

# **FOUNDATION OF SOCIOLOGICAL THEORIES**

**BA SOCIOLOGY**

**2011 Admission onwards**

**III Semester**

**CORE COURSE**



**UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT**

**SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION**

CALICUT UNIVERSITY.P.O., MALAPPURAM, KERALA, INDIA – 673 635

**279**

**UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT**  
**SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION**

STUDY MATERIAL

BA SOCIOLOGY

**III Semester**

CORE COURSE

**FOUNDATION OF SOCIOLOGICAL THEORIES**

Prepared by:

Module I & II *Smt.Rakhi.N.*  
*Assistant Professor,*  
*Department of Sociology,*  
*Zamorians Guruvayoorappan College,*  
*Calicut.*

Module III & IV *Dr.Sara Neena.M.,*  
*Associate Professor,*  
*Department of Sociology,*  
*Vimala College, Thrissur.*

Scrutinised by:

*Dr.N.P.Hafiz Mohamad,*  
*“Manasam”,*  
*Harithapuram,*  
*Chevayoor,*  
*Calicut.*

Layout & Settings

Computer Section, SDE

©

Reserved

## **CONTENTS**

MODULE I	FORMATION OF SOCIOLOGICAL THOUGHT	05-14
MODULE II	FOUNDERS OF SOCIOLOGICAL THOUGHT	15-25
MODULE III	EMILE DURKHEIM (1858 – 1917)	26-30
MODULE IV	MAX WEBER (1864-1920)	31-37



# MODULE I

## FORMATION OF SOCIOLOGICAL THOUGHT

### **Emergence of Sociology**

Having grown up during the aftermath of the French Revolution, Auguste Comte was the first to use the term sociology as a way of studying the world in terms of society. Along with the industrial revolution in England during the 18th century and the rise of urbanisation and mass social change, thinkers such as Comte, Durkheim and Marx began to realise the need to study society in all its dynamic nature. This period of history is often described as ‘the great transformation’, which led to the emergence of sociology. Around the late 18th century an intellectual period known as ‘the Enlightenment’ challenged many of the established orders of society from an analytical and scientific perspective. Following French revolution, the citizens of France were granted new legal rights, a broad centralised education system and a new system of inheritance. These changes all challenged a previous traditional model, and hence gave individual citizens a different perspective of society.

It could be argued that the intellectual revolution known as ‘the Enlightenment’ laid the foundation for the French revolution which created significant social change. It brought about an ideology which believed that scientific and historical study should be looked at and incorporated into a philosophical perspective. Enlightenment figures such as Charles Montesquieu, one of the pioneers of social science, saw humanity as something that develops from infancy to maturity with conflict in between the different stages. He also believed that the Enlightenment could be the beginning of a great period of human development, as science was being applied to humanity. This could be described as the birth of sociology and of social scientific thought.

The Enlightenment period coincided with the increase in knowledge in other scientific fields such as life sciences. Darwin’s studies on evolution challenged the old established ideas of the church. The concept of ‘Social Darwinism’ was based on the ideology that society will gradually improve on the basis that the ‘fittest’ will be the most successful and therefore ‘survive’. The period of the late 18th century and early 19th century contributed significantly to the emergence of sociology due to the significant revolutions that occurred during this time.

The Enlightenment was in many respects a renaissance of scientific thought and signalled the beginning of sociology as a discipline. It changed the way philosophers looked at the world by giving a scientific and analytical approach to their theories. This intellectual revolution made way for the French revolution, and is thought by some to be the most important political event of modern times. It granted citizens individual freedoms and removed old established orders such as the church and crown, and gave people a new perspective of the world and the society in which they live. The French revolution also led to the emergence of Nationalism which changed the way many people viewed the state as whole.

The industrial revolution saw massive changes in society by the destruction of the feudal system and the establishment of capitalism, which is a key area of discussion within sociology. Urbanisation and industrialisation led to the emergence of the working class as a large and powerful body, which led to the birth of Marxism, and gave people a new perspective and relationship with the society they lived in. Thus French revolution and Industrial revolution were events integral to the emergence of sociology and social sciences.

## **Social background of Sociology**

Sociology emerged from enlightenment thought, shortly after the French Revolution, as a positivist science of society. Its genesis owed to various key movements in the philosophy of science and the philosophy of knowledge. Modern academic sociology emerged as a reaction to modernity, capitalism, urbanization, rationalization, and secularization. Within a relatively brief period the discipline greatly expanded and diverged, both topically and methodologically, particularly as a result of reactions against empiricism.

## **French Revolution**

The French revolution challenged and overthrew the old order of society. It was a revolution that strengthened the state which aimed to represent the will of the people. It is important to recognise that the political and cultural climate that existed before the revolution was dominated by the church and the monarchy.

The French Revolution was a period of radical social and political upheaval in France that had a major impact on France and throughout the rest of Europe. The absolute monarchy that had ruled France for centuries collapsed in three years. French society underwent drastic transformation. Feudal, aristocratic and religious privileges were removed from the society. Old of monarchy, aristocracy, and religious authority were overthrown by new Enlightenment principles of equality and citizenship. The Ancien Régime, the aristocratic, social and political system established in France from approximately the 15th century to the 18th century was identified as one of the causes of the Revolution. Economic factors included hunger and malnutrition after several years of poor grain harvests. Bad harvests rising food prices, and an inadequate transportation system that hindered the shipment of bulk foods from rural areas to large population centers contributed greatly to the destabilization of French society in the years leading up to the Revolution. Another cause was the state's effective bankruptcy due to the enormous cost of previous wars, particularly the financial strain caused by French participation in the American Revolutionary War. France's inefficient and antiquated financial system was unable to manage the national debt, which was both caused and aggravated by the burden of an inadequate system of taxation. Meanwhile, the royal court at Versailles was seen as being isolated from, and indifferent to, the hardships of the lower classes.

Many other factors involved resentments and aspirations given focus by the rise of Enlightenment ideals. These included resentment of royal absolutism, resentment by peasants, laborers and the bourgeoisie toward the traditional privileges possessed by the nobility, resentment of the Church's influence over public policy and institutions, aspirations for freedom of religion, resentment of aristocratic bishops by the poorer rural clergy; aspirations for social, political and economic equality, and republicanism.

The French Revolution began in 1789 with the convocation of the Estates-General in May. The first year of the Revolution saw members of the Third Estate proclaiming the Tennis Court Oath in June, the assault on the Bastille in July, the passage of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen in August, and an epic march on Versailles that forced the royal court back to Paris in October. The next few years were dominated by tensions between various liberal assemblies and a right-wing monarchy which tried to resist major reforms.

A republic was proclaimed in September 1792 and King Louis XVI was executed the next year. Internally, popular sentiments radicalized the Revolution significantly, culminating in the rise of Maximilien Robespierre and the Jacobins and virtual dictatorship by the Committee of Public

Safety during the Reign of Terror from 1793 until 1794 during which between 16,000 and 40,000 people were killed. After the fall of the Jacobins and the execution of Robespierre, the Directory assumed control of the French state in 1795 and held power until 1799, when it was replaced by the Consulate under Napoleon Bonaparte.

The modern era has unfolded in the shadow of the French Revolution. The growth of republics and liberal democracies, the spread of secularism, the development of modern ideologies, and the invention of total war originated during the Revolution. Subsequent events that can be traced to the Revolution include the Napoleonic Wars, two separate restorations of monarchy (Bourbon Restoration and July Monarchy), and two additional revolutions (1830 and 1848) as modern France took shape.

### **Decline of Estate System**

French Society was divided into three classes or "estates". The first estate was the clergy, the second estate, nobility and the third estate, the commoners. Each estate was granted an equal voice in an advisory legislative group called the Estates General who would meet whenever there was a need to advise the king. The Estates General had no real power under the absolute monarchy of Louis XIV.

The estate system was division of three different groups. The first estate was made up of the clergy (Church). Although the clergy amounted to no more than a hundred thousand men, they owned about 1/10th of the land in France. The clergy enjoyed many privileges. The second estate was made up of nobles and kings. They lived rich lives and taxed peasants to avoid paying their taxes. The power of this class was based on the feudal seigniorial system. They served as councillors to the royalty, diplomats and governors. They enjoyed rights of local justice, village surveillance, monopoly over hunting and the maintenance of wells and wine presses. The most important differentiation between the nobles and the non-nobles was that the former enjoyed immunity from direct taxation and various other taxes. The traditional nobility held political authority on the basis of landed wealth and got this as a reward to the military aid given to the king. The Third estate was everybody else. They were workers and farmers. The third estate was taxed heavily making the poor poorer and this helped the rich stay rich.

All three of these estates had influence on the French Revolution; without them, the revolution never would have existed. It was because of the oppression of the higher classes that the lower class rose up and stood up to them. The third estate was suppressed and delineated in society. The third estate reacted against this situation whereas, the other two acted as if things were perfect in their present state.

### **Emergence of Capitalism and Establishment of Democracy in Europe**

Capitalism in Europe followed the stage of feudalism. Under feudalism, land was the main means of production. Land was owned by feudal lords, and a large number of peasants bound to the land worked in the farms. There were also a small number of artisans too. The surplus product of these peasants and artisans was extracted by the feudal lords. The basic conflict in feudal society, the conflict that propelled society forward, was between these direct producers and the landowning lords. In order to maintain their class power, the feudal lords tried to maximise the rent they extracted from the peasants. The peasants struggled in various ways to end this extraction of the surplus.

In the course of these struggles many peasants were able to relax the stranglehold of the lords, to keep some surplus for themselves, and to improve and extend their cultivation. Additionally some artisans and merchants became wealthy enough to buy land in their own right, breaking the lords' monopoly on land ownership. And so another process began: some producers improved their production faster than others, and were able to accumulate some capital and over time there developed a class of relatively prosperous farmers along with the poor peasants. This polarisation helped lay the basis for the wage labour that would be needed under capitalism.

Over the centuries of feudal society, as the surplus grew to some extent, trade also grew. Around that trade grew towns where merchants enjoyed some political power. The money power of the towns, the relative political freedom of the towns, and the contact with ideas from distant lands helped to create changes in religious doctrines and philosophy, mathematics and science. The associated change in the world-view of the intelligentsia has been termed the Enlightenment. According to the new ideology, the force of human Reason replaced established authority, such as the Church and the King. The State itself was now no longer seen as God-given, but the product of Man, a 'social contract' among men for their benefit. That implied that if the State were not functioning for their benefit, it was justified to overthrow it and replace it with a new one.

Under feudalism, most household requirements were made at home. A limited number of goods were produced for the market by artisans/craftsmen employing, say, two or three men, working with their own tools and raw materials. But as trade grew, merchants, seeking to increase production, began supplying materials and purchasing the finished goods from the craftsmen; the latter largely lost their independence and were now working for the merchant. However, what definitively marked the emergence of *capitalism* was not simply production for the market, but the system in which all the means of production – the tools/machines, the raw materials, and the location – belonged to the capitalist, and the labourer had nothing to sell but his/her own labour power. Feudalism had needed the use of custom, law and force to extract the surplus from the producers, but under capitalism it was no longer necessary to rely on such non-economic methods. The worker had the choice of working for the capitalist or starving. Surplus extraction now was carried out by the impersonal laws of the market. The new capitalists demanded the abolition of monopolies and privileges in trade and industry on which merchant capital had fattened under feudalism, and thus established free competition at home.

### **Intellectual background of Sociology**

The discipline of Sociology was heavily influenced by the enlightenment period. The Enlightenment was a period of intellectual development and change in philosophical thought beginning in the eighteenth century. Enlightenment thinkers sought to combine reason with empirical research on the model of Newtonian science. They tried to produce highly systematic bodies of thought that made rational sense and that could be derived from real-world observation. They were of the opinion that the social world could be controlled using reason and research. They also believed that traditional social values and institutions were irrational and inhibited human development. Their ideas conflicted with traditional religious bodies of feudalism. They placed their faith instead in the power of the individual's capacity to reason. Early sociology also maintained a faith in empiricism and rational inquiry.

## **Scientific revolution**

The Scientific Revolution changed the way people saw the world. The movement helped shape the attitudes that made the scientific advances of the modern world possible. Many new ideas were developed about humanity's place in the universe and the universe itself. Throughout Europe many individuals began to critically analyse the validity of existing theories. The philosophers and intellectuals of this period had immense faith in the power of human reason. The Scientific Revolution was enormously impressed by Isaac Newton's theory of gravity. The scientists of this period tried to discover the laws underlying all of nature and society. A greater importance was placed on the discovery of truth through the observation of nature rather than through the study of religious sources.

The rise of the new science progressively undermined the ancient geocentric conception of the cosmos. The dramatic success of the new science in explaining the natural world promoted philosophy to an independent force with the power and authority to challenge the old and construct the new, in the realms both of theory and practice, on the basis of its own principles.

## **Freedom of thought**

Freedom of thought is the freedom of an individual to hold a viewpoint, or thought, regardless of anyone else's view. The suppression of freedom of thought is a prominent characteristic of totalitarian and authoritarian regimes, while freedom of thought is one of the fundamental principles of most democracies. Freedom of thought helped in the development of revolutionary ideas and thought.

The Enlightenment may be characterized as a catalyst for the development of particular styles of social thought. It does not represent a set of ideas which can be clearly demarcated, extracted and presented as a list of essential definitions, but represents a general shift in thought. These ideas, when fused with governmental practice, produced some core themes.

- A concept of freedom based upon an autonomous human subject who is capable of acting in a conscious manner.
- The pursuit of a universal and foundational 'truth' gained through a correspondence of ideas with social and physical reality.
- A belief in the natural sciences as the correct model for thinking about the social and natural world over, for example, theology and metaphysics.
- The accumulation of systematic knowledge within the progressive unfolding of history.

Collectively, these changes acted as catalysts for the scientific study of human societies.

## **Efforts to interpret Social change**

Sociology and other social sciences emerged from a common tradition of reflection of social phenomena. The development of sociology and its current contexts has to be understood in the contexts of the major changes of the modern world. Sociology originated in 18th century philosophy, political economy and cultural history. The major conditions, societal changes and revolutions that gave rise to the emergence and development of sociology as an academic science

include the Industrial Revolution, French Revolution, the Enlightenment and advances in natural sciences and technology. These revolutions had brought about significant societal changes and disturbances in the ways of society. Since sociology was born in the midst of the great socio-political and economic and technological changes of the western world, it is said to be the science of modern society. The pioneering sociologists were very much concerned about the great changes that were taking place and they felt that the existing sciences could not help understand, explain, analyse and interpret the fundamental laws that govern the social phenomena. Thus sociology was born out of these revolutionary contexts and events.

### **Need for a new social science**

We need social science because social processes shape human destinies. If we are to take control of our future, we need to understand society as much as we need to understand the atmosphere, the earth, and other things. Social practices are creating new realities in society. Social science, concerned with this reality, has to be empirical. It tries to discover and describe the way things are in the world. The accuracy of its statements matters, its claims have to be testable and, ultimately, tested. The social sciences developed as a field of study during the nineteenth century. Social science helped people understand the consequences and application of the new technologies.

The precursor to Industrial revolution, French revolution and the American War of Independence was the period of 'Renaissance' which started in Italy in 15th century and later moved northwards sweeping all of Europe. The period of Renaissance changed the complete outlook of the society in the social, cultural, political and economic field. It brought about ideological changes in almost all the spheres. The 'New Scientific Method' led to various discoveries and innovation. It was the 'New Scientific Method' which ultimately gave rise to Industrial revolution. It was marked by change from 'Subsistence society' to 'Monetary society' or Capitalist society. Mass production of factory goods changed the complete social structure. But the social changes were so rapid that society was not able to catch up with the changes. The result was huge amount of unrest in society which threatened social stability. Peasants moving to urban areas, growth of cities, adoption of nuclear family etc. were all opposed to traditions existing prior to Industrial society. It led to rising number of suicides and violence. Thus there was an urgent need to understand the cause of these social changes, and to provide some meaningful explanation for the increased problems. No other discipline was catering to the newly developed problems. These changed scenarios resulted in the rise of 'Science of Society'- Sociology.

### **Philosophical background of Sociology**

The philosophical background of Sociology could be related to the enlightenment period and the dominant philosophical thoughts of the time. The philosophers believed that society could progress by rational thinking about the social world. The enlightenment was influenced by a selection of key thinkers e.g Comte, Weber, Durkheim, Locke and provided many philosophical reasoning during this time. The points that make the enlightenment a critical starting point for sociology are really the way we moved into thinking about progress in society the hope for a utopia. Aim for freedom, reasoning, rationality, universal ideas created a way of studying society. They called this the social physics or sociology and the key thinkers helped create a discipline that has largely been based on these ideas.

## **Enlightenment**

The Age of Enlightenment was a cultural movement of intellectuals whose purpose was to reform society and advance knowledge. It promoted science and intellectual interchange and opposed superstition. The intellectual movement called "The Enlightenment" is usually associated with the 18th century, but its roots in fact go back much further. They believed that human reason could be used to combat ignorance, superstition, and tyranny and to build a better world.

The Enlightenment is the period in the history of western thought and culture, stretching roughly from the mid-decades of the seventeenth century through the eighteenth century, characterized by dramatic revolutions in science, philosophy, society and politics. Enlightenment thought laid the foundation of the French Revolution, in which the traditional hierarchical political and social orders were replaced by a political and social order characterised by the Enlightenment ideals of freedom and equality for all. The Enlightenment begins with the scientific revolution of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The Enlightenment is associated with the French thinkers of the mid-decades of the eighteenth century who were known as "philosophes" included Voltaire, Diderot, Montesquieu, etc. The philosophes constitute an informal society of men of letters who collaborate on a loosely defined project of Enlightenment centered around the project of the Encyclopedia. The Enlightenment was related to ideas about what the human mind was capable of, and what could be achieved through deliberate action and scientific methodology. Many of the new, enlightened ideas were political in nature. Intellectuals began to consider the possibility that freedom and democracy were the fundamental rights of all people. Egalitarianism became the dominant value and it meant fair treatment for all people, regardless of background.

In Europe, Voltaire and Jean-Jacques Rousseau were the torchbearers of Enlightenment literature and philosophy. Rousseau was a strong advocate for social reform of all kinds. Rousseau's work on behalf of social empowerment and democracy would remain influential long after his passing. Espousing similar political positions, Voltaire employed dry wit and sarcasm to make convincing arguments for reform. Together, Voltaire and Rousseau are the most well-known of a collective of European writers who propagated Enlightenment philosophy.

## **Contributions of Rousseau**

Rousseau's most important work is *The Social Contract*, which outlines the basis for a legitimate political order within a framework of classical republicanism. The treatise begins with the dramatic opening lines, "Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains. Those who think themselves the masters of others are indeed greater slaves than they."

Rousseau claimed that people were in the state of nature which was a primitive condition without law or morality. Human beings left the state of nature for the benefits and necessity of cooperation. As society developed, division of labor and private property required the human race to adopt institutions of law. Man is prone to be in frequent competition with his fellow men while also becoming increasingly dependent on them. This threatens both his survival and his freedom. According to Rousseau, by joining together into civil society through the social contract and abandoning their claims of natural right, individuals can both preserve themselves and remain free. This is because submission to the authority of the general will of the people as a whole guarantees individuals against being subordinated to the wills of others and also ensures that they obey themselves because they are, collectively, the authors of the law.

The stated aim of the Social Contract is to determine a legitimate political authority. In order to accomplish more and remove himself from the state of nature, man must enter into a Social Contract with others. In this social contract, everyone will be free because all individuals exercise the same amount of rights and same duties are imposed on all. Rousseau also argues that it is illogical for a man to surrender his freedom for slavery; and so, the participants must be free. Furthermore, although the contract imposes new laws, especially those safeguarding and regulating property, a person can exit it at any time and is again as free as when he was born.

Rousseau says that any administration, whatever form it takes, should be divided into two parts. First, there must be the sovereign who represents the general will and is the legislative power within the state. The second division is that of the government, being distinct from the sovereign. Rousseau claims that the size of the territory to be governed often decides the nature of the government. Since a government is only as strong as the people, the larger the territory the more strength the government must be able to exert over the population. In his view, a monarchical government is able to wield the most power over the people since it has to devote less power to itself, while a democracy the least. In general, the larger the bureaucracy, the more power required for government discipline. When Rousseau uses the word democracy he refers to a direct democracy. Rousseau argues that small city-states are the form of nation in which freedom can best flourish. For any state large enough to require intermediaries between the people and the government, an elected aristocracy may be preferable, and in very large states a benevolent monarch; but even monarchical rule, to be legitimate, must be subordinate to the sovereign rule of law.

### **Contributions of Montesquieu**

Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws* (1748) is one of the outstanding works of modern social thought. He constructed a naturalistic account of the various forms of government and of the causes that made them and that affected their development. He also explained how governments might be preserved from corruption. He saw despotism, in particular, as a standing danger for any government not already despotic, and argued that it could best be prevented by a system in which different bodies exercised legislative, executive, and judicial power, and in which all those bodies were bound by the rule of law.

Montesquieu's aim in *The Spirit of the Laws* is to explain human laws and social institutions. Unlike physical laws, which are, according to Montesquieu, instituted and sustained by God, positive laws and social institutions are created by fallible human beings who are "subject ... to ignorance and error, hurried away by a thousand impetuous passions" In his view, the key to understanding different laws and social systems is to recognize that they should be adapted to a variety of different factors, and cannot be properly understood unless one considers them in this light. Specifically, laws should be adapted "to the people for whom they are framed. When we consider legal and social systems in relation to various factors, Montesquieu believes that we will find that many laws and institutions that had seemed puzzling are in fact quite meaningful. Understanding our laws will also help us to see which aspects of them are genuinely in need of reform, and how these reforms might be accomplished. If lawmakers understand the relation between laws and conditions of their countries and the principles of their governments, they will be in a better position to carry out such reforms without undermining the governments they seek to improve.

Montesquieu says that there are three types of governments: republican governments, monarchies; and despotisms. The republican government can be either democratic or aristocratic. Each form of government has a principle and each can be corrupted if its principle is undermined or destroyed.

In a democracy, the people are sovereign. They may govern through ministers, or be advised by a senate, but they must have the power of choosing their ministers and senators for themselves. The principle of democracy is political virtue, by which Montesquieu means "the love of the laws and of our country" including its democratic constitution. The form of a democratic government makes the laws governing suffrage and voting fundamental. A democracy must educate its citizens to identify their interests with the interests of their country, and should have censors to preserve its mores. Its territory should be small, so that it is easy for citizens to identify with it, and make it difficult for private interests to emerge.

Democracies can be corrupted in two ways: by what Montesquieu calls "the spirit of inequality" and "the spirit of extreme equality". The spirit of inequality arises when citizens no longer identify their interests with the interests of their country, and therefore seek both to advance their own private interests at the expense of their fellow citizens, and to acquire political power over them. The spirit of extreme equality arises when the people are no longer content to be equal as citizens, but want to be equal in every respect. Eventually the government will cease to function, and democracy will be replaced by despotism.

In an aristocracy, one part of the people governs the rest. The principle of an aristocratic government is moderation, the virtue which leads those who govern in an aristocracy to restrain themselves both from oppressing the people and from trying to acquire excessive power over one another. In an aristocracy, the laws should be designed protect this spirit of moderation. To do so, they must do three things. First, the laws must prevent the nobility from abusing the people. Second, the laws should disguise as much as possible the difference between the nobility and the people, so that the people feel their lack of power as little as possible. Finally, the laws should try to ensure equality among the nobles themselves, and among noble families. When they fail to do so, the nobility will lose its spirit of moderation, and the government will be corrupted.

In a monarchy, one person governs "by fixed and established laws" According to Montesquieu, these laws "necessarily suppose the intermediate channels through which power flows. These 'intermediate channels' are such subordinate institutions as the nobility and an independent judiciary; and the laws of a monarchy should therefore be designed to preserve their power. The principle of monarchical government is honor. The chief task of the laws in a monarchy is to protect the subordinate institutions that distinguish monarchy from despotism. A monarchy is corrupted when the monarch either destroys the subordinate institutions that constrain his will, or decides to rule arbitrarily, without regard to the basic laws of his country, or debases the honors at which his citizens might aim. In a functioning monarchy, personal ambition and a sense of honor work together.

In despotic states "a single person directs everything by his own will. Without laws to check him, and with no need to attend to anyone who does not agree with him, a despot can do whatever he likes. The principle of despotism is fear. situation of a despot's subjects is genuinely terrifying. Education is unnecessary in despotism. Because property is not secure in a despotic state, commerce will not flourish, and the state will be poor. The people must be kept in a state of fear by the threat of punishment; however, over time the punishments needed to keep them in line will tend to become more and more severe, until further threats lose their force.

## **Contributions of Saint Simone**

Another important Enlightenment philosopher was Claud Henry de Saint Simon, who fell in-between enlightenment and counter enlightenment ideas. Through the study of western history he believed in rational progress through scientific thought, and a new society based on industrial production and scientific discovery. His ideas were highly influential during this emergence of sociological thought.

Saint-Simon had introduced the concept of "industrialization" and written of social development and differentiation. He analyzed how elites must adapt to social development. He wrote of the role of classes in history. He took up common values and their consequences for society. He distinguished between stable structures and those that have not yet crystallized. He foresaw that European nations would develop into parliamentary republics; he even believed in a European parliament.

Saint-Simon is also a primary figure of socialism. The socialism he represents is usually termed ethical socialism, which is also known as "utopian" socialism when it sought to establish co-operative model societies. This movement emerged when Western Europe embarked on modernization. It belongs to the period when factories became the new predominant institution in certain expansive local communities. Household and workplace were then separated, and the towns and their slums became the everyday setting for people who earlier lived in village. Ethical socialism claimed that human beings enjoy natural rights over the political ones. Ethical socialism postulated everyone's right to a decent living standard and the right to human relations in the emerging urban and industrial society. Saint-Simon also formulated the welfare state's solution to the social question: "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs". His experience of the Revolution had confirmed his opposition to violence as a political method.

In opposition to the feudal and military system he advocated a form of state-technocratic socialism, an arrangement where industrialists would lead society and found a national community based upon cooperation and technological progress, which would be capable of eliminating poverty of the lower classes. In place of the church, he felt the direction of society science. Saint-Simon correctly foresaw the industrialization of the world, and he believed that science and technology would solve most of humanity's problems. Accordingly, in opposition to feudalism and militarism, he advocated an arrangement whereby businessmen and other industrial leaders would control society. What Saint-Simon desired, in other words, was an industrialized state directed by modern science, and one in which society would be organized for productive labour by the most capable men. The aim of society would be to produce things useful to life. Saint-Simon also proposed that the states of Europe form an association to suppress war. These ideas had a profound influence on the philosopher Auguste Comte, who worked with Saint-Simon.

## **MODULE II**

### **FOUNDERS OF SOCIOLOGICAL THOUGHT**

#### **Auguste Comte**

Auguste Comte was a French philosopher. He was a founder of the discipline of sociology and of the doctrine of positivism. He may be regarded as the first philosopher of science in the modern sense of the term. He studied and analyzed the effects of French Revolution, Industrial revolution and Renaissance and found the lack of a social science that studied about society. Therefore, he coined the term sociology in 1838 as a social science to study about society.

Strongly influenced by Henri Saint-Simon, Comte developed the positive philosophy in an attempt to solve the problems of the French revolution, calling for a new social doctrine based on the sciences. Comte was a major influence on 19th century thought, influencing the works of social thinkers such as Karl Marx, John Stuart Mill etc. His concept of sociology and social evolutionism, set the background for early social theorists such as Herbert Spencer.

#### **Concept of Society & Sociology**

Auguste Comte was the first to develop the concept of "sociology." He defined sociology as a positive science. Positivism is the search for "invariant laws of the natural and social world." Comte's positivism has influenced profoundly the ways in which sociologists have conducted sociological inquiry.

Comte argued that sociologists, through theory, speculation, and empirical research, could create a realist science that would accurately "copy" or represent the way things actually are in the world. Comte argued that sociology could become a "social physics" — i.e., a social science on a par with the most positivistic of sciences, physics.

Comte proposed sociology to be studied in two main parts (i) the social statics and (ii) the social dynamics. These two concepts represent a basic division in the subject-matter of sociology. The social statics deals with the major institutions of society such as family, economy or polity. Sociology is conceived of as the study of inter-relations between such institutions. In the words of Comte, "the statical study of sociology consists the investigations of laws of action and reaction of different parts of the social system". He argued that the parts of a society cannot be studied separately, "as if they had independent existence".

If Statics examines how the parts of societies are interrelated, social dynamics focuses on whole societies as the unit of analysis and how they developed and changed through time. According to Comte, the laws of social dynamics are most recognisable when they relate to the largest societies. Comte was convinced that all societies moved through certain fixed stages of development and progressed towards ever increasing perfection. He felt that the comparative study of societies as "wholes" was major subject for sociological analysis.

Comte separated social statics from social dynamics. Social statics are concerned with the ways in which the parts of a social system interact with one another, as well as the functional relationships between the parts and to the social system as a whole. Comte therefore focused his social statics on the individual, as well as such collective phenomena as the family, religion, language, and the division of labor. Comte placed greater emphasis on the study of social dynamics, or social change.

His theory of social dynamics is founded on the law of the three stages; i.e., the evolution of society is based on the evolution of mind through the theological, metaphysical, and positivist stages. Comte believed that sociology would eventually occupy the very pinnacle of a hierarchy of sciences. Comte also identified four methods of sociology. To this day, in their inquiries sociologists continue to use the methods of observation, experimentation, comparison, and historical research.

Comte's "law of the three stages" is an example of his search for invariant laws governing the social world. Comte argued that the human mind, individual human beings, all knowledge, and world history develop through three successive stages. The theological stage is dominated by a search for the essential nature of things, and people come to believe that all phenomena are created and influenced by gods and supernatural forces. Monotheism is the ultimate belief of the theological stage. The metaphysical stage is a transitional stage in which mysterious, abstract forces replace supernatural forces as the powers that explain the workings of the world. The positivist stage is the last and highest stage in Comte's work. In this stage, people search for invariant laws that govern all of the phenomena of the world.

## **Positivism**

Comte says that method to study about society must be scientific. He was the first person to claim that the sociological study must be scientific but not theological thought. He believes if the method is scientific, the sociological research and study becomes factual and based on reality. The structure of a society and its change can be studied through this method. After that sociology became a scientific social science. He talks about social facts too and says there are two types of facts. Simple facts can be found in any society but the complex facts are related to concrete science.

The principle of Positivism is that all knowledge comes from 'positive' information of observable experience. Scientific methods are the best way of achieving this. Positivism seeks empirical regularities, which are correlations between two variables. This does not need to be causal in nature, but it does allow laws to be defined and predictions made.

Positivism may be criticized on the following aspects. Positivism asserts that sense experiences are the only object of human knowledge, but does not prove its assertion. It is true that all our knowledge has its starting point in sense experience, but it is not proved that knowledge stops there. Positivism fails to demonstrate that, above particular facts and contingent relations, there are not abstract notions, general laws universal and necessary principles, or that we cannot know them. Nor does it prove that material and corporeal things constitute the whole order of existing beings, and that our knowledge is limited to them.

## **Herbert Spencer**

Herbert Spencer is a British social thinker. He was the first evolutionist who developed Darwinian evolutionism in the society. He assumed a society is a set of different parts. He compared the society with a biological organism. It functions in the same way as a biological organism does. He wrote many books regarding sociology.

## **Concept of Society**

In terms of their evolutionary stage, Spencer arranged societies in a series as simple, compound, doubly compound, and trebly compound according to the degree of structural complexity. He distinguished between simple societies, which were headless, those with occasional headship, those with unstable headship, and those with stable headship. Compound and doubly compound societies were classified in terms of the complexity of their political organization. Similarly, various types of societies were ranked according to the evolution of their modes of settlement, whether nomadic, semi settled, or settled. Societies generally were said to evolve from simple to compound and doubly compound structures through necessary stages. "The stages of compounding and re-compounding have to be passed through in succession."

In addition to this classification of societies by their degree of complexity, Spencer proposed another basis for distinguishing between types of societies. In this other scheme the focus is on the type of internal regulation within societies. To distinguish between what he called militant and industrial societies, Spencer used as the basis a difference in social organization brought about through forms of social regulation. With peaceful relations come relatively weak and diffuse systems of internal regulations; with militant relations come coercive and centralised controls. The characteristic trait of militant societies is compulsion. The industrial type of society, in contrast, is based on voluntary cooperation and individual self-restraint.

Spencer uses his evolutionary theory to trace the movement from simple to compounded societies and from militant to industrial societies. Society evolves from the compounding and recompounding of social groups. It also evolves from military societies dominated by conflict and a coercive regulative system to industrial societies characterized by harmony and a sustaining system of decentralized rule. Spencer thought the society that he was living in was a "hybrid society," exhibiting traits of both military and industrial societies. Although he ultimately hoped society in general would progress towards a state of industry, he recognized that the regression to a militant state was possible.

## **Social change**

Spencer defined sociology as the study of societal evolution and believed that the ultimate goal of societal evolution is complete harmony and happiness. Spencer's theory of evolutionary change is built upon three basic principles: integration, differentiation, and definiteness. Spencer argued that homogenous phenomena are inherently unstable, which makes them subject to constant fluctuations. Thus homogeneous systems grow to become heterogeneous.

Spencer's general theory of social evolution involves the progress of society towards integration, heterogeneity, and definiteness. It also includes a fourth dimension, the increasing coherence of social groups. Social groups, according to Spencer, strive towards greater harmony and cooperation through the division of labor and the state. It is important to note the Spencer does not develop a linear theory of social evolution; he acknowledges that dissolution or no change at all may occur at any given moment. As society grows, it becomes more complex and differentiated. Structures accompany this growth, which function to regulate external concerns like military activities and sustain internal issues like economic activities. Distributing systems eventually emerge that function to help link together regulative and sustaining structures. Spencer considers the "survival of the fittest" as a law of existence applied to life. Life is the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations.

## Organic analogy

Spencer established the hypothesis that society is like a biological organism and then proceeded to defend it against all objections with great logical force. Indeed, he regarded the recognition of the similarity between society and organism as the first step towards a general theory of evolution. In his "Principles of Sociology" Spencer observed some similarities between biological and social organism:-

Society is thus viewed as being essentially analogous to an organism, with its interdependent parts or organs making up the body of society.

Spencer observed some similarities between biological and social organism:-

- 1) Both society and organisms are distinguished from inorganic matter by visible growth, a child grows up to a man, a small community becomes a great city, a small state an empire.
- 2) Both grow in size and this growth is accomplished by increasing complexity of structure,
- 3) In the organism and in society there is an interdependence of parts. The progressive differentiation of structure in both is accompanied by progressive differentiation of functions.  
In both, the differentiation of structure is followed by a similar differentiation of function.
- 4) The life of society, like the life of an organism is far larger than the life of any of the units of parts.

Differences:-

Having outlined these similarities, Spencer points out the ways in which societies and organisms differ from each other. The differences are as follows,

- 1) The organism is a concrete, integrated whole whereas society is a whole composed of discrete and dispersed elements.
- 2) In an organism consciousness is concentrated in a small part of the aggregate, while in society consciousness is diffused.
- 3) Unlike organisms, societies have no specific external form, such as a physical body with limbs or face.
- 4) In an organism, the parts are fixed and bound together in close contact while, in a society parts are separated and dispersed.
- 5) In an organism the parts exist for the benefit of the whole. In a society, the whole exists merely for the benefit of the individual.

## Criticisms:

The modern sociologists have criticized the organic analogy of Spencer.

- (1) In the words of E.S. Bogardus, Spencer's conclusion contains contradictory elements.
- (2) If a society is an organism, it undergoes a cycle of birth, maturity, and death. But according to the principle of progress, the death of a society is not inevitable, but depends on the vision, plans, courage, and activities of that society's members. A society need never die.
- (3) Timasheff is of the view that merely on the ground of systematic similarity, society cannot be considered as an organism.

## **Karl Marx**

Marx was a world-renowned social philosopher, sociologist and economic historian. He made remarkable contributions to the development of various social sciences including sociology. He contributed greatly to sociological ideas. He introduced key concepts in sociology like social class, social class conflict, social oppression, alienation, etc. Marx, like Comte, argued that people should make active efforts to bring about societal reforms. According to Marx, economic forces are the keys to understanding society and social change. He believed that the history of human society has been that of class conflict. He dreamed of, and worked hard towards realizing, a classless society, one in which there will be no exploitation and oppression of one class by another, and wherein all individuals will work according to their abilities and receive according to their needs. Marx introduced one of the major perspectives in sociology, called social conflict theory.

### **Concept of Social Change**

In their struggle against nature, and to gain their livelihood through associated labor, men create specific forms of social organization in tune with specific modes of production. All these modes of social organization, with the exception of those prevailing in the original stage of primitive communism, are characterized by social inequality. As societies emerge from originally undifferentiated hordes, the division of labor leads to the emergence of stratification, of classes of men distinguished by their differential access to the means of production and their differential power. Given relative scarcity, whatever economic surplus has been accumulated will be preempted by those who have attained dominance through their expropriation of the means of production. Yet this dominance never remains unchallenged. This is why "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles."

Free men and slaves, patricians and plebeians, barons and serfs, guildmasters and journeymen, exploiters and exploited have confronted one another from the beginning of recorded time. Yet Marx, insisted on the principle of historical specificity, that is, he thought it essential to note that each particular class antagonism, rooted in particular productive conditions, must be analyzed in its own right. Each stage in history is conceived as a functional whole, with its own peculiar modes of production, which give rise to distinctive types of antagonisms between exploiting and exploited classes. Class antagonisms specific to each particular mode of production led to the emergence of classes whose interests could no longer be asserted within the framework of the old order; at the same time, the growth of the productive forces reached the limits imposed by previous productive relations. When this happened, the new classes, which represented a novel productive principle, broke down the old order, and the new productive forces, which were developed in the matrix of the old order, created the material conditions for further advance.

### **Relations of Production**

Relations of production is a concept frequently used by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in their theory of historical materialism, and in *Das Kapital*. It is first explicitly used in Marx's published book *The Poverty of Philosophy*, although the concept is already defined in *The German Ideology*. Relations of production are the sum total of social relations which human beings establish among themselves in the production of their material lives.

## **Forces of Production**

"Forces of production" is a central idea in Marxism and historical materialism. In Karl Marx and Frederick Engels's own critique of political economy, it refers to the combination of the means of labor (tools, machinery, land, infrastructure and so on) with human labour power. All those forces which are applied by people in the production process (body & brain, tools & techniques, materials, resources and equipment) are included in this concept. Human knowledge can also be a productive force.

Forces of production refers to the physical means and techniques of production to which laborers add value and transform capital into products for sale. Forces of production include instruments of production and raw materials, as well as the productive faculties of producing agents manifested by strength, skill, and knowledge.

## **Mode of Production**

Mode of production includes everything that goes into the production of the necessities of life, including the "productive forces" (labor, instruments, and raw material) and the "relations of production" (the social structures that regulate the relation between humans in the production of goods. Marx used the term mode of production to refer to the specific organization of economic production in a given society. A mode of production includes the means of production used by a given society, such as factories and other facilities, machines, and raw materials. It also includes labor and the organization of the labor force. The term relations of production refers to the relationship between those who own the means of production (the capitalists or bourgeoisie) and those who do not (the workers or the proletariat). According to Marx, history evolves through the interaction between the mode of production and the relations of production. The mode of production constantly evolves toward a realization of its fullest productive capacity, but this evolution creates antagonisms between the classes of people defined by the relations of production.

According to Marx, the combination of forces and relations of production means that the way people relate to the physical world and the way people relate to each other socially are bound up together in specific and necessary ways. People must consume to survive, but to consume they must produce, and in producing they necessarily enter into relations which exist independently of their will.

For Marx, the the analysis of social order and the causes of social change must be discovered in the specific mode of production that a society has. He further argued that the mode of production substantively shaped the nature of the mode of distribution, the mode of circulation and the mode of consumption, all of which together constitute the economic sphere. To understand the way wealth was distributed and consumed, it was necessary to understand the conditions under which it was produced.

Normally a mode of production shapes the mode of distribution, circulation and consumption, and is regulated by the state. New productive forces will cause conflict in the current mode of production. When conflict arises the modes of production can evolve within the current structure or cause a complete breakdown.

The major types of modes of production are as follows

***Primitive communism***

Human society is seen as organized in traditional tribe structures, typified by shared values and consumption of the entire social product. As no permanent surplus product is produced, there is also no possibility of a ruling class coming into existence. As this mode of production lacks differentiation into classes, it is said to be classless. Palaeolithic and Neolithic tools, pre- and early-agricultural production, and rigorous ritualized social control have often been said to be the typifying productive forces of this mode of production.

***Asiatic mode of production***

This is a controversial contribution to Marxist theory, initially used to explain pre-slave and pre-feudal large earthwork constructions in China, India, the Euphrates and Nile river valleys. The Asiatic mode of production is said to be the initial form of class society, where a small group extracts social surplus through violence aimed at settled or unsettled band communities within a domain. Exploited labour is extracted as forced corvee labour during a slack period of the year. Exploited labour is also extracted in the form of goods directly seized from the exploited communities. The primary property form of this mode is the direct religious possession of communities and all those within them. The ruling class of this society is generally a semi-theocratic aristocracy which claims to be the incarnation of gods on earth. The forces of production associated with this society include basic agricultural techniques, massive construction and storage of goods for social benefit.

***Feudalism***

The feudal mode of production is usually typified by the systems of the West between the fall of the classical European culture and the rise of capitalism, though similar systems existed in most of the earth. The primary form of property is the possession of land in reciprocal contract relations: the possession of human beings as peasants or serfs is dependent upon their being entailed upon the land. Exploitation occurs through reciprocated contract. The ruling class is usually a nobility or aristocracy. The primary forces of production include highly complex agriculture with the addition of non-human and non-animal power devices

***Capitalism***

The introduction of the capitalist mode of production spans the period from Mercantilism to Imperialism and is usually associated with the emergence of modern industrial society. The primary form of property is the possession of objects and services through state guaranteed contract. The primary form of exploitation is wage labour. The ruling class is the bourgeoisie, which exploits the proletariat. Capitalism may produce one class (bourgeoisie) who possess the means of production for the whole of society and another class who possess only their own labour power, which they must sell in order to survive. The key forces of production include the overall system of modern production with its supporting structures of bureaucracy, and the modern state, and above all finance capital.

State capitalism and Corporate capitalism, is a universal form encompassing all recent actually existing economic forms based on the nation state and global process of capital accumulation, whether avowedly capitalist or socialist, which was known only in its more or less pure capitalist forms in Marx and Engels time. Fredrick Engels hypothesized that state capitalism would emerge as the final form of capitalism before the contradictions reach a point where capitalism cannot sustain itself and socialism emerges as its successor.

## Class and Class Conflict

For Marx, the analysis of social class, class structures and changes in those structures are key to understanding capitalism and other social systems or modes of production. In the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels comment that the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.

Analysis of class divisions and struggles is especially important in developing an understanding of the nature of capitalism. For Marx, classes are defined and structured by the relations concerning (i) work and labour and (ii) ownership or possession of property and the means of production. These economic factors more fully govern social relationships in capitalism than they did in earlier societies. The main classes in capitalism are the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. However, other classes such as landlords, petty bourgeoisie, peasants, and lumpenproletariat also exist, but are not primary in terms of the dynamics of capitalism.

- a. Bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie or capitalists are the owners of capital, purchasing and exploiting labour power, using the surplus value from employment of this labour power to accumulate or expand their capital. It is the ownership of capital and its use to exploit labour and expand capital are important here. By employing workers, industrial capital created the surplus value that could take on the various forms such as profit, interest and rent.
- b. Proletariat. The proletariat are owners of labour power and mere owners of labour power, with no other resources than the ability to work with their hands, bodies, and minds. Since these workers have no property, in order to survive and obtain an income for themselves and their families, they must find employment work for an employer. This means working for a capitalist-employer in an exploitative social relationship.

This exploitative work relationship recreates or reproduces itself continually. If the capitalist-employer is to make profits and accumulate capital, wages must be kept low. This means that the proletariat is exploited, with the surplus time worked by the worker creating surplus products. While the worker produces, the products created by this labour are taken by the capitalist and sold – thus producing surplus value or profit for the capitalist but poverty for workers. This occurs each day of labour process, preventing workers from gaining ownership of property and recreating the conditions for further exploitation.

The antagonistic and contradictory nature of this system is evident as capitalists attempting to reduce wages and make workers work more intensively, while workers have exactly the opposite set of interests. Work and the labour process in the capitalist mode of production are organized so that workers remain propertyless members of the proletariat. The surplus products and value created by workers turns into capital, which is accumulated.

While the relationship between workers and capitalists, or between labour and capital may appear to be no more than an economic relationship of equals meeting equals in the labour market, Marx shows how it is an exploitative social relationship. Not only is it exploitative, it is contradictory, with the interests of the two partners in the relationship being directly opposed to each other. Although at the same time, the two opposed interests are also partners in the sense that both capital and labour are required in production and an exploitative relationship means an exploiter and someone being exploited.

This relationship is further contradictory in that it is not just two sets of interests, but there is no resolution of the capital-labour contradiction within the organization of capitalism as a system. The contradictory relationship has class conflict built into it, and leads to periodic bursts of strikes, crises, political struggles, and ultimately to the overthrow of bourgeois rule by the proletariat. Class conflict of this sort results in historical change and is the motive force in the history of capitalism. In Marx's view, the dialectical nature of history is expressed in class struggle. With the development of capitalism, the class struggle takes an acute form. Two basic classes, around which other less important classes are grouped, oppose each other in the capitalist system: the owners of the means of production, or bourgeoisie, and the workers, or proletariat. When people have become aware of their loss, of their alienation, as a universal nonhuman situation, it will be possible for them to proceed to a radical transformation of their situation by a revolution. This revolution will be the prelude to the establishment of communism. It is important to recognize that Marx viewed the structure of society in relation to its major classes, and the struggle between them as the engine of change in this structure.

The key to understanding Marx is his class definition. A class is defined by the ownership of property. Such ownership vests a person with the power to exclude others from the property and to use it for personal purposes. In relation to property there are three great classes of society: the bourgeoisie- who own the means of production such as machinery and factory buildings, and whose source of income is profit, landowners- whose income is rent, and the proletariat- who own their labor and sell it for a wage. Class thus is determined by property, not by income or status. These are determined by distribution and consumption, which itself ultimately reflects the production and power relations of classes. The social conditions of bourgeoisie production are defined by bourgeois property. Class is therefore a theoretical and formal relationship among individuals.

The force transforming latent class membership into a struggle of classes is class interest. Out of similar class situations, individuals come to act similarly. They develop a mutual dependence, a community, a shared interest interrelated with a common income of profit or of wages. From this common interest classes are formed, and for Marx, individuals form classes to the extent that their interests engage them in a struggle with the opposite class.

At first, the interests associated with land ownership and rent are different from those of the bourgeoisie. But as society matures, capital and land ownership merge, as do the interests of landowners and bourgeoisie. Finally the relation of production, the natural opposition between proletariat and bourgeoisie, determines all other activities.

As Marx saw the development of class conflict, the struggle between classes was initially confined to individual factories. Eventually, given the maturing of capitalism, the growing disparity between life conditions of bourgeoisie and proletariat, and the increasing homogenization within each class, individual struggles become generalized to coalitions across factories. Increasingly class conflict is manifested at the societal level. Class consciousness is increased, common interests and policies are organized, and the use of and struggle for political power occurs. Classes become political forces.

The distribution of political power is determined by power over production. Capital confers political power, which the bourgeois class uses to legitimize and protect their property and consequent social relations. Class relations are political, and in the mature capitalist society, the state's business is that of the bourgeoisie. Moreover, the intellectual basis of state rule, the ideas justifying the use of state power and its distribution, are those of the ruling class. The intellectual-social culture is merely a superstructure resting on the relation of production, on ownership of the means of production.

Finally, the division between classes will widen and the condition of the exploited worker will deteriorate so badly that social structure collapses: the class struggle is transformed into a proletarian revolution. The workers' triumph will eliminate the basis of class division in property through public ownership of the means of production. With the basis of classes thus wiped away, a classless society will ensue and since political power to protect the bourgeoisie against the workers is unnecessary, political authority and the state will wither away.

## **Dialectical Materialism**

Dialectical materialism is a strand of Marxism, synthesizing Hegel's dialectics, which proposes that every economic order grows to a state of maximum efficiency, while simultaneously developing internal contradictions and weaknesses that contribute to its systemic decay. Dialectical materialism is the philosophy of Marxism, which provides us with a scientific and comprehensive world outlook. It is the philosophical bedrock - the method - on which the whole of Marxist doctrine is founded. Historical materialism is the extension of the principles of dialectical materialism to the study of social life, an application of the principles of dialectical materialism to the phenomena of the life of society, to the study of society and of its history.

Dialectics comes from the Greek *dialego*, to discourse, to debate. In ancient times dialectics was the art of arriving at the truth by disclosing the contradictions in the argument of an opponent and overcoming these contradictions. There were philosophers in ancient times who believed that the disclosure of contradictions in thought and the clash of opposite opinions was the best method of arriving at the truth. This dialectical method of thought, later extended to the phenomena of nature, developed into the dialectical method of apprehending nature, which regards the phenomena of nature as being in constant movement and undergoing constant change, and the development of nature as the result of the development of the contradictions in nature, as the result of the interaction of opposed forces in nature. In its essence, dialectics is the direct opposite of metaphysics.

The principal features of the Marxist dialectical method are as follows:

### **a) Nature Connected and Determined**

Contrary to metaphysics, dialectics does not regard nature as an accidental agglomeration of things, of phenomena, unconnected with, isolated from, and independent of, each other, but as a connected and integral whole, in which things, phenomena are organically connected with, dependent on, and determined by, each other.

### **b) Nature is a State of Continuous Motion and Change**

Contrary to metaphysics, dialectics holds that nature is not a state of rest and immobility, stagnation and immutability, but a state of continuous movement and change, of continuous renewal and development, where something is always arising and developing, and something always disintegrating and dying away. The dialectical method therefore requires that phenomena should be considered not only from the standpoint of their interconnection and interdependence, but also from the standpoint of their movement, their change, their development, their coming into being and going out of being.

The dialectical method regards as important primarily not that which at the given moment seems to be durable and yet is already beginning to die away, but that which is arising and developing, even though at the given moment it may appear to be not durable, for the dialectical method considers invincible only that which is arising and developing.

**c) Natural Quantitative Change Leads to Qualitative Change**

Contrary to metaphysics, dialectics does not regard the process of development as a simple process of growth, where quantitative changes do not lead to qualitative changes, but as a development which passes from insignificant and imperceptible quantitative changes to open 'fundamental changes' to qualitative changes; a development in which the qualitative changes occur not gradually, but rapidly and abruptly, taking the form of a leap from one state to another; they occur not accidentally but as the natural result of an accumulation of imperceptible and gradual quantitative changes.

The dialectical method therefore holds that the process of development should be understood not as movement in a circle, not as a simple repetition of what has already occurred, but as an onward and upward movement, as a transition from an old qualitative state to a new qualitative state, as a development from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher:

**d) Contradictions Inherent in Nature**

Contrary to metaphysics, dialectics holds that internal contradictions are inherent in all things and phenomena of nature, for they all have their negative and positive sides, a past and a future, something dying away and something developing; and that the struggle between these opposites, the struggle between the old and the new, between that which is dying away and that which is being born, between that which is disappearing and that which is developing, constitutes the internal content of the process of development, the internal content of the transformation of quantitative changes into qualitative changes.

The dialectical method therefore holds that the process of development from the lower to the higher takes place not as a harmonious unfolding of phenomena, but as a disclosure of the contradictions inherent in things and phenomena, as a "struggle" of opposite tendencies which operate on the basis of these contradictions.

## **MODULE III**

### **EMILE DURKHEIM (1858 – 1917)**

Emile Durkheim was born in France in 1858, studied social and political philosophy in Paris and took great interest in the work of Montesquieu and Rousseau. Later he became a Professor of Sociology in Sorbonne University, Paris. Like Auguste Comte and Spencer, Durkheim also made a significant contribution to the development of the scientific sociology in which he excelled his predecessor. He was deeply concerned with the impact of the large-scale structures of society and society itself, on the thoughts and actions of individuals. His influence on sociology is a lasting one. The journal which he started “*Année Sociologique*” as one of the leading journals of sociological thought.

Major works of Durkheim

1. *The Division of Labour in Society*, 1893.
2. *The Rules of Sociological Method*, 1895
3. *Suicide*, 1897.
4. *Collective and Individual Representations*, 1899.
5. *Judgements of Reality and judgements of value*, 1911
6. *The Elementary forms of religious life*, 1912.
7. *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals*.

### **Methodology**

Emile Durkheim was deeply concerned with the impact of the large scale structures of society, and thoughts and actions of individuals. Durkheim studied society more closely scientifically based on empirical tests than any of his predecessors. His methodology earned him a status of a scientific sociology. According to Durkheim, sociology being an independent science and it has a special subject matter. As an independent science it has its own field of study, boundary and method. Durkheim was in part of a positivist and a believer in applying the methods of physical science to the study of social facts. Durkheim argued that sociology should be oriented toward empirical research. He advocated the positive method, because he wanted to study social facts objectively with observation and experimentation. *The Rules of Sociological Method* (1895) stands out clear as a testimony to his claim that sociology is a science. It set out the mode of investigation (logic and method) required to make the sociological method scientific. To study social phenomenon he also formulated functional method. It will help the social scientist to understand and explain things in terms of the functions. Emile Durkheim is certainly the most important sociological forerunner of modern functionalism. As a functionalist, he perceived institutional function within the framework of an integrated society. He was also prominent structuralist in French Sociological thought (Nisbet). Durkheim's concept of social structures is external, constraining and general. According to Durkheim society lives with the people and the members can make, remake as well as remould the social structures. Social behaviors are structured and social relationships are organized into structures and they are value oriented and normative in nature. Whatever the kind of structure, each one of them is allocated a specific role to play; this ensures that a structure between functional. He advocated comparative method because it gives necessary relation between two different variables, situation and contexts. Durkheim made comparison between the primitive and the civilized societies in terms of his concepts division of

labor, and social solidarity and also he studied suicide on the basis of comparative data obtained from various European countries. He established a sound empirical methodology and laid the foundation of structural functionalism. He insisted that sociology too should follow the scientific method for it to be considered a science.

### **Functionalist:**

Durkheim was the first major sociological theorist to use functionalist ideas. Functionalism, as Durkheim perceived was about institutional functions in the first place, but within the framework of an integrated society. According to him society integrates by moral consensus. He argued that various parts of the society would have to work together to build a social system in which to maintain the social order. Some of Durkheim's most important ideas are formed from his life long pursuance of the concept of integration in which he clearly integrates that individuals are part and parcel of society. Society was to be viewed as an entity in itself that can be distinguished from and is not reducible to its constituent parts. In conceiving society as reality *sui generis*, Durkheim in effect gave analytical priority to the social whole. Durkheim in giving causal priority to the whole viewed system parts are fulfilling basic functions, needs or requisites. The frequent use of the notion 'functional needs' is buttressed by Durkheim's conceptualization of social system as normal and pathological states. When we view systems as normal and pathological, as well as by functions, the additional implication is that systems have equilibrium points around which normal functioning occurs. He has placed the society above everything else because to him the society has a reality of its own and also is above the individuals who comprise the society. The individual conscience is shaped by the moral values, beliefs and so on which should be integrated into the conscience of the whole. Durkheim was pre occupied with the functions of the society which is centered round his concept of 'social order'. To achieve social order, there has to be a collective conscience of people based on the accumulated values and culture of the society. Social order will constrain individual selfishness for the sake of greater good and for social conscience to grow.

### **Social Facts**

The development and use of the concept of a social fact lies at the heart of Durkheim's sociology. Durkheim was more interested in studying social world empirically than in philosophizing or in abstract theorizing. In order to separate sociology from philosophy and psychology and to give it a clean and separate identity, Durkheim argued in the Rules of Sociological Method that the distinctive subject-matter of sociology should be the study of social facts. His main aim was to create sociology as a separate and identifiable niche. So sociology should be oriented toward empirical research. The concept of social fact has several components, but crucial in separating sociology from philosophy is the idea that social facts are to be treated as things. In that they are to be treated as things, social facts are to be studied empirically, not philosophically. Durkheim has even defined sociology as a science of social facts. Durkheim argued in *The Rules of Sociological Method* (1895) that the distinctive subject matter of sociology should be the study of social facts.

According to Durkheim social facts represents a category of facts with distinctive characteristics, consisting of ways of acting, thinking and feeling, external to the individual and endowed with a power of coercion by means of which they control him. Durkheim wrote 'social facts are collective ways of acting, thinking and feeling'. To him "social facts are passed from one generation to another and received by particular individuals in a more or less complete form".

Social facts must be treated as 'things' as empirical facts from the outside, we must discover them as we discover physical facts. Durkheim argued, sociology must study 'social fact'. To him social factors are external matters to the members of a group or society. Durkheim also warns that we have to get rid ourselves of the preconceptions and prejudices which incapacitate us when we try to know social facts scientifically.

Social facts are not reducible to individual facts. For him social facts are collective ways of acting, thinking and feeling that present the noteworthy property of existing outside the individual consciousness.

Social facts are external to the individuals and exercise a constraint on them. To differentiate sociology from psychology, Durkheim argued that social facts were external to and coercive of the actor. Durkheim has emphatically stated that society is a reality "Suigeneris" above and apart from the individuals.

Social facts have a constraining effect on individuals. Durkheim also recognized the value of 'collective representation and collective consciousness. They are expressly obligatory, even though 'social facts' are constraints upon individuals and imposed upon them.

### **Division of Labour and Social Solidarity**

Durkheim's doctoral thesis, "**division of labour in society**", 1893, is his first major book. It is indeed a classic study of social solidarity. In the book 'The Division of Labour' he has presented two different patterns of society-two ideal types of society; one existed in the primitive period and the other in the industrial period. The core aspect of this work is the relationship between individuals and society or the collectivity. Durkheim tried to determine the social consequences of the division of labour in modern societies.

He argued that the nature of **social solidarity** depends on the extent of the division of labour. Social solidarity refers to "the condition within a group in which there is social cohesion plus co-operative, collective action directed towards the achievement of group goals" by Scott. Durkheim made comparisons between the primitive and the civilized societies in terms of his concept of solidarity. The basis of social solidarity are different in simple societies and complex societies. Life in the primitive period was mechanical and life in the latter was organic. According to him, the primitive society is characterized by "**mechanical solidarity**" based on the "conscience collective" and the modern industrial society is characterized by 'organic solidarity' based on the division of labour. Mechanical solidarity was simplistic, but organized and based on common belief and trust mostly dictated by religion values like totemism. Mechanical solidarity is solidarity of resemblance. No individual differences, high level of collective consciousness and obedience, share same responsibilities, common belief system homogeneity are the major characteristics of mechanical solidarity. Achieving moral consensus and social solidarity were the main concerns of the society at that stage.

**Organic solidarity** is almost the opposite of mechanical solidarity. It emerges with the growth of the division of labour. It can be seen in modern industrial society. As defined by Durkheim, organic solidarity refers to "a type of social solidarity typical of modern industrial society, in which unity is based on the interdependence of a very large number of highly specialized roles in a system involving a complex division of labour that requires the co-operation of almost all the groups and individuals of the society. This type of solidarity is called organic because it is similar to the unity of a biological organism in which highly specialized parts or organs, must work in co-ordination if the organism (or any one of its parts) is to survive". More specialization, high level of differentiation, individualism, narrower range of task and responsibilities etc. are the major characteristics of organic solidarity. In organic solidarity, consensus results from the differentiation itself. Durkheim stated that a society with organic solidarity needed fewer common beliefs to bind members to the society.

## **Durkheim's study of suicide**

Durkheim's most famous monograph 'suicide' is a classic case of empirical study which published in 1897. In this he investigated inductively covering all available causes of suicide. This work related to his Doctoral thesis Division of Labour in various respects. Suicide is an analysis of a phenomenon regarded as pathological, intended to throw light on the evil which threatens modern industrial societies, that is, "anomic". Suicide is an indication of disorganization of both individual and society. Suicide is a kind of indicator of decay in social solidarity. He held that suicide was not an individual but social act.

Durkheim's study of suicide being with a definition of the phenomenon. According to Durkheim suicide refers to "every case of death resulting directly or indirectly from a positive or negative death performed by the victim himself and which strives to produce this result".

Suicide is a conscious act and the person concerned is fully aware of its consequences. Suicide is also a social fact and social order and disorder are at the very root of suicide. He strongly accepts social forces are the real causes of suicide and he rejects all extra-social factors as the causes of suicide. Durkheim has established the view that there are no societies in which suicide does not occur. It means suicide may be considered a 'normal', that is, a regular occurrence.

He identifies four types of suicide dependent upon different degrees and forms of integration; two pairs at opposite ends of a continuum. They are as follows:

### **Egoistic suicide**

Egoistic suicide is a product of relatively weak group integration. It takes place when some members of a society are detached from the mainstream social life caused by 'relaxation of social bonds' and lack of integration program, then, they are thrown into despair. Durkheim's belief is that lack of integration of the individuals into the social group is the main cause for egoistic suicide. Egoistic persons are aloof and cut off from the mainstream of society and do not take full interest in social matters. Such persons get alienated and find it difficult to cope with social alienation and feel impelled to commit suicide.

### **Altruistic Suicide**

This kind of suicide takes place in the form of a sacrifice in which an individual ends his life by heroic means so as to promote a cause or an ideal which is very dear to him. It results from the over integration of the individual into his group. In simple words, altruistic suicide is taking off one's own life for the sake of a cause. It means that even high level of social solidarity induces suicide. Altruistic suicide takes place in many societies where some members having had failed to achieve their objectives, commit suicide. Or that, some members in order to save the honor of the family or the group in which they are strongly integrated commit suicide if not, they would face ignominy and disgrace in the society and would remain as shameful burden on the family as well. For example, Harakiri practice in Japan and the Sutte in India.

### **Anomic Suicide**

Anomic suicide occurs when the rulers that govern the social life fail and we do not know how to behave, or what is appropriate; this often happens during periods of rapid social change, which will be reflected in individuals lives, perhaps through the sudden gain or loss of wealth. In short this takes place when social order breaks down and normative regulations fail to guide the members to remain on course. When the collective conscience weakens, men fall victim to anomic suicides.

## **Fatalistic Suicide**

Fatalistic suicide occurs when the society restrict individuals too much. Or when regulation is excessive. Durkheim described those who are more likely to commit fatalistic suicide as “persons with futures pitilessly blocked and passions violently choked by oppressive discipline”.

Durkheim’s theory of suicide, and the structure of his sociological reasoning, can be seen more clearly if we examine each of his four types of suicide – egoistic, altruistic, anomic, and fatalistic (Bearman, 1991). Durkheim linked each of the types of suicide to the degree of integration into, or regulation by, society (Thorlindsson and Bjarnason, 1998). Integration refers to the degree to which collective sentiments are shared.

## MODULE IV

### MAX WEBER (1864-1920)

Max Weber is probably the best-known and most influential figure in Sociological theory. Weber's work is so varied and subject to so many interpretations that it has influenced a wide array of sociological theories. He entered the field of sociology through law and remained as one among the great Sociologists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Weber in his life earned varied experiences as a soldier, a professor, a politician, a legal expert, as a historian as a economist and also as a Sociologist. Weber is prolific writer whose work covers general philosophy, economics, comparative history, religious, law, bureaucracy stratification and so on. Weber also wrote about the cultures and religion of India, China and South East Asia. He was particularly interested in comparing western culture and society with the values of the Eastern cultures of India, China and Southern Asia.

#### Main Works Of Max Weber

1. "General Economic History"-London: Allen and Unwin-1927
2. "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism"-New York (NY) Scribner-1930
3. "Max Weber on Law in Economy and society"-Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press-1945
4. "From Max Weber: essays in sociology"-NY Oxford University Press-1946
5. "The Theory of Social and Economic organisations"- NY Oxford University Press-1947
6. "The Methodology of Social Sciences"-NY : Free Press-1949
7. "The City"-NY: Free Press-1958
8. "The Sociology of Religion"-Boston-Beacon Press-1963
9. "On Charisma and Institution Building"-Chicago: The University Press-1968
10. "Economy and Society"-in Three Volumes-Totowa, M.J. Bedminster-1968.

#### Other Main Works

1. The Religion of China-The Religion of India-Ancient Judaism.
2. Science as a Vocation and politics as a Vocation
3. Bureaucracy.

### VERSTEHEN

Max weber's Verstehen method is examined in the light of contemporary intellectual background in Germany. It is argued that Verstehen was originally developed by Wilhelm Dilthey and George Simmel as the method of Geisteswissenschaften. According to Dilthey, verstehen explains the psychological reality of the individual, the ultimate basis of all human actions. Both dilthey and Simmel maintained that social actions must be understood in terms of the 'inner-motives of the acting individuals. But Weber defined it in an opposite way, Verstehen as a method of empirical science which attempts to understand 'the meaning' of action, not the motives of acting individuals.

The German word for understanding is *verstehen*. Weber's special use of the term *Verstehen* in his historical research is one of his best-known, and most controversial, contributions to the methodology of contemporary Sociology. Improving sociological research methods by using the method of "bracketing" and the "Verstechen" method. *Verstechen* requires an empathic effort to move into the mind of the other. According to Weber, understanding motives of people why they are acting and behaving in a particular manner can be done by 'Verstechen' method meaning you imagine yourself in the position of the person you are seeking to explain like the empathic way: be in the shoes of the other person you are seeking to feel his/her feeling and experience.

*Verstehen* has come to mean a systematic interpretive process in which an outside observer of a culture attempts to relate to it and understand others. *Verstehen* is now seen as a concept and method central to a rejection of positivistic social science. *Verstehen* refers to Understanding the meaning of action from the actor's point of view. It also implies that unlike that unlike objects in the natural world human actors are not simply the product of the pulls and pushes of external forces. Individuals are seen to create the world by organising their own understanding of it and giving it meaning. To do research on actions without taking into account the meanings they attribute to their actions or environment is to treat them like objects.

## **SOCIAL ACTION**

Weber's entire Sociology was based on his conception of social Action. The aim of social sciences is to arrive at a rational understanding of human action. There is a distinction between behaviour and action. Behaviour is what we do without attaching a meaning to it. Concept of behaviour is reserved. For automatic behaviour that involves no thought processes. Such behaviour was not of interest in Weber's sociology. He was concerned with action that clearly involved the intervention of thought process between occurrence of a stimulus and the ultimate response. Sociology is concerned with meaningful action whether meaning is attributed to as action by an individual or to one by a group of individuals. To Weber, the task of Sociological analysis involved the interpretation of action in terms of its subjective meaning. In his action theory, Weber's clear intent was to focus on individuals and patterns and regulations of action and not on the collectivity.

Perceiving society, Weber believed in the individual right to act in the growth of society. He further found that without the society the individuals would be lost in the wilderness. Social action is a sum total of the actions of the individuals. Weber was keenly interested in the motives, intentions and purposes of the human beings which cause the growth of issues and factors that change ideology of the society. Individuals as social actors, interpret issues giving new meanings and motives to initiate change. To Weber, society encircles from individual contributions. Weber is the first Sociologist to advocate a social action approach.

Weber has identified four different types of social action, characteristically; they are all pure and ideal types. Weber utilized his ideal type methodology to clarify the meaning of action. The first one is the traditional action, is determined by the actor's habitual and customary ways of behaving. The great bulk of all everyday action to which people has become habitually accustomed approaches this type.

Weber's second type of action that based on emotion. The purely effectual it is determined by the emotional state of the action. This sort of action can relieve emotions for the time being. Weber believed that this kind of action is less affective and important in today's society. The third one is the instrumental rational action. In this type, the actor assesses both the goal and the means by which the goal can be achieved. In this type, goal and means to achieve the particular goal are important. Without the means, goal cannot be achieved.

The fourth type is the value related rational action. This action is rational based on the equation between the goal and the satisfaction on the sacrifice being made for. Weber said in his book titled *Economy and Society* Sociology is a science which it is concerned with social action and its course and consequences. The social action is something to which an individual defences and gives meaning to his or her actions and also attaches a meaning on account of behaviour of others.

The individual is conscious of the fact that his/her action is something that only concerns the society, nothing else. To Weber, motives of the individuals are important as well which generate forces of action. Weber was well aware that any given action usually involves some combination of all four ideal types of action.

## **Rationalisation**

Rationalisation as an ideal type and as an historical force appears in much of Weber's writings. He regards the development of rational forms to be one of the most important characteristics of the development of Western society and capitalism. Weber viewed traditional and charismatic forms as irrational, or at least non-rational. The latter may rely on religion, magic, or the supernatural as a way of explaining the social world and authority may also derive from these. These may have no systematic form of development, but may rely on personal insight, revelation, emotions and feelings, features that are non-rational in form.

## **Types of Rationality**

In his writings, Weber used rationality in various ways. Four of the meanings of rationality are as follows:

1. **Practical rationality** involves the individual who considers ends, and on some systematic basis decide what is the best means or course of action to pursue in order to achieve these ends. This form of rationality can be considered to be pragmatic in that it provides individuals with a way of pursuing practical ends.
2. **Theoretical rationality** abstract concepts form as essential part of logical reasoning or theoretical models. These attempts to describe, explain, or understand the world in terms of models that are constructed from observation and reasoning. These forms of rationality need not be associated with social action but are more a part of logical structures and theory.
3. **Substantive rationality** individuals might consider a range of possible values or actions, and attempting to make them consistent. Weber termed this substantive rationality and considered it problematic in modern society in that rationalization of social life makes it difficult for people to pursue particular values. For example, pursuit of family or religious values may be difficult in modern society, given economic pressures and dominance of bureaucratic organizations.
4. **Formal rationality** is a broader form of rationality that characterizes organizations, especially bureaucratic ones. This leads to "universally applied rules, laws and regulations that characterize formal rationality in the West particularly in the economic, legal, and scientific institutions, as well as in the bureaucratic form of domination". (Ritzer, p.123). Rational-legal forms or authority such as the contemporary legal and judicial systems are examples of formal rationality.

Weber's fear was that formal rationality was becoming more dominant in modern, western society, with substantive rationality declining in importance. Weber notes that formal rationality developed as capitalistic forms of organizations emerged and its expansion is associated with the development of formal organizations and methods. This formal rationality and the organizational features associated with them, tend to crowd out other forms of rationality and limit the possibilities of creative social action.

## **POWER AND AUTHORITY**

Weber defines power as the ability of a actor (or actors) to realize his or her will in a social action, even against the will of actors. Power relates to the ability to command resources in a particular domain. Economic power, then, is the ability to control material resources: to direct production, to monopolize accumulation, to dictate consumption. Societal power includes economic power, social power, legal or political power and so forth. Although the control of these domains of resources usually goes together, they represent different mechanism of power, and are conceptually distinct. Weber's typology of power identifies three different appeals-

- Traditional Power
- Charismatic Power
- Bureaucratic or legal power

He defined domination as the "probability that certain specific commands will be obeyed by a given group of persons". Domination can have a variety of basis, legitimate as well as illegitimate, but what mainly interested Weber were the legitimate forms of domination, or what he called authority. What concerned Weber, and what played a central role in much of his sociology, were the three basis on which authorities made legitimate to followers- traditional, charismatic and rational.

### **Traditional Authority**

Traditional authority is legitimated by the sanctity of tradition. The ability and right to rule is passed down, often through heredity. It does not change overtime, does not facilitate social change, tends to be irrational and inconsistent, and perpetuates the status quo. Traditional authority is typically embodied in feudalism or patrimonialism and in a purely patriarchal structure.

### **Charismatic Authority**

It is found in a leader whose mission and vision inspire others. It is based upon the perceived extraordinary characteristics of an individual. Weber saw a charismatic leader as the head of a new social movement and one instilled with divine or supernatural power, such as religious prospect.

Weber's favour for charismatic authority was particularly strong, especially in focussing on what happened to it with the death or decline of a charismatic leader.

### **Legal-Rational Authority**

It is empowered by a formalistic belief in the content of the law<sup>9</sup>legal<sup>0</sup> or natural law (rationality). Weber thought the best example of legal-rational authority was a bureaucracy. This form of authority is frequently found in modern state, city, governments, private and public corporation, and various voluntary associations. This type of authority is not based on the perennial qualities.

The types of authority change over time, when the ruled are no longer satisfied with the system. Legitimacy and power to control is handed down from the past and power can be exercised in quite dictatorial arrays.

Authority by comparison, is a quality that enhances power, rather than being itself a form of power. The word “authority” comes from the verb “to authorize” therefore an individual’s power, must be authorised by the group in order for it to be legitimate. An individual is considered an authority because of his technical expertise, combined with his ability to communicate effectively with the group.

## **IRON CAGE AND BUREAUCRACY**

It is a sociological concept introduced by Max Weber. It refers to the increased rationalisation inherent in social life, particularly in western capitalistic societies. Iron cage thus traps individuals in systems based purely on teleological efficiency, rational calculation and control. Weber also described the bureaucratization of social order as ‘the polar righty of icy darkness’.

The original German term is *Stahlhartes Gehäuse* this was translated to “iron cage”. Weber became concerned with social actions and the subjective meaning that human attach to their actions and interactions within specific social contexts. He also believed in idealism, which is the belief that he only know things because of the meanings that we apply to them. This led to his interest in power and authority in terms of bureaucracy and rationalization.

The iron cage is one set of rules and laws that we are all subjected and must adhere to. Bureaucracy puts us in an iron cage, which limits individual human freedom and potential instead of a ‘technological utopia’ that should set us free. It is the way of the institution, where we do not have a choice anymore.

### **Bureaucracy**

One major type of organization that has emerged in modern, western society has been bureaucracy or bureaucratic administration. The term Bureaucracy finds its origin from the French word “Bureau” which means desk and a government which is run from table is called Bureaucratic government.

Bureaucratic theory was developed by a German Sociologist and political economist Max Weber. According to him, bureaucracy is the most efficient form of organisation. The organisation has a well-defined line of authority. It has clear rules and regulations which are strictly followed.

This is the primary way that rational-legal authority has developed in formal organizations. The dominance of bureaucratic organizations in modern society shows the effectiveness of formal rationality as a way of organizing society. Hadden notes that “bureaucratic administration is generally capable of efficiency, precision, and fairness” (p.140). The ideal type of formal bureaucracy has a continuous and hierarchical organization of official functions or offices, with rules that govern each positions and relationships in the organization. Max Weber’s model of Bureaucracy is oftentimes described through a simple set of characteristics.

The characteristics or features of Bureaucratic Organisation are as follows:

1. There is a high degree of Division of Labour and Specialisation.
2. There is a well defined Hierarchy of Authority.
3. It follows the principle of Rationality, Objectively and Consistency.
4. There are Formal and Impersonal relations among the member of the organisation.
5. Interpersonal relations are based on positions and not on personalities.
6. There are well defined Rules and Regulations. These rules cover all the duties and rights of the employees. These rules must be strictly followed.
7. There are well defined Methods for all types of work.
8. Selection and Promotion is based on Technical qualifications.
9. Only Bureaucratic or legal power is given importance.
10. Wages and salaries are associated with the position.
11. Clearly defined sphere of competence.
12. No ownership of position and everyone is subject to discipline.
13. People in such organisations are not bound to others in a servant-master, slave-master or family relationship.
14. Difference between private matters and official issues.
15. Officials of the bureaucracy are expected to work according to the written rules.

Weber is the first sociologist to analyse the functioning of bureaucracy from the sociological point of view. Weber's theory of bureaucracy is a significant contribution to the field of sociology. Weber's interest in the nature of power and authority and his realisation of the inevitability of rationalisation in the operation of large-scale modern organisations-led him to establish a "theory of Bureaucracy". In modern industry, the complex work system is needed to be organised structurally in order to maintain efficiency. There is a need for a hierarchy of officials and a system of rules to maintain the structure. Weber saw an emerging bureaucracy as a characteristic feature of the modern industrial society.

### **Religion and economy**

Weber was interested primarily in the systems of ideas of the world's religions, in the "spirit" of capitalism and in rationalization as a modern system of norms and values. Much of Weber's historical, comparative work is focusing on the influence of religious beliefs on action. He was also interested in the structures of the societies in which they exist that serve to faultier or impede rationalization and the structural aspects of capitalism and rest of the modern world.

Weber's masterly work "**the protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism (1977)**" he observed a close connection between religious and economic forces. His concept of religion is more ethical than theological. Weber wanted to examine its influence on the life of people.

He traced the impact of acetic Protestantism-primary Calvinism- on the rise of the spirit of capitalism. Weber undertook a massive study of the major world religions and the societies in which they were found and concluded that the answer lay in specific religious beliefs say, Calvinism and other forms of Puritanism.

Weber pointed out that modern capitalism requires rational, calculated procedures in a methodical attempt to accumulate money and it should be reinvested to earn yet more capital. Modern capitalism emerged by the religious ethic of Protestantism and particularly of Calvinism. Weber observed that capitalism was growing very fast in the west. He felt that capitalism of the western type was growing more in protestant society than in others. Unlike other forms of economy for capitalism to work, capital has to be accumulated; not to be consumed, but to be reinvested in the pursuit of ever more efficient and profitable, techniques of production. The more wealth is made and the more successful the capable enterprise is, the more resources are available to improve the efficiency of production. Work is therefore an end in itself; profit to be reinvested is virtuous and brings its own reward. Weber established a correlation between a religious way of thinking in the world and an attitude towards economic activity. Weber argued other religions did not provide the same incentive for this kind of social and economic change. Weber undertook a massive study of the major world religious systems (for example Catholicism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Islamism) that inhibit the growth of a rational economic system.

Weber's thoughts on rationalisation and various other issues are illustrated in his work on the relationship between religion and capitalism.

\*\*\*\*\*