Maria,

Thank you for your essay which I have just finished marking.

You show a clear grasp of the theories of Lukes and Weber. Your examples are good, although some lack detail. I have indicated on the essay where you could develop your ideas further.

I think that you analysis is lacking in some areas, so want to encourage you to consider the following ideas when you come to revise this topic:

**The secretive face (paragraph 3)**

*It could be argued that while the secretive face of power exists in democratic systems, it is perhaps most common in authoritarian regimes where this ‘face’ of power is the most common form. This is because power does not need to be shared and representatives do not need to be consulted. This means that this secretive face of power is relevant in the 21st century as of today, there are 50 dictatorships in the world that use the secretive face of power to control the social, political, economic and cultural agenda.*

**Lukes’ manipulating desires face (paragraph 4)**

*It could be argued that the notion of women staying at home for the betterment of the family unit and to comply with societal expectations was most prevalent up to the 1950s, particularly in Britain. This shows that Lukes’ theory of the secretive face of power in relation to this feminist theory may have historic relevance and has lost so much of its widespread acceptance in the 21st century. That said, traditional gender roles still exist across the world and for some feminists this marks female oppression by men. Today, though, despite a trend towards greater equality, some countries still ban women from certain jobs. This is particularly prevalent in industries such as manufacturing, agriculture, transportation, mining, construction, energy and water. The World Bank says there are 104 economies with labour laws that restrict the types of jobs women can undertake, and when and where they are permitted to work. It estimates that this affects the employment choices of 2.7 billion women.*

**Traditional Authority (paragraph 5)**

*One example is the concept of monarchy. Queen Elizabeth II is the constitutional monarch of the UK. The monarch holds only a titular role and wields very little power. Her presence is based on tradition and general acceptance by the government and people.* *Supporters of this form of traditional authority argue that royal families embody their country’s human roots and identity – and that they help keep alive a sense of history. Brave kings and queens often become symbols of their nation’s unity in times of war or crisis, because when they are doing their job properly there is nothing like a family to help define and exemplify the human values that a country stands for. It could be argued therefore that traditional authority is relevant in the 21st century because today there are 44 monarchies in the world. Interestingly, Belgium is the only existing popular monarchy – a system in which the monarch's title is linked to the people rather than a state. The title of Belgian kings is not King of Belgium, but instead King of the Belgians.*

**Charismatic authority (paragraph 6)**

Donald Trump is a good example of a charismatic leader. His chants of ‘Lock her up!’ served to fuel an anti-Hilary Clinton rhetoric as he progressed through and was victorious in the 2016 US Presidential election. Trump has an almost celebrity-like status, perhaps from being a recognisable socialite, businessman and TV personality. Many people find him entertaining (despite his false claims of fraud and antagonism towards immigrants) and engaging. His success in 2016 demonstrates clearly that his charismatic, almost magnetic personality seen in the delivery of his speeches that had a very simple and understandable message was appealing and therefore this form of Weber’s authority is relevant in the 21st century. That said, charismatic authority is not something just seen in the 21st century. Throughout history we have seen charismatic leaders such as Adolf Hitler and Martin Luther King. Perhaps, however we could argue that charismatic authority is most commonly associated with males rather than females, which feels like an outdated concept in the 21st century. Weber defined charisma as ‘Power legitimised on the basis of a leader’s exceptional personal qualities or the demonstration of extraordinary insight and accomplishment, which inspire loyalty and obedience from followers.’ However, the few women that do hold leadership positions are often not thought of as charismatic leaders. Hillary Clinton is a prime example of what the public thought of as a female leader who was lacking in charisma.

**Rational-legal authority (paragraph 7)**

When we consider rational-legal authority, we might think of branches of the state that the people, on the whole, accept as necessary to maintain peace and avoid chaos. Examples of such branches could be law enforcement such as the police, the army and the court system. This is perhaps the most relevant of all of the types of authority present in the 21st century. If we look back to a pre-US constitution era where there was no police force, citizens were permitted to carry weapons in order to protect themselves as there was no rational legal authority in the form of police officers. This led to the Second Amendment of the US Constitution that allows the people to keep and bear arms. This is still in place today despite the presence of rational legal authority in the USA. However, the vast majority of countries have representative democratic systems and political representatives to act as a rational legal authority when it comes to voting, such as in the Westminster Parliament, police forces and judicial systems.

**Conclusion**

In this section you should make 4 separate points that does not feel like a summary of what you have already said. I would go for something like this:

In conclusion, it could be argued that the concepts of power, authority and legitimacy remain highly relevant in the 21st century, but that they do not all coexist in all counties at the same time. For example, North Korea’s leaders enjoy hereditary power and have authority. Their legitimacy comes from the acceptance of the people and the repressive nature of the regime, as opposed to democratic legitimacy. In a country like the UK, the Prime Minister has significant powers (to go to war, for example) and he has legitimacy because he has been voted as the representative for his constituency and can therefore take up a seat in the House of Commons. Some would say that he lacks legitimacy because the people did not choose him to be their leader (the Conservative Party members voted for him) and in a First past the post electoral system, politicians can win their seat with a very small majority, which can mean that the majority of people did not vote for them. What this shows is that power, authority and legitimacy look different in different parts of the world in the 21st century. Lukes’s faces of power are relevant in the majority of nations, but perhaps his secretive face of power is more difficult to identify because of is clandestine nature. Weber’s theories are perhaps most relevant and successful in Protestant countries because Protestantism works well alongside the idea of acceptance of authority and individual responsibility in order to maintain capitalism. With this in mind, perhaps Weber’s theories are only fully relevant in the 21st century to capitalist states as opposed to authoritarian regimes.