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Abstract
This article uses Max Weber’s analysis of charisma to differentiate types of symbolic places. Although Weber did not include the role of space in his analysis of charisma, we can construct different types of spatial charisma based on his distinction between traditional and bureaucratic regimes. Heritage sites and monuments are used by traditional regimes to legitimise their rule by looking back to their charismatic origins, while futuristic places are used to convince the population that bureaucratic regimes will provide a brighter future. In reality these ideal types of charismatic places are almost always mixed. Nation-states combine both types of charismatic places. The analysis of the Zeche Zollverein in Essen, Germany shows that the meaning of a place can change and incorporate both types of spatial charisma at the same time and place. This was the consequence of a deliberate policy to legitimise a new economic regime in Germany’s Ruhr area.

Introduction
Charisma is reduced in everyday vernacular to an attribute of an individual. In the social sciences charisma is primarily linked to leadership, and the relation between charisma and leadership is the subject of hundreds of academic articles. While the nation-state is an important spatial context for charismatic leadership, charisma also has more direct links with space. When charisma is applied as an attribute of other entities beyond the individual, such as nationalistic movements or specific

* Kees Terlouw is Assistant Professor in the Department of Human Geography and Planning at Utrecht University in the Netherlands, where he teaches political, cultural, and regional geography. His research focuses on the changing forms of regional identity. In cooperation with medievalists, he studies the transformation of regions and regional identities since the Middle Ages in Europe. The main focus of his research is on the emergence of new forms of regional identities. Thin, functional, and network based identities increasingly replace traditional territorial thick regional identities. He also studies how these new and more fluid forms of regional identity are linked to each other and layered across different scales. Translocalism in identities and regional development is also a topic in his publications. He has also extensively published on the relation between the world-system and regional development.
ethnic groups, charisma is thus extended from a property of an individual to a property of a collective with a clear link to space. Sometimes space itself has a role in the creation of charisma, which has been analysed as the link between charisma and heritage sites, or how key objects in national museums have become charismatic through the way in which they are displayed.

Charisma is also more directly linked to space. The success of local business elites to reinvigorate local economies has been linked to the special charisma of those localities (Peck 1995). Regional charisma is also used to partly explain the success of prosperous industrial regions like the Silicon Valley (Appold 2005). Others use the charisma of the long-established group in a specific neighbourhood to explain the rivalries and power relations between local groups. Charisma is then linked to both social groups and their neighbourhood spaces (Elias and Scotson 1965; Oosterbaan 2009; Terlouw, Hogenstijn, and van Middelkoop 2008). Spaces and places, such as cities (Hansen and Verkaaik 2009; Savitch 2010), are also occasionally regarded and analysed as charismatic. The open spaces and possibilities of frontiers can also have charismatic properties (Gray 1999). Even nonhuman spaces, such as comets (Olson and Pasachoff 2009), ecosystems (Duarte et al. 2008), and recognisable species in complex ecosystems like pandas (Lorimer 2006; Lorimer 2007; Sergio et al. 2006), have been attributed with charisma. These nonhuman objects derive their charisma from the special qualities attributed to them by humans. Their charisma is based on being out of the ordinary and is used to emphasise and explain the special role these objects have in social life.

Although charisma is frequently applied as a characteristic of spatial objects, the charisma of space has not been studied systematically. This article thus seeks to provide a more systematic exploration of the relation between charisma and space. It starts by demonstrating the relevance of relating space and charisma. A geographical perspective on charisma is further legitimised by recent developments in geography, which challenge the modernist opposition between nature and society. After the cultural turn, geography now re-materialises and focuses more on human–nonhuman interaction. This challenges the conceptualisation of charisma as an innate, God-given human property. Nonhuman charisma has been defined as the distinguishing property of nonhuman entities or processes that determine its perception and evaluation by humans (Lorimer 2007:915).

The article proceeds as follows. First, I demonstrate how Weber’s conceptualisation of charisma is related to other types of regimes. I then focus on the role of space in the process of emergence and transformation of charisma. This is elaborated and systemised in a typology of relations between charisma and space. This brings us to the important differentiating role of time. The past and the future are crucial elements in the different ways spatial charisma is used to legitimise regimes. Charismatic places with a link to the charismatic past are frequently used to legitimise traditional regimes; similarly, bureaucratic regimes tend to use charismatic places presenting the future to legitimise their rule. The article concludes with an analysis of how these two different ideal charismatic places are combined to legitimise nation-states and regional regimes.
Max Weber introduced the concept of charisma into the social sciences. Charisma was originally a theological concept referring to the divine gift of grace Christians receive through their faith in God. Weber used charisma in his analysis of power, mobilisation, and legitimation. Along with rational and traditional rule, charismatic rule is one of the ideal types of *Herrschaft*. This is sometimes mistakenly translated as a form of power. Weber, however, distinguishes between power (*Macht*) – imposing one’s will against the will of the other – and authority (*Herrschaft*), which is accepted as legitimate by all parties. Translating *Herrschaft* as authority, however, reduces the concept too much to an individual trait. *Herrschaft* is better understood as a social concept; it refers to the specific social structure of political control and influence. It also refers more to the organisational and spatial process and practice of exercising influence. *Herrschaft* is not perpetual and unchanging; rather, it transforms over time. Weber identifies ideal types of *Herrschaft*; real examples combine aspects of these ideal types. Although not a perfect translation, ‘regime’ more successfully encompasses these different aspects of *Herrschaft*.

Traditional or patrimonial regimes are based on long-established rules, which provide the regime of the traditional ruler legitimacy. While they enable him to rule, these rules also limit his actions to some extent. The legitimacy of rational or bureaucratic regimes is based on the impersonal rule of law to achieve agreed upon ends. Whereas traditional regimes are based on morality (*wertrational*), bureaucratic regimes are based on efficiency (*zweckrational*). Thus while the legitimacy of traditional regimes is based on past success, the legitimacy of bureaucratic regimes is based on future results (Weber 1980:124). Both traditional and bureaucratic regimes are strongly institutionalised and predictable. They manage everyday life and give the population political and material security (ibid.:654). These regimes thus also organise a territory.

In contrast, charisma starts as an unbounded and unorganised event initiated by the emergence of a charismatic leader. Charisma is a fundamentally different type of regime (Adair-Toteff 2005; Shils 1965; Weber 1980; Weber 1988). It is based on a sudden overthrow of the established order by an extraordinary, almost magical, intervention by a charismatic individual. Charismatic leaders are most successful when the established order is in crisis, especially during times of war. The collapse of the established regime calls for a new order. Anomy makes the population receptive to a charismatic leader who promises to create a new regime. The charismatic leader is successful in the overthrow of the old regime and the legitimisation of the new regime, as he possesses extraordinary saintly, supernatural, exemplary, or heroic characteristics. These characteristics become charismatic through their recognition by others (Weber 1980:124, 140–42, 654–55). Charisma is thus not an individual but a social phenomenon. Its legitimacy is based on the charisma of its leader on his ‘*ausseralltäglichen Hingabe an die Heiligkeit oder Heldenkraft oder Vorbildlichkeit einer Person und der durch sie offenbarten oder geschaffenen Ordnungen*’ [extraordinary dedication to the holy or heroic or exemplary characteristics of an individual through the revealed
or created order] (ibid.:124). An extraordinary individual, at a special moment in time and at a specific place, overthrows a long-established regime and creates a new legitimate regime through the sudden mobilisation of other individuals.

Although the spatial aspects of charisma are not explicitly discussed by Weber, the development of charisma is linked to space. The charismatc leader acquires his charismatic characteristics frequently outside the territory controlled by the established regime. For example, the desert has produced many prophets. Charismatic leaders are mostly outsiders, whose charismatic traits have been formed outside the established regime and in separation from their later followers. They tend to come from outside the space where the everyday life regulated by the established regime takes place. Many charismatic leaders have developed their charisma through isolation and sacrifice. Their sudden entrance from the outside is an important impetus for the overthrow of the established regime. Many charismatic national leaders have a mixed ethno-cultural background and come from outside the national core territory. To name just a few, Napoleon came from Corsica, Hitler from Austria, and Stalin from Georgia. Their entrance from the outside not only helped their followers accept their charisma, but they were also motivated to overthrow the regime, as their position as outsiders hindered their career opportunities in the established regime.1

The next phase is the recognition of charisma by others. For instance the prophet moves out of the desert and enters the territory of the established regime and attracts disciples. Large sections of the population are persuaded to follow the charismatic leader. Charismatic persons are charismatic in a social setting, which is spatially bounded. These contexts are predominantly linked to the nation-state and its territorial framework. Charisma can sometimes break out of the national context. It can destroy established territories and attempt to create new large territorial regimes, as occurred with Bolivar, Hitler, and Napoleon. It can also split territories through separation.2

After the charismatic leader has established his own regime, he is confronted with many problems that undermine the charismatic character of his regime. Charismatic regimes are inherently unstable and become over time more like bureaucratic or traditional regimes. Charismatic regimes exist only in ideal typical purity when the old regime is toppled ‘so muß die charismatische Herrschaft, die sozusagen nur in statu nascendi in idealtypischer Reinheit bestand, ihren Character wesentlich ändern: sie wird traditionalisiert oder rationalisiert’ [consequently the charismatic regime, which only existed in its ideal typical purity at its inception, changes its character: it transforms into a traditional or rational regime] (Weber 1980:143). This transformation of charismatic regimes is stimulated by several mechanisms. The mobilisation of followers becomes more successful through organisation, which leads to bureaucratisation. Attending to the practical needs of the population also forces the charismatic regime to become more mundane. Feeding its followers’ calls for rational decisions based on functionality is at loggerheads with the irrational otherworldliness of charisma. The succession of the charismatic leader further transforms charismatic regimes. Charismatic regimes tend to develop into traditional regimes (ibid.:143–48,
Charisma is then transformed from a regime to a source of legitimation used by other types of regimes (Adair-Toteff 2005; Turner 2003). Traditional regimes can be legitimised through their charismatc origins, especially through the line of succession from the charismatic founder to the present traditional ruler. Although the charismatic regime is the opposite of a bureaucratic regime (Weber 1980:655), charisma can also be used to legitimise these kinds of rational regimes. Bureaucrats can be legitimised through their special education. Some bureaucratic institutions acquire a kind of institutional charisma, which gives them legitimacy. This is frequently linked to elections. One of the problems all charismatic regimes encounter is the succession of the charismatic leader. A new leader is sometimes elected by (a section of) his followers. When the electorate is wide enough this can transform charismatic regimes into democracies. The election of officials legitimises bureaucratic regimes through the charisma of the democratic process (Weber 1989:680, 155–56). Besides the pure charisma of a revolutionary individual, charisma is also used for the legitimation of other regimes. It is important to distinguish between these two forms of charisma. Some object to using charisma for analysing the legitimation of non-charismatic regimes and want to reserve it purely for individual charisma (Bensman and Givant 1975; Shils 1965). The remainder of this article focuses on the use of charisma to mobilise support for traditional and bureaucratic regimes and not on primary and pure individualistic charisma.

### A Typology of the Relations between Charisma and Space

The here and now of everyday life is the domain of established regimes. To legitimise their ordinary rule, established regimes try to link up with distant charisma. This is one of the ways in which both traditional and bureaucratic regimes seek support from their population. They can legitimise their rule by linking their national narrative with the charisma embodied in special iconic places. Space is frequently used to construct linkages with the pure charisma of other times. This section provides an overview of the different types of spatial charisma. Table 1 identifies five possible types of spatial charisma that are outside the present, everyday life of established regimes. These different types of spatial charisma are based on Weber’s distinction between backward looking traditional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Different types of spatial charisma in time and space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Away</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
regimes and more forward looking bureaucratic regimes. To this temporal differentiation, I have added a very rudimentary spatial differentiation between distant and nearby places. In this table there are five possible types of spatial charisma.

The sites linked to the charismatic origins of a traditional regime can become protected and transformed into heritage sites or marked by monuments. These are usually not places where important charismatic events took place, but are branded by the present regime to signify its charismatic past. They are imagined charismatic places. Westminster Abbey, where the coronations of English monarchs take place, is an example of a charismatic heritage site. Its use is part of the ceremonies legitimising the succession of monarchs. Similarly, the statues of Joan of Arc in French towns link present day France with Joan of Arc’s charismatic leadership during the struggle for French independence. The function of these backward looking charismatic places is to demonstrate to the population a link between the present regime and its charismatic past. The visualisation of this linkage provides legitimacy to the traditional regime. This charismatic legacy is visualised through monuments and heritage sites in places linked to the centres of power of established regimes. Capitals and central squares are typical locations for displaying these charismatic linkages with the past (Johnson 1995).

Places of pilgrimage can emerge when these charismatic places are further away from the population centres. In many respects they are like ordinary heritage sites, but their remoteness lends them a special quality. Located outside of everyday life, visitors must make a conscious decision to visit them and temporarily leave their normal lives. Pilgrims to these holy sites not only travel in space, but also travel back in time to the original charisma of the past. Pilgrims to a holy site relive to some extent the charisma of the founders of the present regime. This reliving of the charismatic past legitimises traditional regimes. These holy places, however, are frequently seen as more pure than the messy present. Holy places are thus distant in both time and place from the more problematic present. Voyages in space to visit the original places of charisma are thus also voyages in time and can possess a semi-religious character. Battlefields of the American War of Independence are, for example, pilgrimage sites for those who want to relive the charisma of the American Revolution. Most real life examples only partly fit in this ideal typical category. The heroism and martyrdom attached to lost battles (e.g., the battle of Kosovo or the battle of the Alamo in San Antonio, Texas) can also imbue those places with charisma. Places of refuge can also become charismatic. During the Ottoman rule of Greece, the Greek Orthodox monasteries in Meteora, located on isolated hilltops, became a place of pilgrimage for Greek nationalists who wanted to rediscover true and unspoiled Greek Orthodox beliefs. The charisma of the isolated place and the charisma of the ascetic monks reinforce each other, and Meteora was seen as a refuge for true Greek national charisma. The focus on these isolated ascetic monks made it possible to detach Greek history from the much larger Byzantine and Ottoman empires. This legitimised the creation of a separate Greek state (Nikonanos 1987).

Distance in space is also part of the charismatic appeal of a Promised Land for those not living there but who intend to migrate there in the future and leave
behind their suffering caused by an established regime. The Promised Land, with its milk and honey, contrasts with the harsh reality of everyday life, particularly for deprived sectors of the population. The distance to the Promised Land is frequently part of the charismatic appeal; this is somewhat similar to charismatic leaders who partly base their charismatic appeal on their entrance from the outside. The colonies and North America were a nineteenth and twentieth-century Promised Land for many poor Europeans, as were the frontier and California in nineteenth-century America. The possibilities these new territories offered to migrants helped to legitimise the American regime. Different from monuments and heritage sites, this kind of legitimation was not so much the result of intentional actions, but instead emerged more or less spontaneously.

The charisma of a better future can also be projected on futuristic places. Unlike the remote and out of sight Promised Land, the charisma of futuristic places is based on their visibility in everyday life. The better future is already partially present in purposely built charismatic places. Bureaucratic regimes legitimise their rule by their efficiency and future results. They mobilise public support by presenting how the future under their regime will look. The charisma of the future is frequently linked to specific places where the better future of tomorrow is already visible and visitable today. This paradox of a place already here today but pointing to the modern and better future is very charismatic. The location of these futuristic places can be somewhat secluded like pilgrimage sites (e.g., Futuroscope near Poitiers, France), but they can also be very visible in daily life. In the German Democratic Republic, the *Palast der Republik*, a large modernist building completed in 1976 with many social amenities such as well-supplied restaurants, was constructed with the East German regime’s intention to give the population a preview into the communist future (Neill 1997).

That spaces and places can have important symbolic meaning is widely accepted (Cresswell 2004). Weber’s analysis of charisma helps us to further differentiate between types of symbolic spaces and their political functions. The distinction between backward looking heritage sites and forward looking futuristic places used to legitimise different types of regimes is especially interesting. The next sections will further investigate the relation between these two types of charismatic places and the legitimation of specific regimes.

### From Ideal Typical Charismatic Places to the Legitimation of Nation-States

These futuristic charismatic places and the monuments and heritage sites of past charisma are important places for the legitimisation of established regimes; both types of charismatic places are used for legitimation of very different types of non-charismatic regimes. While traditional regimes focus on the past, bureaucratic regimes focus more on the future. Traditional regimes, based on morality (*wertrational*), legitimise their rule by linking it to their charismatic past. Their legitimacy is based on past performance, and places linked to their charismatic past thus legitimise their rule. In contrast, bureaucratic regimes are based on efficiency (*zweckrational*) (Weber 1980:124). Persuading the population that this rational regime will perform even better in the future is important for their
legitimacy. Futuristic places legitimise bureaucratic regimes by showing the population how its rule will further improve daily life in the future. This modernistic future, already visible and visitable today, provides futuristic places with the charisma of radical transformation into a new and better world, thus legitimising the bureaucratic regime. Thus ideal bureaucratic regimes are legitimised by forward-looking charismatic places, while traditional regimes are legitimised by backward-looking charismatic places.

However, these are Weberian ideal types that, in their purity, do not exist in complex reality. In fact, existing regimes mix characteristics of both traditional and bureaucratic regimes. Nation-states use both traditional backward-looking and rational forward-looking charismatic places to legitimise themselves. This is linked to the Janus face of modern nationalism, which looks both backwards to a glorious past and forwards to a magnificent future (Nairn 1975). Nation-states depend on both traditional and rational forms of legitimacy: they use a traditional form by constructing a long continuous history of their territorial rule, while they further legitimise themselves through the promise of an even better future, which will be created through the efficiency of their modern bureaucracy.

Accordingly, nation-states use different types of charismatic places to legitimise their rule. In France, for example, statues of Joan of Arc link the French state with this charismatic national leader in a traditional way. It also uses the more revolutionary charisma captured in the monument at the Bastille, the storming of which marked the beginning of the French revolution that toppled the traditional regime of the French kings. The French state also initialised the creation of the futuristic Futuroscope near Poitiers to demonstrate the possibilities of new media to the French public. It is also a technopole, which attracts innovative firms by high-tech facilities and the presence of important educational institutions.

The importance of national monuments is not eternal. The charisma of places like Nelson’s Column in London, the Arc de Triomphe in Paris, and the Place du centenaire in Brussels diminished over time. The meaning of monuments in the national narrative can also change. Berlin’s Brandenburg Gate began as a monument to celebrate Prussian military success. During the Cold War it became a symbol of how the division of the world into two blocks literally divided the heart of Berlin. The charismatic event of the peaceful demolition of the Berlin Wall by the masses of East German citizens transformed the symbolism of the Brandenburg Gate. Based on memories of the charismatic fall of the Wall, it now symbolises the reunited capital of the reunited Germany. Its changed symbolism is now used to legitimise the new Germany (Jurt 1993). It has also become a very popular venue for festivities celebrating the new German national identity, including public viewings of important national football team matches and New Year’s Eve celebrations.

Changing the Charismatic Meaning of a Place: The Zeche Zollverein in the Ruhr Area

Many charismatic places do not fit well in the ideal type distinction between the different types of spatial charisma. This does not mean that the classification is not
useful. Weber’s motivation to use ideal types was not to describe reality in its complexity, but to understand the different mechanisms which form reality. Ideal types incorporate these different aspects in their logically pure form. These ideal types are not hypotheses to explain reality, but help us to understand the different processes behind reality (Weber 1980). The previous sections discussed different forms and examples of spatial charisma, and the previous section focussed on how nation-states use different types of charismatic places to legitimise their rule. This section analyses how the combination of a heritage site and a futuristic place gives the obsolete coal mine Zeche Zollverein in Essen a special charisma for Germany’s Ruhr area as a whole. By housing both a museum of the industrial past and a cultural and design centre for the future, the Zeche Zollverein combines and embodies the charisma of a glorious past with the charisma of a magnificent future.

The current use of the Zeche Zollverein as a symbol for the restructuring of the entire Ruhr area is rooted in the region’s industrial history (Schwarz 2008:10). Coal mining was crucial for the region’s industrial development. Its role in transforming the Ruhr area into the world’s largest and most modern industrial region gave coal mining a certain charisma in the nineteenth century. Coal fuelled industrialisation, which transformed traditional German society (Goch 2002).

The winding tower of a coal mine had a unique charisma that is distinct from the vague general charisma of coal mining. The large winding towers visible from afar became the symbol of the mine and thus the focus of the charisma attached to mining. Its charisma was strengthened by its function in the operation of the mine: it transported the miners and the coal, thus linking the darkness of the underworld of the mine with the light and blue skies of the surface. Riding it signified for the miners the transition from work to leisure and from danger to safety. The rescue work after accidents focussed on the winding tower, where the local population eagerly waited for the survivors or the casualties. The symbolism or charisma of the winding tower is somewhat comparable to that of a church tower. The monumentality of the winding tower is further emphasised by the empty space of the court of honours (Ehrenhof) in front of it. The winding tower was also the focus of the secluded neighbourhoods most miners lived in. While it was an important local symbol for the miners, it also symbolised efficient large-scale production in the Ruhr area, which legitimised the economic regime despite its social inequalities and destructive ecological effects (Schwarz 2008:30, 52–58).

The regional identity in the Ruhr area developed slowly and was based on size. The population developed some civic pride from their contribution to the fast developing, most modern, and largest industrial region of the world (Ditt and Tenfelde 2007). In general, however, the coal miners identified more strongly with their social class. Their unions were strong, and, until the Nazi regime, they mostly supported the Communist Party. Migration also hindered the development of a regional identity. The mines in the Ruhr area attracted many migrants from within Germany and, later, other parts of Europe.

Coal mining not only provided the Ruhr area with positive charisma; it was also part of the black, polluted, over-industrialised, conflict-ridden stereotype of the Ruhr in the rest of Germany. This negative image stuck to the Ruhr area in the
outside world (Schwarz 2008:45) and even became more important after the industrial decline and the virtual disappearance of the coal industry from the 1960s. This undermined the positive charisma of the size, productivity, and modernity of the Ruhr area. The oldest, smaller collieries located mostly in the South were closed first. These sites were levelled and used as new industrial sites to locate the new industries that with state subsidies created new employment for the redundant miners. The northern part of the Ruhr area, where the largest mining and industrial complexes were concentrated, was the last to be affected by this industrial decline. This transformed the Emscher zone into an area of industrial blight in the 1980s.

The decline of this old core of the Ruhr area not only undermined the regional economy, but also tore away the basis of regional identity. Creating new local pride required the identification of new iconic landmarks like the Zeche Zollverein. Policymakers also linked the industrial decline to a conservative mentality, and thus transforming the Zeche Zollverein into a futuristic place was intended to change the mindset of the backward-oriented population. The transformation of the Zeche Zollverein was imposed upon the local population by the regional and national government. The explicit goal was to create an icon that would legitimise the Ruhr area’s transformation from an industrial to a service economy (Schwarz 2008:21, 36, 286). Due to the fiscal crisis of the German state in the 1980s, the Ruhr area was no longer able to subsidise its problems away, especially as the scale of these problems escalated. Instead, the German state embarked upon a new type of regional development policy which focussed more on the image of the region. It used some selected projects to link the charisma of the industrial past with the charisma of a new and better future, which was built on a new creative economy based on culture and design. Transforming old industrial estates into monuments was also, in the short run, cheaper than demolishing them. Between 1989 and 1999, the international construction exhibition IBA aimed to transform the destitute industrial zone in the northern Ruhr area into an Emscher Park (van Houtum and Lagendijk 2001; Franz, Güles, and Prey 2008; Schwarz 2008).

The Zeche Zollverein fitted very well into this project. It was the largest mining complex, which was just then closing. Architecturally, it is also quite remarkable. Built in the 1920s, it linked up several old collieries into the largest and most modern mining complex in the world. Its strictly functionalist architecture made it a futuristic icon of modern industry in the 1920s (Schwarz 2008:61, 65). The general transformation of the Ruhr area can thus be exemplified by the Zeche Zollverein (Schwarz 2008:56). It has become a heritage site and now houses the Ruhr Museum, which features the best exhibits of other museums in the Ruhr area. However, it has simultaneously developed into a futuristic place with modernist architecture. Many firms of the creative economy that focus on design, architecture, and engineering are located in the old buildings. The area also houses the Zollverein School of Management and Design, which is ‘the only research and educational institute of its kind in Europe’.

The size of the Zeche Zollverein contributes to its charisma. The superlative is used in many instances to signify its special and charismatic character; for example, it still boasts that it was the largest and most efficient coal mine with
the biggest welded winding tower. It also flaunts being elected as the best known industrial heritage site in the Ruhr area (Joly 2003) and further presents itself as ‘the world’s most beautiful coal mine’ and as the best event location in Germany.\textsuperscript{5} Interestingly, the newly built escalator to the museum was initially branded as the longest escalator in Europe. Now the superlative branding of the escalator has been rephrased as the longest free standing escalator in Germany. This size-based spatial charisma and the use of the superlative are not only used for the Zeche Zollverein but also for the Ruhr area as a whole. The marketing of the cultural capital of Europe elaborately stresses the large number of museums, theatres, and concert halls. In contrast to this accumulation of elite culture, it also organises mass events for all inhabitants, like the Love Parade in Duisburg and the construction of the longest coffee table in the world along a highway closed off for the occasion. The region as a whole now presents itself as a metropolitan region due to its comparable size to London and Paris.\textsuperscript{6}

The Zeche Zollverein is both a heritage site and a futuristic place. These are linked through sharing the same location and production-based narratives. The modernist architecture of the coal mine’s buildings link the old industrial production of coal with the new industrial design companies that are partially housed in the old collieries. Policymakers argue that the new futuristic developments fit very well into a heritage site of modernity. The Zeche Zollverein is thus an interesting example of how the spatial charisma of sites can combine and transform the charisma of the past into the charisma of a better future. This is not a spontaneous process but was an explicit strategy of actors exercising bureaucratic spatial power to create new forms of regional identity to legitimise their policies. The German state has spent hundreds of millions of Euros funding the renovation of the Zeche Zollverein (Schwarz 2008:268, 297). It prefers to concentrate much of its resources on the Zeche Zollverein to create for the world an example of the successful restructuring of the Ruhr area. This was initially opposed by large sectors of the local population. They agreed on retaining the Zeche Zollverein as a heritage site because of its local historical significance. However, many opposed its development as a futuristic site based on design and culture, which was opposite to their everyday life of deprivation. The elitist character of its new cultural function was also opposed by many of these old coal miners. They saw the Zeche Zollverein as an elitist island in the depressed Ruhr area. They resented the costly development of the Zeche Zollverein by a state that simultaneously cut local welfare spending. The initial opposition between the local population and regional planners has now somewhat abated. The local population adopted a more positive attitude since its recent completion, and it has become increasingly popular as a recreational area for the locals (Schwarz 2008:23, 274, 304, 330).

Conclusion

This article’s exploration of the relation between charisma and space has shown that space plays a role in the emergence of pure charisma as analysed by Weber. Coming from the outside to overthrow an established regime is important for the creation of charismatic leadership. How spatial charisma is used by
non-charismatic regimes to legitimise their rule was also discussed. These different types of spatial charisma have in common that they are outside the everyday life regulated by established regimes. In other words, these charismatic places are outside the space or time of everyday life. Their relation with time differs between regimes. Traditional regimes focus on heritage sites and monuments that refer to their charismatic past. They legitimise their rule by looking backwards. Bureaucratic regimes use more futuristic places to show the population a better future to be realised by their rational and efficient rule. Bureaucratic regimes thus legitimise their rule by looking forward. Nation-states combine both types of legitimation and use both types of charismatic places for legitimation. Although these different theoretical ideal types hardly exit in reality, they help us to better understand the different aspects of specific symbolic sites.

The discussion of the emergence of the Zeche Zollverein as the icon of the restructuring Ruhr area demonstrated how the complex charismatic meaning of a place can change over time. The German government used it to improve the image of the region and to legitimate its regime of restructuring by creating a charismatic place linking the glorious past with the grand future. The special history of the Ruhr area is mirrored with a special new future, symbolised by the Zeche Zollverein. Thus, spaces have no inherent charisma; rather, the charisma of spaces is constructed and shaped by state policies.

Notes

1 Organisational and industrial innovations can also be conceptualised as new charismatic developments that change established production regimes. It is widely recognised that innovations tend to originate outside the main places of power. For example, peripheral mountainous areas pioneered the industrial revolution. Being outside the established urban society in the core seems to have been important for the motivation and the possibility to develop new ways of production. The true industrial revolution took place when these charismatic new techniques were applied on a large scale in more urban regions (Pollard 1997).

2 In our present globalising world the charisma of some leaders like Nelson Mandela and Barack Obama affects people all over the world. As this hardly changes the political regimes outside their national contexts, this new global form of charisma has few direct political consequences. The example of Gandhi shows that this kind of global charisma is not new and that its influence is much less directly political and is much more based on indirect influence through ideas and practices.
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