger (prophet) to Mazzini's 'people', from Plato's 'philosopher ruler' to Hegel's 'World Historical Individuals', from Marx's 'proletariat' to Gramsci's *'élite* of intellectuals'. In a similar pattern, charisma ranges from God or gods itself/themselves to the most hard-line anti-religious or so-called materialistic leaders of secular movements.

Thus, in order to avoid such a 'slippery' path towards the multidimensional arguments of a wide-ranging literature, I shall have to condense these two intricately interrelated concepts into a single path of cognisance. By doing this, of course, the individuality of each will not be denied.

As one of the 'three pure types of legitimate authority'[i], charismatic authority that operates both in the organisation's structural bodies and the supporting masses has much to do with motivational effects in the social turmoil. In its 'matured' phase, on the other hand, the familiar power metamorphoses into a demobilising character, and hence the phenomenon has much to do with depressing the masses[ii]. Also, charisma has much to do with the messianic expectations of the helpless masses; we thus need to make a brief reference to Messianism whilst unfolding the phenomenon.

The Problem of the Concepts

The term 'Messiah' derives from the Hebrew *mashiah* literally meaning 'the anointed one'. It denotes a 'chosen' individual, or, in Christian theology, the Christ. The idea of 'chosenness', afterwards, exceeds the individual and stretches to

encompass either a group or a class or a people or a nation, and so on. Charisma comes from Greek word *kharisma* which means 'gift of grace'. And that is given by a divine power or, in secular cases, is an inborn quality of the individual. But both the messiah and the charismatic individual, according to believers or followers, are 'chosen' and/or 'sent' for redemption and/or salvation of a country or people —or, in the case of 'socialist messianism', for the 'total redemption of humanity'. In fact, the phenomena are 'closer relatives' than is generally recognised in their respective literatures. The very *idea* —or the culture— that nurtures these unbridled and awesome powers with 'ramifications of an individualised hegemony' (Lee1992: 44) relates the revolutionary yearnings of the helpless mob ('incapable of achieving order for themselves') —that is, Nietzsche's 'herd'.

Scholars are confident of three points regarding messianism: (a) that it is attached to the human need for 'revolution'[iii] (the indispensable hope for total redemption from social evil) as a 'comprehensive movement of thought' (Talmon 1960:17-24; Duncan 2000: 48-61; Wegner 2000: 68,69),[iv] (b) that it originates from the 'Messiah' of Christianity, and (c) that its idea of 'chosenness' can be traced back to Judaism's 'chosen people'. Duncan firmly states that the 'concept of a "chosen people" penetrated into Christian thought from Judaism' (Duncan 2000: 141). Arguing for the 'Jewish ingredient' in 'political messianism', Talmon points at 'the fact that Karl Marx was of Jewish ancestry' (Talmon 1960: 77) and further states that 'it was the Messianic urge that sent Marx upon his quest' (*ibid.*: 505). On the other hand, the 'elasticity' of the term 'messianism' employed in the related literature cannot be overlooked. This is the 'characteristic feature of all movements and ideas described as forms of "messianism"' says Duncan, and he quotes R.J. Zwi Werblowsky.

> The term messianism…denoting the Jewish religious concept of a person with a special mission from God, is used in a broad and at times very loose sense to refer to beliefs or theories regarding an eschatological (concerning the last times) improvement of the state of man or the world and a final consumption of history.[v] (Duncan 2000: 6)

The concept of charisma contains a similar problem. Although, as Conger puts it, 'there is a little disagreement in the literature over the locus of charismatic leadership'[vi] (Conger and Kanungo 1988: 23), it is not clear whether it is a religious or non-religious phenomenon. It involves both supernatural and secular endowments, and its repositories are not only individual persons but may also be 'groups' or 'objects' such as 'kinship groups', 'blood lines', 'status systems' or 'an institutional structure regardless of the persons involved' (Spencer 1973: 343)[vii] Also, it is not yet settled whether the 'power of charisma' is deployed for 'good' or

'evil', or whether it is 'neutral'. There is a 'problem' in the lack of consensus on the precise meaning of *charisma*, because the term has been applied to very diverse leaders,

> Despite the increased attention being focused on charismatic leadership in the academic literature, to date no scholarly consensus has emerged on the precise application of the concept of charisma. (House and Howell 1992: 83),

Howell refers to Willner's 'mediating' statement, which accords with a classical text —the concept of 'charismatic authority' theorised by Max Weber.

> It should be underscored that, in accordance with Weber's example (1947 [1924]), charisma is used in a value-neutral manner. As Willner ...[viii] points out, charismatic leadership is 'inherently neither moral nor immoral, neither virtuous nor wicked ... such questions arise only when we wish to evaluate whether a particular charismatic leader has used the relationship in the service of good or evil.' (Howell in Conger and Kanungo 1988: 214, 215)

Yet, 'the problem' of the literature is found in the absence of 'an explanation of the process by which charismatic leadership has its profound effects' (Shamir, House and Arthur 1993: 579). Accordingly, to overcome the problem, research efforts are exhausted in analysing the 'profound effects' that are generated on followers by charismatic leaders (*ibid.*: 1993 *and et al.*). Jermier talks of confusion about the 'vague concept' of charisma that necessitates 'additional imaginative new theories, critical reconceptualizations' (Jermier 1993: 218).

Scholars have explored two main areas when analysing the phenomenon of charisma as a 'process': the personal attributes of leaders as an inborn 'seed' and the social tension of conflicts and contradictions as a nurturing 'soil' accompanied with followers' perceptions/responses. While the scholars with psychoanalytic approaches are rather inclined to restrict themselves to the *person* of charisma (Popper 2000: 734, 735), inquiries in the social-psychological field investigate the *persona* of leaders (Gabriel 1997: 319, 330). Namely, some stress the sociological insights of the phenomenon by calling attention to the 'soil' that yields charismatic leaders. Others focus on the leader's performance in terms of either 'sacrifice/suffering/benefiting' or his/her personality as 'a constellation of individual qualities', or on leaders' upbringing and backgrounds. On the other hand, when the central focus is charisma's relatively positive or negative consequences, intellectual efforts are devoted to the dichotomous 'faces' of charisma: *personalised* and

socialised or transactional and transformational types of leaderships (Burns 1978; Howell 1988; House and Howel 1992; Lee 1992: Popper 2000; and *et. al.*). However, the mainstream of the literature overwhelmingly acknowledges the relational dialectic between leader and followers. It is the creation of a twofold process: the *person* of the leader with relevant inborn qualities and the *persona* of the leader influenced by the tension of social affairs.

> Thus, charisma is not a thing that can be possessed by an individual. Neither does it emerge automatically from certain circumstances regardless of individual qualities and initiative. Stated more precisely, charisma is a process that exists only in social relationships. It is a product of the qualities and actions of individuals and situational factors, but the nature of the situation is its most important determinant. (Jermier, 1993: 221).

And charisma is in any case recognised as a fateful social power that cannot be trivialised.

However, the *idea* that resides at the roots of the concepts, Messiah and charisma, is the revolutionary expectations of the masses –the *mob* that is alien to ruling and rulers– no matter whether their usage is in the service of good or evil. The helpless mob, which 'does not "distinguish" itself, does not become independent in its own right' without organisers (Gramsci, 1971: 334), has so far never dispensed with its radical expectations of total emancipation from social evil. This has always provided fertile 'soil' to give rise to charismatic messiahs or messianic charismas. Here, the defining difference is associated with the timeline of human development. The progress of humanisation from the primitive/ancient to our days transformed supernatural messiahs towards relatively secular charismas. Accordingly, while explanations of messianism are worded in religious terms, charisma is conceptualised instead in secular or modern or in 'materialistic/deterministic' terms.

The Reification and Ramification of the Power of Charisma

In view of the problematic definitions of the concept charisma, as with many other concepts in the social sciences, the crux of the phenomenon entails pursuing the questions of 'how it faithfully operates among the followers' and 'for whom it, in the final analysis, works'. The charisma of the *dead*, such as in Khumaini's Iran (Sanasarian 1995; Saeidi 2001), is rather grandiose and is easily considered, but contemplating the mechanisms of its 'unbridled' power in the course of the

'routinization' of the charismatic leadership would be a more difficult sociological enterprise.

Charisma, as an 'unbridled power', *demonstrates* itself through 'legendary' successes in 'battle' (Spencer 1973: 345-347) and salvages its followers from despair and disperses the tension of the existing 'status quo', whose very tension is 'substituted' (Jones 2001: 759-761) by the *rationally* institutionalised new charismatic authority. This charisma becomes indispensable for the emerging 'bureaucratic staff'. Further, if its very power has recently salvaged the followers or has just dispersed their hopelessness, then charisma is 'reborn' as a rapid *deus ex machina* for the 'adolescent' ruling stratum that has come out of the process. This facet of the phenomenon reveals the genuine socio-political process vis-à-vis charisma and its charismatic ['transformational' (Burns 1978)] leadership. This process of the 'ramifications of an individualised hegemony' (Lee 1992: 43,44) is largely overlooked in the vast literature on the subject, in spite of Weber's articulation of the process under his major subtitle (The Routinization of Charisma [1947: 363-373]) to 'Charismatic Authority' —the classical reference source. This may be   why Spencer, while finding charisma as always involved with 'a *relationship* between the group and the leader', has repeatedly 'refused to consider the charisma as *either* a sociological or psychological phenomenon' (Spencer 1973: 348).

In his article on the 'two faces' of the process, in a scholarly analysis containing examples from Islam and Hinduism; Lee briefly pulls the crux of the sociological/political phenomenon into the mainstay of his argument and raises 'the problem' of charisma.

> Generally, the problem of charisma is a problem of unbridled power that is psychologically awesome and socially threatening. This is the contemporary meaning of charisma, expressed in numerous studies of idiosyncratic power and its organisational consequences.   ... For Weber, it was not the moral teachings that became routinized but the personal authority of the charismatic individual once he transferred his command to an impersonal, stratified order. By reallocating the source of routinization in the individual, rather than in the teachings, Weberian revisionists have been able to argue that the charismatic qualities of individuals once enshrined within institutions can assume a life of their own, in effect producing charismatic institutions which in a sense transcend individual idiosyncrasies but from which particular incumbents of

corporate roles can enjoy tremendous power flowing from
them (Shils 1965[ix]). (Lee 1992: 42, 43)

Lee, therefore, states that the central concern of contemporary researchers on charisma needs to be 'the dialectical relationship between the personal and social or cultural sources of charismatic power' (ibid.: 44). In a similar mode, Spencer, though contradicting his refusal of charisma as a sociological or psychological phenomenon, draws attention to the 'diffused form' of charismatic power 'in the stratification system of society' (Spencer, 1973: 342). Whereas, in contrast with 'Weberian revisionists', Weber begins his explication of the 'routinization of charisma' by situating his argument on the *base* of the 'stronger ideal and also stronger material interests of the members of the administrative staff'. He first underlines the inevitability of a *radical change* in the pure form of charismatic authority, which 'exists only in the process of originating', towards taking 'on the character of a permanent relationship forming a stable of disciples or a band of followers or a party organisation or any sort of political or hierocratic organisation …'. Then he goes on to the causes of the inevitable transformation, in fact, the metamorphosis.

> The following are the principal motives underlying this
> transformation: (a) The ideal and also the material interests of
> the followers in the continuation and the continual reactivation
> of the community, (b) the still stronger ideal and also stronger
> material interests of the members of the administrative staff,
> the disciples or other followers of the charismatic leader in
> continuing their relationship. (Weber 1947 [1924]:364).

The vitality of the strong 'ideal and material' interests, Weber adds, 'generally become conspicuously evident with the disappearance of the personal charismatic leader … which inevitably arises' (*ibid.*). Thinking of the charisma of the *dead* when 'the problem of succession' arises, the reification of the power, allocated to the hierarchy of the newly arisen ruling apparatus, adds to the sense of the genuine significance of the 'routinization' of charisma, in other words, of the 'radical change' in the charismatic authority.[x]

Weber's 'routinization of charisma' denotes *seizing* the power of charisma from the person of the charismatic leader to guard the 'interests of the administrative staff … so that their own status is stable on a day-to-day basis' (Saeidi 2001: 222). In fact, power is a non-individual phenomenon. Jermier advises thinking of charisma 'as a pattern of interactions' which necessitates a cosmos-like (a well-ordered hierarchized whole) communal structure as *sine qua non* to be reified. He applies to Foucault's metaphorical words:

...Power must be analyzed as something which circulates, or
rather as something which only functions in the form of a
chain. It is never localised here or there, never in anybody's
hands, never appropriated as a commodity or a piece of wealth.
Power is employed through a net-like organisation. And not
only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are
always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and
exercising this power.[xi] (Jermier 1993:221).

In this very sense, charisma is a mere property of the 'bureaucratic staff'.
Any charismatic authority operates through a body of staff. A body of corporate
staff that steers political affairs defines a bureaucratic apparatus. Thus, the
'bureaucratic administrative staff' is not only a sub-property of 'legal authority' but
also of 'charismatic authority' —both in the charisma of the living and the
deceased.[xii] Since the *charisma* does relate to a 'certain quality of an individual
personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men' (Weber
1947[1924]:358), its *authority* does not function through the charismatic person. The
charismatic authority too, in contrast with Weber's separation of 'pure types of'
authorities, is networked and operated by 'a bureaucratic and administrative staff'
(*ibid.*:329) just as in the 'legal authority'. Further, both the charisma and its
authority may well 'be defined, created and manipulated' by the very 'bureaucratic
and administrative staff' 'for all practical purposes' in securing the material and
spiritual privileges 'that power gives' to the bureaucratic staff. It is so, no matter if
the person of charisma is alive or dead. This has been the case in Cuba with the
very much alive Fidel Castro, just as it is in Turkey and Iran in the cases of the
deceased Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and Ayatollah Khumaini.

The power of charisma, in all cases, undergoes two main stages: a) the
emerging process, 'the process of originating' —during which it is in 'pure' form—
in Weber's words, and b) the process of 'routinization' or, so to speak, of the
institutionalisation of routinization. In both processes the power is still based on the
'attitude of awe' or 'reverential posture', or 'enthusiasm'. But while in the former
period the power is targeted at the tension, conflict and contradictions of the status
quo, and consequently is deployed for the mobilisation of followers and masses, in
the latter it is devoted to securing the status quo, and is consequently 'sacrificed' for
the reestablishment of the 'loyal' followers and the demobilisation or stagnation of
the masses. The former period, in general, squares with the duration of the struggle
against the existing ruling order, and therefore charisma functions as 'messianic
power' for the followers and entrepreneurs 'that can fan "the spark of hope" in the
dimmest political possibility' (Wegner 2000:72). The latter period squares with the

time of ascending to the throne and afterwards, and in consequence, 'radically' changes. Its *demonstrated* power is now in the service of guarding the new status order. And this is precisely why the ubiquitous 'hallmark' of the process of rationalisation or institutionalisation or 'routinization' of charisma is the clear-cut elimination of dissenters —no matter what religious or secular or Marxist stamp the process bears.[xiii]

The processes of institutionalisation and routinization in charismatic organisations unavoidably follow a simultaneous path of development, for they mutually nurture one another. Regardless of their secular/materialistic or religious character, both processes require —in a *de facto* flaw of organisational working— the elimination or dysfunctionalisation of the person of charisma, just as has been the recurrent face of history in examples such as those of Lenin, Mao, Ataturk, Mandela and even the prophets and so on. Even if the person of charisma does not like it, the process of institutionalisation 'shadows' the routinization of charisma.

> Personal charisma is, besides, generally associated with strong
> resistance to institutionalisation. The leader, in fact, has no
> interest in organisational reinforcement which would inevitably
> set the stage for the party's 'emancipation' from his control.
> (Panebianco 1988: 66, 67).

That is, the resistance of the charismatic leader by no means has the power to prevent the routinization and/or institutionalisation taking place. This is because charismatic power too 'is employed through a net-like organisation', and the 'material and ideal interests' of the administrative-bureaucratic staff is, at its 'matured' hegemony, far stronger than the love for the person of charisma. This appears to be the plausible reason why Pedahzur and Brichta call to mind Maor's critique of Panebianco in 'defining a charismatic party as un-institutionalised' (2002: 34) for Panebianco places the institutionalisation and routinization against one another.

> In a charismatic party (before the routinsation of charisma), the
> absence of institutionalisation and the presence of a very strong
> centralisation of authority ... are associated. (Panebianco 1988:
> 66).

Whereas the institutionalisation of charismatic parties takes place precisely along with the routinization of charisma. And this is probably the fact that drove Rose and Mackie to develop the concept of 'charismatic institutionalisation' (Pedahzur and Brichta 2002: 35).

Conclusion

Charisma, in the person of the leader, 'emerges in a field of conflict and contradictions and is so sustained' (Perinbayanagam 1971: 395) *as messiahs* of any kind. It first operates as a pivotal revolutionary force to either end or transform the 'rules and resources that maintain structural order' (Lee 1992: 41). Then it smoothly metamorphoses into a pivotal reactionary force at depersonalised-bureaucratised hegemony's service, devoted to maintaining the *new* status order. That is, it has —rather than 'two faces'— two phases: it initially operates for individual or group or mass mobilisations and eventually for the hegemony of a corporate body. It is an indispensable tool in the absence of institutionalised civic organisations which are *ruled by rules.*

To summarise, the 'magic' power of the charismatic leadership of political parties —or of organised leading entities of non-local social movements exclusive of the field of business, etc.— emerges as a force sparking revolution. It has thus always been messianic. However, the 'unbridled awesome power' arrives, in the final analysis, at its mission: to operate on the part of newly emergent bureaucratic staff to institutionalise and to *class* themselves so as to assure their 'stronger ideal and also stronger material interests'. It continues to function since it succeeds regardless of the existence or absence of the person of charisma.

This recurrent 'face' of human social development appears to reoccur until civil *political* organisations in every aspect of life have superseded —or obtained mastery of— the political parties that have hitherto been 'instruments of the maintenance and the widening of power of some man over others' (Panebianco 1988:viii). That is, the 'sparking' power of both revolutions and 'counter-revolutions', charisma, will be antiquated when what is called civil society is the working of total socialness.

Notes

---

[i] Max Weber classifies the 'three pure types' as a) legal authority with a bureaucratic administrative staff, b) traditional authority and c) charismatic authority, and theorises them as the principal means of 'imperative control' in societies.

[ii] We in this paper examine the phenomenon in its political dimensions. The other spheres such as business or management are excluded.

[iii] The classical reference point of the literature on charisma, Max Weber, is additionally firm about the 'revolutionary force' of charisma and believes that it 'is scarcely in need of further discussion'. When comparing it with rational and traditional types of authority, Weber finds the 'charismatic type' to be their antithesis in terms of being 'foreign to all rules', and he consequently concludes that it is 'a specifically revolutionary force' (Weber 1947[1924]: 361, 362).

^{iv} Wegner, in his penetrating article, 'Messianic Historicity' in *Rethinking Marxism*, is more inflexible on the 'revolutionary rupture' of messianism: '...the messianic is always revolutionary, it has to be' (Wegner 2000: 68).

^v Footnoted by Duncan: R.J. Zwi Werblowsky, 'Messiah and Messianic Movements', in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th edn (Chicago 1974), Macropaedia, XI: 1017.

^{vi} Conger points towards 'a relational basis' as the 'widely accepted' diagnosis of charismatic leadership in the related literature. 'Charisma is believed not to reside solely in the leader and his or her personal attributes but rather in the interplay between the leader's attributes and the needs, beliefs and perceptions of followers' (Conger and Kanungo 1988: 24).

^{vii} Martin E. Spencer cites from Weber's *Economy and Society* (1968) edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich.

^{viii} Cited by Howell from Willner, A. R. (1984: 12), *The Spellbinders: charismatic Political leadership*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

^{ix} Shils, Edward (1965). charisma, Order and Status. American Sociological Review 30, 199-213.

^x With regard to the ramifications of the charismatic power, both E. Sanasarian (1995) and A. Saeidi (2001) present informative arguments on the Ayatollah Khumaini's (or Khomeini's) case. The former scholar delineates how the 'routinization' institutionalised through the governing apparatus of theocratic Iran during the lifetime of the person of charisma. He in particular exemplifies the institutionalisation of Khomeini's charisma within the military establishment, the 'backbone' of the state, and its premier body *Pasdaran* (Revolutionary Guards). The latter scholar extends his argument to the penetration and solidification of 'economic charisma' in the post-revolutionary and post Khumaini Iran, and figures the extent of charismatic power in terms of the redistribution of income and wealth.

^{xi} Jermier excerpts from Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. Edited and Translated by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books.

^{xii} 'God' has been functioning for millennia as an effective *charisma* though it is solely a 'persona' of a non-existent 'person'. God is a charisma, the messiah is the prophet and the prophet is the *resulullah* (representative) or messenger of God. This fact of history shows how the messiah is charismatic and how charisma is messianic.

^{xiii} For empirical information about the example of unforgiving elimination of dissenters in Iran see Sanasarian 1995: 195.

Bibliography

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*, Harper & Row, New York.

Conger A.J. and Kanungo R.N. (1988). *Charismatic Leadership*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Fransisco-London.

Duncan, P.J.S. (2000). *Russian Messianism; Third Rome, Revolution, Communism and After*, Routledge, London and Newyork.

Gabriel, Y. (1997). Meeting God: When Organisational Members Come Face to Face with the Supreme Leader, *Human Relations*, April, Vol. 50, No. 4, 315-342.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks,* Trans. and ed. Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith, International Publishers, New York.

House, R.J. and Howell J.M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership, *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 81-108.

Howell, J.M. (1988). Two Faces of charisma: Socialised or personalised leadership in Organisations, in Conger A.J., and R.N. Kanungo, Ed. *Charismatic Leadership*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Fansisco-London.

Jermier, J.M. (1993). Introduction—charismatic leadership: Neo-Weberian Perspectives, *Leadership Quarterly*, 4, 217-223.

Jones, H.B. (2001). Magic, meaning and leadership: Weber's model and the empirical literature, *Human Relations*, Jun 2001, Vol. 54, No. 6, 753-772.

Lee, R.L.M. (1992). Two Faces of charisma: Structure, System, Praxix in Islam and Hinduism, Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, March, Vol. 22, No. 1, 41-62.

Panebianco, A. (1988). *Political Parties: Organisation and Power*, Cambridge University Press.

Pedahzur, A. and Brichta A. (2002). The Institutionalisation of Extreme Right-wing Charismatic Parties: A Paradox?, *Party Politics*, January, Vol. 8, No. 1, 31-50.

Perinbanayagam R. S. (1971). The Dialectics of Charisma, *The Sociological Quarterly*, Summer, Vol. 12, 387-402.

Popper, M. (2000). The Development of Charismatic Leaders, *Political Psychology*, Vol. 21, No. 4, 726-744.

Saeidi, A. (2001). Charismatic political authority and populist economics in post-revolutionary Iran, *The World Quarterly*, April, Vol. 22, No. 2, 219-236.

Sanasarian, E. (1995). Ayatollah Khomeini and the Institutionalisation of Charismatic Rule in Iran, 1979-1989, *Journal of Developing Societies*, December, Vol. XI, No. 2, 189-205.

Shamir, B., House R.J. and Arthur M.B. (1993). The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-concept Based Theory, *Organization Science*, Vol. 4, 577-594.

Spencer, M.E. (1973). What is Charisma? *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 24, 341-354.

Talmon, J.L. (1960). *Political Messianism; The Romantic Phase*, Secker & Warburg, London.

Weber, M. (1947 [1924]). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation*, The Free Press, New York-London.

Wegner, P.E. (2000). 'A Nightmare on the Brain of Living': Messianic historicity, Alienations, and Independence Day, *Rethinking Marxism*, Spring, Vol. 12, No. 1, 65-86.

Yorges, S.L., Weiss H.M. and Srrickland O.J. (1999). The Effects of Leader Outcomes on Influence, Attributions, and Perceptions of Charisma, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Jun, Vol. 84, No. 3, 428-436.

YAZARLARA DUYURU

1) Dergiye gönderilen yazılar, başka bir yerde yayımlanmamış veya yayımlanmak üzere gönderilmiş olmamalıdır. Metinler bilgisayar ortamında bir disket ile beraber A4 kağıdının bir yüzüne çift aralıkla yazılmış üç kopya halinde teslim edilmelidir. Disket ile birlikte kullanılan yazılım programı, bilgisayar ismi ve dosya ismi gönderilmelidir. Teknik nedenlerden ötürü, daktilo ile yazılmış metinleri kabul edemiyoruz. Yayın kurulunca kabul edilmeyen yazılar iade edilmez.

2) Türkçe özet (150-200 kelimelik) ve İngilizce başlıklı İngilizce özet (150 -200 kelimelik) ve her bir özetin altına beş adedi aşmayan anahtar kelimeler / keywords yazıyla birlikte teslim edilmelidir.

3) Tablo ve şekillere numara verilmeli, başlıklar tablo ve şekillerin üzerinde yer almalı kaynaklar ise tablonun altına yazılmalıdır. Denklemlerin sıra numarası parantez içinde, sayfanın sağ tarafında gösterilmelidir.

4) Kaynaklara yapılan göndermeler dipnotlar yerine, metin içinde açılan ayraçlarla belirtilmelidir. Ayrıca içindeki bilgiler sırasıyla şöyle olmalıdır. Yazar(lar)ın soyadı, kaynağın yılı, sayfa numaraları. Örneğin:

...tespit edilmiştir (Atkinson, 1983; 77-28).

...Sayer (1998a: 43-72; 1986b: 666-695) belirtilmelidir.

Metinde gönderme yapılan bütün kaynaklar, Kaynakça başlığı altında ayrı bir sayfada, alfabetik sıraya göre gösterilmelidir. Kaynakça da uyulması gereken biçim kurallarına aşağıdaki örnek verilmiştir.

KİTAPLAR

Förlster, S. (1991), The Art of Encouraging Invention: A New Apporoach to Goverment Innoation and Economic Review, California Press.

MAKALELER

Boumol, W. J. (1986), "Productivity Growth, Convergence and Welfare: What the Long Run Daha Show", *American Economic Review,* 76, 1072-82.

DERLEMELER

Hall, P. H. (1986) "The Theory and Pratice of Innovation Policy: An Overview", P. Hal (der), Technology, Innovation and Ekonomic Policy içinde, Oxford: Philip Alan, 1-34.

5) Belirtilen kurallara uymayan yazılar, gerekli düzeltmelerin yapılması için geri gönderilebilir. Yazının yayınlanması halinde derginin 3 kopyası yazara ücretsiz gönderilecektir.

6) Yazarların, makaleleri ile birlikte, **yazışma adresi, telefon, faks ve e-mail** bilgilerini de içeren notu göndermeleri gereklidir.

7) Sosyal Bilimler alanına katkı sağlayacağı düşünülenler dışında, tercüme eserler kabul edilmemektedir.

8) Teknik kısıtlamalar nedeniyle, makalelerin en fazla 15-20 sayfa olması gerekmektedir.