

A theoretical approach to the formation of the state

OROZCO-MACIAS, Andrés*†

Universidad Nacional de Colombia

Received January 12, 2015; Accepted June 22, 2015

Abstract

This article aims, contrast different theoretical models and historical state formation, from perspectives as Weber, Tilly, Wallerstein and Norbert Elias, in the same way, an analysis of the different processes of formation of the monopoly of physical and economic violence carried out for state formation. Finally, it is pertinent to take a look at religion in the XXI century as the linchpin in the reconfiguration of nationalism and international relations.

State, violence, monopoly, space, capital

Citation: OROZCO-MACIAS, Andrés. A theoretical approach to the formation of the state. ECORFAN Journal-Republic of Colombia 2015, 1-1: 35-44

* Correspondence to Author (email: andresorozco08@gmail.com)

† Researcher contributing first author.

Introduction

The theory of the state and its exponents, made an approach to the historical development of their training and the creation of different social phenomena that allowed the current model. Authors as Wallerstein and Norbert Elias allow state formation understand from historical perspectives that put modernity in a differentiator in the forms of development of national states.

Prospects like Tilly, offer more analytical models and in which issues of violence as the basis of the state, like the fiscal monopoly, is introduced allowing the configuration of these two forces as the basis for consolidating existing European models Been.

One of the great debates of the century, is the reconfiguration of the States in setting aside of an international order that maintains control over the war between States, this technological advancement which in turn reconfigures the military and adds the economic power of all countries. we find a more complex issue, and is the return of religion as a force in shaping States, which undermine the idea of secular states and isolated religious beliefs, which use actual violence to consolidate their strength and ensuring its establishment.

For its analysis as part of Weber allows more specialized internal structure of the state look, Weber is the most important for understanding the processes of formation of an administrative apparatus theory, bureaucracy and other elements that make the theoretical development of Weber scale key element in the theoretical developments of the formation of the modern state.

In the shadow of historic state formation

External relations among social groups and internal control exercised by these groups on its members developed the logic diatribe shaping the state. "War woven lattice European nation states and preparation for war believe the internal structures of the states that made up" (Tilly 1992, 121).

Before the formation of modern nation states, were the processes of social group which carried out the creation of these systems, social relations are preceded by a history of spatiality and how that spatiality is compromised in social struggles nobility to the capitalist bourgeoisie:

The demand for properties, land pressure and hunger for it, generalizes the competitive struggle for new spaces, a competitive struggle being waged by means of war and economic violence (Elias 1989, 345). Search the monopoly of space, determined itself the monopoly of violence and capital, coercion and alliances, Elijah illustrates Louis VI and Capetian dynasty, his battles and alliances with the families of Montmorency, Beaumont, Rochefort, Montlhéry, Ferte-Alais, Puiset among others, in order to get prestige stately and imposing monopoly of Capet in a manner of considerable dimensions.

This integration or annexation of territories implies defeat a warrior race by another, this meant the disappearance of one another or in the best case, submission, dependence Victor that ends up being a shared dependency, as they accumulate in one hand, the individual loses possibilities of administering whereby, due to its monopoly, is sure to end up depending on others, depending on the network of people who, in turn, depend on it (Elias 1989).

For the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries, the struggle for territorial opportunities, rivalry between a numbers shrinking of warring families, is the impetus for joining growing territories; he introduced one of the ways to weave the modern state demarcating different processes in space monopoly, violence and later capitalism as advanced forms of domination. Tilly argues:

Efforts to subordinate neighbors and rivals fight farthest create state structures as not only armies but of civilians who meet the means to sustain organized armies and sovereign control over the rest of the civilian population (1992, 45).

"The sovereign is not a" superior ", but also personal sir, your administrative staff is not constituted by" officials "but for" servers "" (Weber 1987, 180), the control is exercised by rules traditionally established, in this case is that of a territorial display, relations are not determined by the position, but personal loyalty to the sovereign and the ability to absorb warriors territory by force and ostentation to other stately homes (Elias 1989).

The appearance of revenue for the maintenance of spatial monopoly through violence gives way to domination as the highest form of the state. As early as the sixteenth century, King benefited from the circumstances to increase their wealth against the nobility and was the imposition of subsequent fiscal monopoly which would lead to fundamental mechanisms were bureaucratization, monopolization of force, creating the legitimacy and homogenization of the subject population. Absolutist kings are the sixteenth century the way for modern specialized states and the origin of state apparatus (Wallerstein 2009, 190-191).

The Roman Empire demonstrates the decentralization and concentration of centrifugal forces, unlike the procedural levels offered by the case of the nascent Capetian France and Louis VI. Tilly mentions three types of state-forming processes that match the examples of Elijah: "empires receptors taxes; fragmented system of state sovereignty as cities and urban federations and national states "(Tilly 1992, 47).

The Roman Empire during Otto I and Henry IV exposed by Elias (1989), like that of Carlos V developed by Wallerstein (2009), seems to fit the model of fragmented sovereignty, which tends to be the lightest element of decentralization and the consolidation of centrifugal forces, its vast territory have prevented a total monopoly control over the cities. Elijah exposed:

While in the empire by contrast, in an incomparably greater territory, each house of territorial lords tried vainly to make use of the imperial crown for true and stable over the entire empire hegemony. Enrique IV before the joint attack of the great German territorial lords, the church, the cities of northern Italy and the eldest son of Emperor; that is, the Empire is sinking under the assault of the most diverse centrifugal forces (1989, 338).

The heterogeneous amplitude was an impediment to the formation of a centralized state, along the same lines Wallerstein clarifies the process expansionist Spanish sixteenth century during the reign of Charles V:

Spain was an empire, when what he needed in the sixteenth century was a medium-sized state. Its bureaucracy was inadequate because the imperial Spain required more bureaucracy could build given its resources, human and financial (Wallerstein 2009, 254).

And further still:

Spain lacked administrative energy needed to create a large bureaucracy in the Americas. He therefore appealed to the old record of empires, the cooptation of local leaders into the political system as brokers between the crown and the Spanish colonists (Wallerstein 2009, 265).

There is a distinction in Wallerstein's vision, which is in two types of global systems: one has to do with the World Empire and one Capitalist World Economy, is through the process of the capitalist world-economy, which in a way or another, I facilitated a secular process of increased centralization and internal control within the central states (Wallerstein 2009), in terms of Weber:

The separation of administrative resources is carried out in exactly the same way in the public bureaucracy and private bureaucracy (eg in large capitalist enterprises), clarifying that are private capitalist entrepreneurs, [who] have been precursors of modern bureaucracy (1987, 177).

What Wallerstein calls the second sixteenth century Amsterdam, where "picked up the threads of the empire in dissolution of the Habsburg, creating the framework for the proper functioning of the world economy, which would enable Britain and France to begin to emerge as states strong, possibly for strong national economies "(Wallerstein 2009, 282). As Tilly coins:

England looked more like the Netherlands to Scandinavia. Finally, from the seventeenth century, the state was settling saw the real power progressively contained by the united bourgeoisie and landlord representation, ie parliament. So England was able to advance some distance by the great highways of state formation (Tilly 1992, 102).

What was then the development that took place the Netherlands to that level?

The nobility of the "Netherlands" would fear suddenly that the prince was not his agent, his policy in the short and medium term threaten their interests significantly and was not available to their political possibilities the persuade them to change their policy, since their (the Spanish empire) political arena was far greater than theirs, if established, they could control. In short they were a reflection of opposition "nationalist" (Wallerstein 2009, 288).

Because the nobility was in debt, and Charles V during his last years, real incomes declined nobility. After a number of revolutions that went through several stages ranging from 1566 to 1609:

Throughout this period, what should be noted is that the -amorfo and multipolar conflict at first- took an increasingly clear as fighting Protestant north, or better, "protestantized" looking for their national independence a consonant system with the needs of the commercial bourgeoisie, whose strength worldwide grew throughout the fight and subsequently in the seventeenth century (Wallerstein 2009, 209).

Protestantism, Catholicism seems to be unifying forces in the territories and the first seeds of national identity and territorial demarcation. Not only in the sixteenth century, in the late twentieth and twenty-first century, the religious wars seem to be in place and determining various scenarios of national hegemonies, the Yugoslav wars and ethnic religious between 1990 and 1999, the conflict in Ireland North between Protestant Unionists and the Irish Republicans, the attacks September 11, 2001 justified under the precept of Islamic fundamentalism, the current Islamization of Turkey by Recep Erdogan.

The June 29, 2014, the Islamic State declared the establishment of an Islamic caliphate under the leadership of Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the great caliph of all Muslims proclaimed. Baghdadi denied the territorial order established by the European powers after the end of World War I and declared the search for the consolidation of a unitary Islamic state in the present territories of Syria and Iraq.

The violent Islamic State, operate beyond the limits of violence control, it establishes a terror tactic in which torture and other actions that violate the physical integrity of its adversaries are included. The crucial question is: can we establish a state under the functionality of terrorism?

Tilly argues that states went from what might be termed reactive to proactive repression repression, especially with regard to potential enemies beyond national elite (Tilly 1992). The formation of a legitimate state from instrumental mechanisms of terror, is not recognized by the international standards that allow a proactive use of violence to justify State sovereignty:

Competition prompted the military to end in the same general direction. [...] Creating a state system that dominated the world.

Today we live under this system of European States to the rest of the globe, including the relationship between military activity and state formation (Tilly 1992, 219). Therefore, the axis of evil recognized nominated by George Bush, instituted the eradication of all forms of terrorism and the physical elimination of any extra-state and supra-state force that threatens the hegemony of the countries that are governed by institutional models European.

A forged under the instrument of terrorism, State will have international recognition under European institutional regulations and rethinking, a new paradox of secular and secular policies for the formation of state and the reassessment of the concept of terrorism to the organization attribute such power of building a state on the form of a caliphate.

Religious wars established territorial monopolies, "without the existence of monopolistic organizations of physical violence within the national level, it would be possible to maintain the limitation of this struggle for the" economic "opportunities within the means of violence for a long time "economic" and maintaining its fundamental rules in the respective states "(Elias 1989, 335), just as happens with the nuclearization of the territories, listed as guarantors of spatial monopoly, until the emergence of a relationship of obedience Immediate versus what the nuclearization of space by the world powers, the states with the monopoly of nuclear power tend to generate tension, but not to ensure global dominance.

The financial resources flowing into the central power and hold the monopoly of violence; the monopoly of violence holds the monopoly tax (Elias 1989), a sustainable and inseparable symbiosis, for the sixteenth century and certainly the XXI century.

"The crown needed money to build his state apparatus" (Wallerstein 2009, 195), so the income needed to increase its coercive power or what Wallerstein calls the Trust in the coercive potential of the state.

Both Wallerstein and Tilly, and there is a demarcated distinction has to do with the idea of world empire based on political-military domination.

The other capitalist world economy is set to the global economic domination, while there are three modes Tilly : the coercion-intensive, capital-intensive and an intermediate that is capitalized coercion, both Tilly that "France and England finally took the form of capitalized coercion, which produced, full national states before the intensive modalities coercion and capital intensive "(Tilly 1992, 60) and that there is sustainable through a specialized administrative apparatus (Weber 1987).

"Political organizations are always more stable as they acquire at least a partial legitimacy" (Wallerstein 2009, 202), and is sustainable through a bureaucratic box there to support him as we saw in the case of Carlos V and the need to an administrative apparatus, unlike the expansive process of Capet, "as they increase the monopolized opportunities and the division of labor is widespread in the framework of the humans involved in the administration of the monopolized opportunities in their capacity as officials or whose job or function it depends somehow keep the monopoly, both the importance and the laws of this domain is evidence of monopoly "(Elias 1989, 348).

It is only with the emergence of the modern state, and in the sphere of the private economy, the emergence of advanced forms of capitalism is given, that capitalism determines the fatal nature of the bureaucracy heart of all management bodies.

Only small (political, hierocratic, economic, etc.), widely institute could do without it. Just as capitalism in the current state of development fosters the bureaucracy (Weber 1987), the bourgeoisie as the highest representative of capitalism seems to be the centralization of economic stabilization and local control, or as I understand it from the perspective of Elijah:

What the bourgeoisie tries to get to the struggle for the monopoly of domination and finally gets what is, as stated, not the division of the existing monopolies, but a redistribution of burdens and benefits. The fact that these monopolies will no longer depend on an absolute king, but of a whole class, is a step in the direction mentioned, it is a step in that direction in which the opportunities provided by the monopoly no longer distributed at the whim and the personal interests of individuals, but as an impersonal, exact plan in the interest of many interdependent partners and, finally, in the interests of an entire network of interdependent human beings (1989, 353).

The private monopoly of some individuals are socialized and becomes a monopoly of whole classes in a public monopoly into a central organ of the state, it is the way in which the personal domination becomes an impersonal domination, where the legal authority estatuidas legally impersonal and objective ordinations (Elias 1989) are obeyed.

Weber between the state and leaders

Max Stirner announces that "the State law calls its own violence and crime to the individual" (1844, 66), Weber argues:

State is a human community that within a given territory (the "Territory" is distinctive element), claiming (with success) for the monopoly of legitimate physical violence (1997, 83). Weber recognizes the need for space to exercise coercion on the men who inhabit it, because as he contends: "Everywhere the development of the modern state begins when Prince started the expropriation of the" private "owners" (Weber 1987, 91) by means of repression or physical violence, melee, or domination by the tools of war, the State itself the legitimate domain of force and space is given.

The definition of the state as a monopoly of legitimate violence, is only part of its essential characterization, because in general, needs a political and institutional partnership that actually exercises the physical strength (Nosseto 2015).

This policy and institutional partnership results in Table Administrative State, which links in with the bureaucratic apparatus and represents outward firm political domination, is the prize of administrative staff and the last and decisive basis for solidarity the holder of power "(Weber 1987, 88).

The state is locked as coercive-regulatory power, ie as organic articulation between universal subordination (monopoly of violence) and universal homogenization legality or legitimacy as universal jurisdiction (Rabotnikof 1989).

Weber mentioned that for the state to survive, you need to obey the attention of men who obey, to recognize the authority of the state that dominates and that men should fulfill their statutory obligations, should admit the force does not appear, legitimate violence in fear or emotion that trigger state leaders domain holders.

Every state needs a representative who holds power, which is among the charisma and legitimacy, between fear and hope, which certainly takes place within the whole structure of domination, under the figures and representatives of power " ranging from the appearance of the "demagogue" free, in the field of city-state, which is very creation of the West and, above all, of the Mediterranean culture, and later in the "party leader" in a system Parliament within the framework of the constitutional state, which is also a product of Western soil specific "(Weber 1987, 87).

Weber restates what are the defining characteristics of political legitimacy to exercise "There are two ways to make politics a profession. O "for" policy exists or lives "of" politics "(1987, 95).

The figure on the stage of the political vocation plays a key role, as lives "of" politics as profession who tries to make her a lasting source of income, while those who live for politics, have a "plutocratic" treatment that are part of, financially independent and free of any labor or political leaders entrepreneurship layers. Weber explains further:

The plutocratic such address exists does not mean that the politically dominant group but also try to live "from" politics and not used to also use its policy to their private economic interests (1987, 98) domination.

It can shake the political ideal of economically booked attracting state money, somehow, the ruling class that lives only for politics is permeated with the collection of these funds for their personal interest. Therefore, any political struggle between parties brings the game of interest charges to bring economic benefits these machines and party functions.

This bureaucratic machine also becomes one of the early forms of power, "Weber conceives of power as the ability of a group to overcome or neutralize resistance from other groups in order to realize their interests (ideal or material) or even to put the energies of other groups serving their interests willingly or unwillingly "(Poggi 2006, 58), but said that does not speak of institutionalized power yet, but the strategies developed by each political party to attract positions within the bureaucracy, as Weber parties become a means to achieve the purpose of procuring a fee.

But back to the figure of the leader, it depends on the quality or success of the parties and achieve emotional strength to cope in public:

Besides the qualities of the will, critical to everything in this world, what counts here is, above all, the power of demagogic speech. To move the masses purely emotional means are often used. It lawful qualify this situation as "based on the use of the emotionality of the masses dictatorship" (Weber 1987, 136).

Hence it is assumed for the selection of a leader or leader of the party, certainly, this is one of the most significant for the development of the charisma and appeal of leading figures, I say important because Weber "charisma connected with web of political concepts: articulates with the nation, with the state and its bureaucracy, and democracy "(Aronson, 2011, 121) is transverse to the political life in general.

But where did the idea of the leader's charisma in Weber arise?

The concept of charisma has, as we know, a religious matrix. It was taken by Weber of research on church history and R. Karl Holl Sohn. In its earliest uses, the notion of charisma opposed the bureaucratic organization. According to Sohn, Christianity was originally a non-bureaucratic organization, founded in the belief that God was distributing the gifts of grace (charisma) and gave some Christians precise "Vocations". "Führer" was the term used for Christians called by God to govern the community.

In this case, the bearer of charisma, endowed with exceptional qualities or features is one that confronts intractable situations critical elements available to all. Unsolvability situations which "exit" from grace personally designated a "way of salvation" (Rabotnikof 1989, 216).

Weber gives the leader the charismatic element and that certainly is embedded within the idea of the sociology of domination that is not exactly the hub of the Political and scientific, but that opens the branches to its further development, opening the door to the three terms of tradition, reason and charisma that correspond to three principles of obedience:

The man obeys heads the custom establishes that designates reason or enthusiasm rises above others. Grandparents, organizers and the prophets symbolize these three sources of legitimacy (Weber 1987, 54).

The legitimacy of Weber, are held on three pillars: tradition, reason and charisma; in the tradition is the way the exercising patriarchs and economic leaders of old conditioned minted by the fears and hopes of societies metaphysical states and conditioned by gods and magical beliefs, on the other hand, the reason is the belief in the validity legal precepts and objective 'competence' based on rationally established rules, and finally, charisma patterns corresponding to grace, so why dare science as the basis of experimental and observational knowledge source, allows "science is not only a gift of visionaries and prophets that distribute blessings and revelations, no member of the meditation of sages and philosophers about the meaning of the world "(Weber 1989, 225) part.

Weber sees the charismatic authority, the authority of the gifts of grace which speaks Sohn and takes Weber to highlight the extraordinary personality of a purely personal heroism order, ability to circumstantial adversity every moment and especially the capacity precedence to obstacles.

But so far these circumstances make the word a causal leader of a political nature, through which the image of the leader and leader, who shows in his historical moment that has the knowledge and vocation that allow you to perform daily builds the compromises necessary to overcome the resistance that is, and exercising dominion over that which gave enough belief.

Finally, rationalization and science in Weber, does not talk about the values that should remain in society, but give the theoretical basis for forms and institutional settings in which science works in the social field, becoming the monopoly of specialized knowledge, for both science and monopoly of knowledge and status as a monopoly of politics, the state-company monopolizing political means.

Is formed from a process of concentration and expropriation founded on violence (Rabotnikof 1989), while the specialized staff are in obedience orientation in legal obligations; domination exercised as the modern 'servant of the state' (Weber 1987).

Weber distinguishes the diversity of principles and values in politics, that arise from political vocation, which is the affirmation of the conviction, the last of this values, can establish an evaluative core of the various political struggles are born equal and confront, and are framed in the responsibility of the political to keep the valuation integrity of these principles, the conflict between values leads to confrontation of values and in other cases the debate and dialogue about this, but "if the conflict of values is truly intractable, that irresolution must tear the heart of the individual. This means that the commitment to a value, the firm conviction and determined by a cause must compete with other sense of duty, which also stresses the individual heart and faces a tragic resolution" (Nosetto 2015, 184).

It is political, in the midst of responsibility and guilt personally assume its commitment to the ideas and the prefixed values of their ongoing struggle with other social groups or political parties, is expressed in all its glory in the struggles for power over others, ie power as the ability of a group to overcome or neutralize resistance from other groups in order to realize their interests.

References

Charles Tilly. Coerción, capital y los estados europeos, 990 - 1990. España: Alianza Editorial, 1992

Gianfranco Poggi. Weber. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2006

Imanuel Wallerstein. El moderno sistema mundial. Vol. 1. España: Edit. Siglo XXI, 2009
Karl Lowith. Max Weber y Karl Marx. España: Editorial Gedisa, 2007

Max Stirner. El único y su propiedad. España: Edición Proyecto Espartaco, 1844

Max Weber. Economía y sociedad. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1987

_____. El político y el científico. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1997

Melina Ivana Acosta y Gustavo Gastón Pérez. La ex Yugoslavia. Conflictos y tensiones en una región de encrucijada (pp. 244-264), Huellas nº 15 2011

Nora Rabotnikof. Max Weber: Desencanto, Política y Democracia. México: Universidad Autónoma de México, 1989

Norbet Elías. El proceso de la civilización. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1989

Nosetto, Luciano. Max Weber y el concepto de lo político. La ética guerrera y la necesidad de la culpa. Estudios Políticos, 46, Instituto de Estudios Políticos, pp. 179-196: Universidad de Antioquia, 2015

Nuria Arbizu. Cultura y Conflicto en Irlanda del Norte. España: Edt. Nuria Arbizu. Licencia de Creative Commons, 2010

Paulina Perla Aronson. La centralidad del carisma en la sociología política de Max Weber. Revista de la Carrera de Sociología. pp. 109-126. Vol. 1, N° 1 2011

The Commentator: "Where is the alternative to Erdoğan's Islamisation?" Enlace:
http://www.thecommentator.com/article/3814/where_is_the_alternative_to_erdo_an_s_islamisation [Consultado 20 de marzo de 2015]