

# Commonalities and Differences Between Max Weber and Michael Foucault on the Theme of “Rationalization of the Body”

Öğr. Gör. Dr. Buğra ÖZER

Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, Uygulamalı Bilimler Yüksekokulu, MANİSA

## ABSTRACT

The main objective of this paper is to elucidate the very nature of ‘the rationalization of the body’ in regard to the convergence and divergences as envisioned in the works of Max Weber and Michael Foucault. While both of the thinkers may be deemed to be important critiques of the modernity process, their insights reveal certain commonalities as the came to deal with the rationalization of the body and individuation of the body along with differences that can be traced back to their roots in their critiques about the modernity project. In such respect, the study emphasizes that rationalization of the body has been a complex process and it italicizes that different dynamics came to redefine the body and individuate the individual along with the continuation of the process.

**Key Words:** Body, rationalization, rationalization of the body, Max Weber, Michel Foucault

**JEL Classification:** I19, I29, I39

## “Bedenin Ussallaşması” Teması Üzerinde Max Weber ve Michael Foucault Arasındaki Yakınsamalar ve Farklılıklar

### ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın temel hedefi çağdaş Batı felsefesinin iki önemli ismi olan Max Weber’in ve Michael Foucault’nun eserlerinde geçen ‘bedenin ussallaşması’ temasını düşünürlerin algılayış benzerlikleri ve ayrık-samalarını göz önüne alarak kavramsalı yeniden değerlendirmektir. İki felsefeci de modernite süreçlerini şiddetli olarak eleştirirken, bedenin ussallaşması ve bedenin kimlik belirliliğine dair görüşleri ve açılımları ortak yönlerini temel kaynağını modernite projesine olan eleştirilerden kaynaklamışlardır. Bu bakımdan, çalışma bedenin ussallaşması olgusunun karmaşık bir süreç olduğunu ve bu sürecin gelişiminde bireyi belirleyen ve bedeni yeniden tanımlayan bir çok dinamiğin var olduğu olgusun altını çizmektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Beden, ussallaşma, bedenin ussallaşması, Max Weber, Michel Foucault

**JEL Sınıflaması:** I19, I29, I39

## I. INTRODUCTION

This study will problematize the rationalization of the body in works of Weber and Foucault. The rationalization of the body has been a widely discussed issue in the works of both of the thinkers from different perspectives. The pursuit of the paper in this sense is to elaborate the convergences and divergences of these thinkers in relation to their interpretation of the rationalization of the body. The rationalization of the body has been an important concern for both classical and contemporary thinkers in different accounts on how liberalism came to

rationalize the body and individuate the persons. An attempt for establishment of similarities and differences between the concerning authors on different themes may at first sight appear to be a difficult task to realize. The reason for this is that Weber and Foucault are classified into different realms (Szakolcia, 1998:ii). Weber is deemed to be the founding father of sociology, a champion of value free sociology, a methodologist of objectivity and ideal types and a theorist of rationality and the rationalization process (Szakolcia, 1998:iii). Foucault, on the other hand is "considered as a post modern or post structuralist thinker, a champion of gender and sexual politics and a critic of value freedom, objectivity and rational." (Szakolcia, 1998:iv).

What I will argue in this paper is both Weber and Foucault had some commonalities as they came to deal with the rationalization of the body and individuation of the body although both of the thinkers locate themselves at quite different points. In this respect, the rationalization of the body has been a basic common theme to which both of the thinkers approached with different tunes of emphasis in their works. The rationalization of the body becomes an important element of Weber's central theme of rationality and rationalization in the Western societies that occupy the main thrust of his works whilst Foucault takes a different twist during his exposition of those links between knowledge and power in the human in the human sciences, their discourses and institutions.

The plan of this study will follow a short of sketch of how these thinkers grasp the rationalization of the body and individuation of bodies in their works, later an analysis of their commonalities and differences in their approach to the theme in question and at the final stage a concluding remarks of what insights may be gained in relation to the body and individuation of persons in the phase of liberal and capitalist development.

## **II. UNDERSTANDING THE RATIONALIZATION AND THE BODY**

Before going through the foundations of my argumentations, it will be essential that some introductory remarks have to be made in relation to the rationalization and the very understanding of the body. In this regard, rationalization formed a central concept in the foundation of classical sociology, particularly with respect to the emphasis the discipline placed on the nature of modern Western societies. In such regard, the term rationalization is embedded with a great deal of rejection of dialectism and socio-cultural evolution. Given the perspective, rationalization is defined as the increasing role of calculation and control in social life, thereby being a trend leading to what Weber names the "iron cage" of bureaucracy.

From the Weberian perspective, Habermas comments on rationalization as such ' *What Weber depicted was not only the secularization of Western culture, but also and especially the development of modern societies from the viewpoint of rationalization. The new structures of society were marked by the differentiation of the two functionally intermeshing systems that had taken shape around the*

*organizational cores of the capitalist enterprise and the bureaucratic state apparatus. Weber understood this process as the institutionalization of purposive-rational economic and administrative action. To the degree that everyday life was affected by this cultural and societal rationalization, traditional forms of life - which in the early modern period were differentiated primarily according to one's trade - were dissolved.'* (Habermas, 1985:2).

In the midst of this rationalization process, reminding Shakespeare's famous saying 'you are the object of my affection', rationalization of the body refers to the fact that the human body becomes an integral part of rationalization process. Whilst one rational tendency progresses on the way to increasing the efficiency and output of the human body, a wide variety of means can be utilized in reaching this end. This may include trends towards regular exercises, dieting, increased hygiene, drugs, and an emphasis on optimal nutrition since all of these means facilitate stronger, leaner, more optimized bodies for quickly performing tasks (Foucault, 1978:cha.2-3). One other derivative of the rationalization process of the body may be realized through maintaining a certain level of physical attraction inclusive processes encompassing the combing of hair, use of a fragrance, having an appropriate haircut, and wearing certain clothes. All such elements attain calculated use that of giving off a certain impression to other individuals.

### **III. RATIONALIZATION OF THE BODY IN WEBER'S FRAMEWORK**

The process of rationalization has been a central tenet for understanding the Weberian project whose pillars have been widely discussed in terms of its thematic unity (Turner, 1992:vii -viii). The rationalization process basically refers to practical application of knowledge to achieve a desired end. It leads to efficiency, coordination, and control over both the physical and the social environment. (Elwell, 1999) Rationalization is a process whereby it becomes the guiding principle behind bureaucracy and the increasing division of labor. The outcome of such a process leads to the unprecedented increase in both the production and distribution of goods and services (Gerth and Mills, 1994:6). It is also associated with secularization, depersonalization, and oppressive routine. (Gerth & Mills, 1994) Increasingly, human behavior is guided by observation, experiment and reason (zweckrationalitat) to master the natural and social environment to achieve a desired end (Runciman, 1991:cha.1 and cha.2) Weber's general theory of rationalization (of which bureaucratization is but a particular case) refers to increasing human mastery over the natural and social environment. (Gerth and Mills, 1994)

Actually the rationalization process affects many spheres of the society. The very process is visible even in the religious sphere whereby magic was eliminated as monotheistic religions developed along with the company of development of the science and technology. Weber argues in relation "*The great historic process in the development of religions, the elimination of magic from the*

world which had begun with the old Hebrew prophets and, in conjunction with Hellenistic scientific thought, had repudiated all magical means to salvation as superstition and sin, came here to its logical conclusion. The genuine Puritan even rejected all signs of religious ceremony at the grave and buried his nearest and dearest without song or ritual in order that no superstition, no trust in the effects of magical and sacramental forces on salvation, should creep in." (Max Weber, 1965:61). In turn, these changes in social structure have changed human character through changing values, philosophies, and beliefs. Such superstructural norms and values as individualism, efficiency, self-discipline, materialism, and calculability (all of which are subsumed under Weber's concept of zweckrationalitat) have been encouraged by the bureaucratization process. (Runciman, 1991) Bureaucracy and rationalization rapidly replace all other forms of organization and thought. (Gerth and Mills, 1994) They form a stranglehold on all societies with specific emphasis on the Western society. (Gerth and Mills, 1994)

Several authors emphasize the paradoxical quality of this very rationalization process in the context of Western capitalist development. Turner argues rationalization has its roots at the irrational Protestant quest for salvation. Moreover, the process of rationalization becomes more problematic, when confronted with the contradictory relationship between the substantive and formal rationality at a level "when substantive questions of values are subordinated to formal questions of logic." (for a more thorough discussion see Turner, 1992. preface). The further paradox becomes more apparent with the outcome of the rationalization, "a meaningless world which lacks in moral directions and which is dominated by a bureaucratic structure." (Gerth and Mills, 1991:123). The disenchantment of the world and the iron cages of the modernity bring forth such a social evolution where Weber argues "No one knows who will live in this cage in the future, or whether at the end of this tremendous development entirely new prophets will arise, or there will be a great rebirth of old ideas and ideals or, if neither, mechanized petrification embellished with a sort of convulsive self-importance. For of the last stage of this cultural development, it might well be truly said: 'Specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart; this nullity imagines that it has obtained a level of civilization never before achieved.' (Gerth and Mills, 1994: 123-124)

In this general framework as given above, I will now turn to locate how human bodies came to be rationalized and humans happen to be individuated. Especially Weber's work of "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism" is a starting point for this discussion. The work gives a detailed account of origins, nature and effects of rationalization process in the Western society. Weber describes this development such that a culture of reason, stability, coherence, and discipline and world mastery was brought up by the Calvinist quest for salvational security. Weber describes the change such that "A man does not 'by nature' wish to earn more and more money, but simply to live as he is accustomed to live and to earn as much as is necessary for that purpose. Wherever modern capitalism

*has begun its work of increasing the productivity of human labor by increasing its intensity, it has encountered the immensely stubborn resistance of this leading trait of pre-capitalistic labor.”(Max Weber, 1965:60). This gradual process in turn cut the cord that linked the individual to the institutions of the religious institutions and contributes to the development of a new kind of possessive individualism “bringing about the legitimation of money and emphasizing a new culture dedicated to the work and transformation of human’s environment.” (Turner, 1992:13). The management of the body came to require the men (and the other women too) organize themselves in a strict fashion. In relation to this Weber explains “Waste of time is thus the first and in principle the deadliest of sins. The span of human life is infinitely short and precious to make sure of one’s own election. Loss of time through sociability, idle talk, luxury, even more sleep than is necessary for health . . . is worthy of absolute moral condemnation . . . [Time] is infinitely valuable because every hour lost is lost to labor for the glory of God. Thus inactive contemplation is also valueless, or even directly reprehensible if it is at the expense of one’s daily work. For it is less pleasing to God than the active performance of His will in a calling.”(Max Weber, 1965:157).*

Moreover, Protestantism undermined the particularistic relations of the family; in turn kinship ties were also underemphasized in exchange for a new conception of the political system. The study also asserts that Reformation becomes a landmark event that acts as a catalyst that transformed the urban Western culture. (Turner, 1992) This also stimulated a new kind of rationality characteristic of the urban bourgeoisie, spreading to all classes and groups in Western civilization. (Turner, 1992) In one sense capitalism becomes in Weber’s own words “*an immense cosmos into which the individual is born, and which presents itself to him, at least as an individual, in so far as he is involved in the system of market relationships, to conform to capitalist rules of action.*” (Gerth and Mills, 1994 & Max Weber, 1965:47-48).

There are several authors that linked this transformation to a process of the rationalization of the body. Turner for example argues that Weber’s discussion of such a transformation can be attributed a process where there emerges a particular form of consciousness and where there emerges new forms of discipline which regulate and organize the energies of the body. Furthermore, Turner continues “*the rationalization of the body in terms of disciplining of energies and an amplification of needs is thus an underlying theme of Weber’s narrative of capitalist development.*”(Turner, 1992:118). It is here important to realize Weber elaborates on a general macro picture where I will argue the rationalization of the body is a smaller detail in the whole picture. In fact, Weber locates modern disciplining mechanisms’ origins in the monasteries and the armies. (Turner, 1992) At several instances in Weber’s works, Weber notes how the military and monasteries (which devised an overall controlling mechanism via religion on the individual’s dieting habits and control on the sexual desires, all mundane in nature) provide a total control of environment (Turner, 1992 and Gerth and Mills, 1994). Especially he notes that military was the foremost

important institution that molded large numbers of men into a disciplined unit by personal discipline and bureaucratic demand systems. (Gerth and Mills, 1994 and Turner, 1992) Turner here remarks that rationalization of the body intensifies as the militarism and religion are united in a single context. (Turner, 1992)

What basically happens in the modern societies is these communities shift their emphasis on those controls targeting the internal structure of emotions to ordering of control to a different control scheme of controlling the outer surfaces of the body considered in a secular framework as sources of desirable feeling and personal significance (Turner, 1992:115-138). In this sense Turner argues the strength of Weber's sociology of capitalism such that it enables us to understand the rationalization processes in modern society and locating the changes regarding the transformation of position of the human body. However the basic concern, whilst Weber was analyzing these changes regarding the rationalization of the body, was primarily the changes in knowledge and consciousness (Turner, 1992:115-138). The general rationalization of the body in Weber's account may sum up such that controlling mechanism that laid emphasis on the control of the mind in the feudal times switch to those new mechanisms that concentrate onto the outer surface of the body. This means that the body is no longer a part of the religious culture rather the rationalization of the body brings forth a process of incorporation of the body into scientific discourses especially via medicalization (Turner, 1992:115-138).

#### IV. RATIONALIZATION OF THE BODY: FOUCAULT

Foucault is more concerned with the genealogy of things and genealogy. The rationalization of the body has to be evaluated in this general framework. Genealogy is an attempt to reveal discourse at the moment it appears in history as a system of constraints. This leads him to analyze literary, biological, medical religious and ethical bodies of knowledge (Rabinow, 1984:03-29). Knowledge becomes an area between opinion and scientific knowledge. The genealogy also compels Foucault to locate how different kinds of knowledge might relate to—for example-- the discourses on heredity and sexuality (Rabinow, 1984:03-29). This method leads him to study the effects of discourses claiming to be scientific like sociology and medicine and practices like the penal system and schooling as they first they appear. The embodiment of the knowledge is not in only theoretical texts or experimental instruments. It is also in the whole body of practices and institutions. (Foucault, 1972-1977) History becomes in this respect for Foucault nothing but depersonalized and formed complex relations and rules—discursive formations. (Foucault 1972-1977) and Turner 1992) Genealogy allows for historical change and it is not bothered with finding a truth to history or describing neutral archeological structures of knowledge but is interested in history will to power (Horrocks, 1997:iv).

Foucault realizes a new different point that man emerges "*as the product of a new set of discourse of the body and populations.*" (Rabinow, 1984) In the very genealogy of things the human body and the human population simply

become objects of a series of natural sciences. (Turner, 1992) The new objectification of the human body, according to Turner, “*expressed a more detailed and differentiated treatment of the body as one component of a process of cultural rationalization.*” (Rabinow, 1984:29). Foucault argues that man’s emerging out of a new set of discourse of the population and the body became more apparent just after the French Revolution and the rapid urbanization that started by the end of the eighteenth century and the nineteenth century on. (Rabinow, 1984 and Turner, 1992)

In such regard, contemporary political theory and philosophy has vested an in interest in the perception of the body as posited in the language. In other words, according the contemporary feminist thinker, Judith Butler, humans do posit a body prior to language. Yet the very understanding of the act of positing itself is always made within language, and is consequently only an effect of language (Butler, 1993:5).

Therefore, whatever all intents and purposes be, the body becomes nothing other than language, a fiction or fantasy (Butler, 1993: 5). Butler explains: “For something to be constructed, according to this view of construction, is for it to be created and determined through that process” (Butler, 1993: 6)

At Foucault’s famous work, “Discipline and Punish”, the picture of the rationalization of the body becomes clearer. The study is a genealogy of the soul and the body in the political, judicial and scientific fields. (Rabinow, 1984 and Foucault, 1977) Particularly, the study focuses on the punishment above all power over and within the body. Foucault also states that power relations have an immediate hold upon the body. (Foucault, 1977) He adds that these relations of power invest it, mark it train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies to emit signs. “*The more organized or technically thought out knowledge becomes, the closer we get to a political technology of the body.*”(Horrocks, 1997) Foucault extends his argument as he shows the development of human sciences as ever-expanding knowledge of men. This very knowledge was supposed to deal with problems regarding the labor, exchange and language (Rabinow, 1984:03-29).

New disciplines such as penology, criminology, demography and social medicine were clear indications of the development of panopticism, which refers to the pursuit of keeping a total control of human environment. (Turner, 1992 and Foucault, 1970) Like Benthamian panopticon the subjects under surveillance never realize when they come to be watched and so effectively police themselves. This process is a location of bodies in space in relation to each other. (Horrocks, 1997) The modern penitentiaries were the perfect examples by which societies came to scientifically manage the socially unacceptables with the very identical understanding of panopticism towards more efficient and “*the utility of correctly managed bodies.*” (Turner, 1992). In Foucault’s account of panopticonism, the late eighteenth century also witnesses “*the development of an organized police apparatus, statistical information on the population, an increasing wealth and*

*moral value imposed on property relations placed everyday behavior under surveillance.*" (Horrocks, 1997:115-120). The punitive city and coercive institution commenced to be in charge after all. This development signified "*the birth of carceral society whose object is not to punish less but to punish or correct better—everywhere*" (Horrocks, 1997:100-150).

It is also important that Foucault notes how the architectural designs were also used to deal with the space, which could facilitate the mental re-education. (Turner, 1992 and Foucault, 1965) The rationalization of the body is also related to the normalization of the body certain criteria. The carceral society and its sciences in this respect ensure that judges of normality are omni present. Foucault explains "*the carceral network constituted one of the armatures of the power/knowledge that has made the human sciences historically possible. Knowable man (soul, individuality, consciousness, conduct, etc) is the object/effect of this analytical investment of this domination/observation.*" (Horrocks, 1997 and Foucault, 1977:305). As Turner points out "*We could argue that these principles of institutional development and reform sought a re-education of the mind via the discipline and organization of bodies into a regime that sought to maximize efficiency and surveillance through the application of new forms of knowledge and belief.*" (Turner, 1992:126).

#### **IV. PARALLEL LINES AND DIVERGENCES BETWEEN FOUCAULT AND WEBER ON THE RATIONALIZATION OF THE BODY**

The very analysis of Weber's rationalization and the bureaucracy at one hand, and Foucault's analysis of powers on the disciplinary techniques and panopticism on the other hand have been deemed to be parallel analysis in the point of rationalization of the body. But why is this really an important point of similarity or parallelism? I will come back to this very important question in a short while. In relation to this initial Turner argues both of the thinkers, Weber and Foucault locate the origins of the modern rational body practices in the monasteries and the army. According to both of the thinkers the disciplining practices of the body respectively follow their spread through the factory, the hospital and finally home.

While Turner attracts our attention into the paradox of Weberian rationalization process, he points out Weberian rationalization process has its roots at the irrational Calvinian quest for salvational rationality. Meanwhile, Foucault also shows those effects of religious practices on long-term secular arrangements regarding the rationalization of the body like Weber does. (Rabinow, 1984 and Turner, 1992) But let us pause here and come back to the question that I posed several lines ago. More essentially, the way that both authors envisage the modernity should be discussed here to comprehend the *raison d'être* of the very similarity between these people on their views regarding the rationalization of the body.



In fact, both Weber and Foucault have a very pessimist picture of modernity. For Weber, the modernity is an ideal repudiated in it as an end. Welmer notes in relation to this *“Rationalization... for Weber on the one hand signifies for a set of interrelated tendencies operating on various levels (or in various subsystems) and pointing towards increasing formalization, instrumentalization and bureaucratization according to an internal systemic logic or necessity. These tendencies point toward to a society in which the European ideal of the autonomous individual becomes more and more anachronism and in which the symbolic structures which once supported the formation of autonomous individuals and the leading of a meaningful have disintegrated into a pluralism of privatized value choices, therefore, in which the autonomous individual, the creation and discovery of modern European History is likely to disappear . . . . or to merely survive at the fringes of the depersonalized system”*(Welmer, 1988:134).

Meanwhile, Foucault is of the idea that a critical way of seeing the enlightenment project such that we must ask what we are and analyze historically the limits imposed upon us so that we may transgress them. In this sense Foucault renounces the quest for truth and plumps for a critical engagement with the present. (Rabinow, 1984). Foucault claims that the modernity simply possesses this very desperate eagerness to imagine it. This imagination however brings a different kind of thing than it is. Foucault’s conclusion follows that the relation to the self should therefore be one of creative and Nietzsche an activity of giving style to one’s strengths and weaknesses and not trying to reveal a “true” self. The proposition of Foucault simply follows that “we know reality only via our representations of reality.” (Yeatman, 1984:30). These representations are necessarily multiple, based on differences arising out of differences in the positioning of knowing subjects in relation to the historicity of interconnected relationships of domination and contestation (Yeatman, 1984:30-32).

Apparently, as given for Nietzschean influence<sup>1</sup> on Foucault, Szkolcia suggests that Weber had also Nietzschean influence that affected the way that Weber considered the modernity. It is this influence that compelled Weber to have this negative and pessimist picture of the modernity. Turner again directs our attention how both of Weber’s and Foucault’s accounts are allegedly skeptical of the “rational reform and scientific development.” Turner also draws another commonality between Weber and Foucault from Barry Smart’s study in their terms “iron cages” and “carceral society” respectively. However Turner differentiates the way that these thinkers put forth these concepts. Turner states that Smart’s notice follows Weberian account of rationalization process is

---

<sup>1</sup> Nietzsche argues that *“it was inconceivable to imagine that history will move towards a whole or reveal a total truth, In this sense it could pertain to the fundamental nature of existence that a complete nature of truth would destroy one”*(Horrocks, 1997) Horrocks evaluates this such that *“ ... [t]his presents a break with the Hegelian thought that History leads us to Absolute and total knowledge. This places reason in doubt.”* He adds *“ Hegel’s dialectic which moves towards complete of knowledge is undone by Nietzsche.”*(Horrocks, 1997)

inevitable development of rational culture, which humans cannot resist. In contrast, Foucault's histories of disciplines are open ended and contingent based. However, a commonality that was raised by Turner and Szakolcia Weber also like Foucault was against the mono-causal definition of the historical development. (Szakolcia, 1998) In the Weberian approach the contingent view of historical outcomes as the consequences of struggle and resistance was also significant.

Foucault always reserves the point that humans can always resist to the course of these discipline mechanisms. (Turner, 1992). Despite Foucault's resistance possibility versus the disciplinary mechanisms, Foucault does not offer us an adequate theory of such practices and knowledge. (Turner, 1992). The problem that Turner raises in relation to Foucault's location upon this matter is simply the point that he "*appears to be firmly within a deterministic structuralist position hereby the knowledgability and agency of individuals are firmly denied and precluded.*" (Turner, 1992:129). A second problem that also appears according to Turner in Foucauldian perspective (which is also a concern for Szakolcia) is such that Foucault does not differentiate relation between the discursive and non-discursive institutions and practices.

## VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This study attempted to show the convergent and divergent lines in relation to what Weber and Foucault had to say for the rationalization of the body. There remain several potential problem or those points that I would call discussion points -- which would hopefully bring a better scrutiny to these different accounts of the thinkers. Several authors like Turner evaluated the Weber's account on the rationalization of the West as "Orientalist discourse".

There are two reasons for this critique. First, Weber has presented the reasoning of such an approach follows rationalization as "*a teleological<sup>2</sup> and irreversible process in western culture.*" (Turner, 1992:130). Second, he overemphasized the uniqueness of the West thereby creating "an unbridgeable dichotomy between the oriental and the occidental civilizations."<sup>3</sup>(Turner, 1992:130). There are other problems that Turner raises again in relation to the Weberian account on the question how capitalism and Protestantism combined could happen to give the way to rationalization process. He cautions that coming from the Weberian logic, the Protestantism could be arguably giving way to the development of capitalism, which all complicates the picture of rationalization in the Western society. The third question for the Weber according to Turner becomes the real source of the rationalization process as a whole, whether the

---

<sup>2</sup> Both Turner and Szakolcia put that such a kind of teleological discourse was also visible to some part in the Foucauldian analysis as he comes to explore the dynamics behind those disciplinary techniques development in the late eighteenth century on.

<sup>3</sup> In relation to these Orientalist discourse of Weber, I will argue that Foucault's analysis is also based solely on the Western liberal development and I am not really sure to which extent we can have a clear view of the processes of the rationalization of the body in the so called Orient. Of course, Foucault's method of inquiry seems to be less-limiting than the Weberian framework

rationalization process is due to an unfolding and irresistible logic or whether it is due to a struggling process between varieties of socio-economic dynamics. In contrast, as already mentioned the basic problem for Foucault is the knowledgability and agency of individuals in his framework.

I will, however, argue that such a critique has insights but Foucault happens to give accounts of struggle of resistance versus these mechanisms. In fact these struggles belong to those weak individuals who happen to be dominated by discourses that produce them like the anti-hero Pierre Rivera's example. (Horrocks, 1997 and Rabinow, 1984) Turner also criticizes Foucault that he does not provide more grounds for accepting histories as a struggle of discourses as in some way authoritative or legitimate. Final critiques on Foucault's works on the rationalization of the body that most of his works have been demographics-centric and rely solely on the term population, which may be easily adapted to the conventional views of the society. (Turner, 1992).

To sum up: Foucault and Weber actually attempted to grasp a picture of the rationalization of the body, which has been an important part of the liberal-capitalist in the Western Europe. Their commonalities on the rationalization of the body show that the very process of the rationalization of the body has been a complex process after all in the context of the liberal development of Western Societies. The rationalization of the body shows that different dynamics came to redefine the body and individuate the individual as the process continued. In fact, the very redefinition of the body as we can see, is an ongoing process where a good example may be our bombardment by the media on the beauty and good looking criteria which is a complementary of "the rationalization of the body" in part.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Butler Judith. (1993) *Bodies that matter: on the discursive limits of "sex"* New York: Routledge
- Elwell, Frank W. (1999) *Industrializing America: Understanding Contemporary Society through Classical Sociological Analysis*. West Port, Connecticut: Praeger
- Foucault, Michel (1965) *Madness and Civilization* translated by Richard Howard New York: Random House Inc.
- Foucault, Michel (1970) *The Order of Things: an Archeology of Human Sciences* translated by Alan Sheridan-Smith. New York: Random House Inc.
- Foucault, Michel. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, translated by Alan Sheridan New York: Pantheon Books
- Foucault, Michel. (1978) *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction*, translated by Robert Hurley (1978) New York: Random House Inc.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* edited by Colin Gordon New York: Pantheon Books
- Habermas, Jürgen.(1985) *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, Polity Press
- Horrocks, Chris and Jevtic, Zoran. (1997) *Foucault for Beginners* London: Penguin Books
- Rabinow, Paul ed. (1984) *The Foucault Reader* New York: Pantheon Books and Publications.
- Runciman, W.G. edition. (1991) *Weber: Selections in Translation* Translated by Eric Matthews Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Szakolcia, Arpad. (1998) *Max Weber and Michel Foucault Parallel Life-works* Routledge Studies in Social and Political Thought London: Routledge
- Turner, Bryan S. (1992) *Max Weber: From History to Modernity* London: Routledge

- Weber, Max. (1958) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, T. Parsons, trans. New York: Scribners,
- Weber, Max. (1994) *From Max Weber*. Translated and edited by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Galaxy.
- Welmer, Albert (1985) *Reason Utopia and the Dialectic of Enlightenment* in Richard J. Bernstein edition. (1985) *Habermas and Modernity*. Cambridge Massachusetts: The MIT Press
- Yeatman, Anna. (1994) *Post-Modern Revisionings of the Political* London: Routledge