

## Sociological Thinkers

Dr. Rishabh Gahlot

Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Jai Narain Vyas University, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India

**How to cite this paper:** Dr. Rishabh Gahlot "Sociological Thinkers" Published in International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (ijtsrd), ISSN: 2456-6470, Volume-6 | Issue-6, October 2022, pp.2144-2154, URL: [www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd52248.pdf](http://www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd52248.pdf)



Copyright © 2022 by author(s) and International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development Journal. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)



Sociology is the study of social rules and processes that bind, and separate people not only as individuals, but as members of associations, groups, and institutions.

A typical textbook definition of sociology calls it the study of the social lives of humans, groups and societies. Sociology is interested in our behavior as social beings; thus the sociological field of interest ranges from the analysis of short contacts between anonymous individuals on the street to the study of global social processes.

Sociologists are those who study sociology.[1,2]

Social theories are analytical frameworks, or paradigms, that are used to study and interpret social phenomena. A tool used by social scientists, social theories relate to historical debates over the validity and reliability of different methodologies (e.g. positivism and antipositivism), the primacy of either structure or agency, as well as the relationship between contingency and necessity. Social theory in an informal nature, or authorship based outside of academic social and political science, may be referred to as "social criticism" or "social commentary", or "cultural criticism" and may be associated both with formal cultural and literary scholarship, as well as other non-academic or journalistic forms of writing.

Sociological thinkers known are:

### Auguste Comte

Auguste Comte (1798- 1857) was a French positivist thinker and came up with the term of sociology to name the new science made by Saint-Simon. One universal law that Comte saw at work in all sciences he called the 'law of three phases'. It is by his statement of this law that he is best known in the English-speaking world; namely, that society has gone through three phases: Theological, Metaphysical, and Scientific. He also gave the name

"Positive" to the last of these because of the polysemous connotations of the word.[3,4]

The Theological phase was seen from the perspective of 19th century France as preceding the Enlightenment, in which man's place in society and society's restrictions upon man were referenced to God. By the "Metaphysical" phase, he was not referring to the Metaphysics of Aristotle or any other ancient Greek philosopher, for Comte was rooted in the problems of French society subsequent to the revolution of 1789. This Metaphysical phase involved the justification of universal rights as being on a vauntedly higher plane than the authority of any human ruler to countermand, although said rights were not referenced to the sacred beyond mere metaphor.

What he announced by his term of the Scientific phase, which came into being after the failure of the revolution and of Napoleon, was that people could find solutions to social problems and bring them into force despite the proclamations of human rights or prophecy of the will of God. In this regard he was similar to Karl Marx and Jeremy Bentham. For its time, this idea of a Scientific phase was considered up-to-date, although from a later standpoint it is too derivative of classical physics and academic history. The other universal law he called the 'encyclopedic law'. By combining these laws, Comte developed a systematic and hierarchical classification of all sciences, including inorganic physics (astronomy, earth science and chemistry) and organic physics (biology and for the first time, physique sociale, later renamed sociologie). This idea of a special science-not the humanities, not metaphysics-for the social was prominent in the 19th century and not unique to Comte. The ambitious-many would say grandiose-way that Comte conceived of it, however, was unique. Comte saw this new science, sociology, as the

last and greatest of all sciences, one that would include all other sciences, and which would integrate and relate their findings into a cohesive whole.[5,6]

Comte's explanation of the Positive philosophy introduced the important relationship between theory, practice and human understanding of the world. On page 27 of the 1855 printing of Harriet Martineau's translation of *The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte*, we see his observation that, "If it is true that every theory must be based upon observed facts, it is equally true that facts cannot be observed without the guidance of some theory. Without such guidance, our facts would be desultory and fruitless; we could not retain them: for the most part we could not even perceive them. He coined the word "altruism" to refer to what he believed to be a moral obligations of individuals to serve others and place their interests above one's own. He opposed the idea of individual rights, maintaining that they were not consistent with this supposed ethical obligation (Catechisme Positiviste).

Comte formulated the law of three stages, one of the first theories of the social evolutionism: that human development (social progress) progresses from the theological stage, in which nature was mythically conceived and man sought the explanation of natural phenomena from supernatural beings, through metaphysical stage in which nature was conceived of as a result of obscure forces and man sought the explanation of natural phenomena from them until the final positive stage in which all abstract and obscure forces are discarded, and natural phenomena are explained by their constant relationship. This progress is forced through the development of human mind, and increasing application of thought, reasoning and logic to the understanding of world. During his lifetime,[7,8] Comte's work was sometimes viewed skeptically because he elevated Positivism to a religion and named himself the Pope of Positivism. Comte coined the term "sociology", and is usually regarded as the first sociologist. His emphasis on the interconnectedness of different social elements was a forerunner of modern functionalism. Nevertheless, like many others from his time, certain elements of his work are regarded as eccentric and unscientific, and his grand vision of sociology as the center-piece of all the sciences has not come to fruition. His emphasis on a quantitative, mathematical basis for decision-making remains with us today. It is a foundation of the modern notion of Positivism, modern quantitative statistical analysis, and business decision-making.

### **Karl Marx**

Karl Marx's (1818- 1883) thought was strongly influenced by:

- The dialectical method and historical orientation of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel;
- The classical political economy of Adam Smith and David Ricardo;
- French socialist and sociological thought, in particular the thought of Jean-Jacques Rousseau.

The most important concepts of Karl Marx

The following concepts of Marx have aided sociological thought significantly;

- Dialectical Materialism
- Materialistic Interpretation of History i.e Historical Materialism
- Class and Class conflict
- Alienation

Marx believed that he could study history and society scientifically and discern tendencies of history and the resulting outcome of social conflicts. Some followers of Marx concluded, therefore, that a communist revolution is inevitable. However, Marx famously asserted in the eleventh of his Theses on Feuerbach that "philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point however is to change it", and he clearly dedicated himself to trying to alter the world. Consequently, most followers of Marx are not fatalists, but activists who believe that revolutionaries must organize social change.[9,10]

Marx's view of history, which came to be called the materialist conception of history (and which was developed further as the philosophy of dialectical materialism) is certainly influenced by Hegel's claim that reality (and history) should be viewed dialectically. Hegel believed that the direction of human history is characterized in the movement from the fragmentary toward the complete and the real (which was also a movement towards greater and greater rationality). Sometimes, Hegel explained, this progressive unfolding of the Absolute involves gradual, evolutionary accretion but at other times requires discontinuous, revolutionary leaps- episodal upheavals against the existing status quo. For example, Hegel strongly opposed the ancient institution of legal slavery that was practiced in the United States during his lifetime, and he envisioned a time when Christian nations would radically eliminate it from their civilization. While Marx accepted this broad conception of history, Hegel was an idealist, and Marx sought to rewrite dialectics in materialist terms. He wrote that Hegelianism stood the movement of reality on its head, and that it was necessary to set it upon its feet. (Hegel's philosophy remained and remains in direct opposition to Marxism on this key point.)

Marx's acceptance of this notion of materialist dialectics which rejected Hegel's idealism was greatly influenced by Ludwig Feuerbach. In *The Essence of Christianity*, Feuerbach argued that God is really a creation of man and that the qualities people attribute to God are really qualities of humanity. Accordingly, Marx argued that it is the material world that is real and that our ideas of it are consequences, not causes, of the world. Thus, like Hegel and other philosophers, Marx distinguished between appearances and reality. But he did not believe that the material world hides from us the "real" world of the ideal; on the contrary, he thought that historically and socially specific ideologies prevented people from seeing the material conditions of their lives clearly.

The other important contribution to Marx's revision of Hegelianism was Engels' book, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* in 1844, which led Marx to conceive of the historical dialectic in terms of class conflict and to see the modern working class as the most progressive force for revolution. The notion of labour is fundamental in Marx's thought. Basically, Marx argued that it is human nature to transform nature, and he calls this process of transformation "labour" and the capacity to transform nature labour power. For Marx, this is a natural capacity for a physical activity, but it is intimately tied to the human mind and human imagination: A spider conducts operations that resemble those of a weaver, and a bee puts to shame many an architect in the construction of her cells. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. (*Capital*, Vol. I, Chap. 7, Pt. 1) Karl Marx inherits that Hegelian dialectic and, with it, a disdain for the notion of an underlying invariant human nature. Sometimes Marxists express their views by contrasting "nature" with "history". Sometimes they use the phrase "existence precedes consciousness". The point, in either case, is that who a person is, is determined by where and when he is- social context takes precedence over innate behavior; or, in other words, one of the main features of human nature is adaptability. Marx did not believe that all people worked the same way, or that how one works is entirely personal and individual. Instead, he argued that work is a social activity and that the conditions and forms under and through which people work are socially determined and change over time. Marx's analysis of history is based on his distinction between the means / forces of production,[11,12] literally those things, such as land, natural resources, and technology, that are necessary for the production of material goods, and the relations of production, in other words, the social and technical relationships

people enter into as they acquire and use the means of production. Together these comprise the mode of production; Marx observed that within any given society the mode of production changes, and that European societies had progressed from a feudal mode of production to a capitalist mode of production. In general, Marx believed that the means of production change more rapidly than the relations of production (for example, we develop a new technology, such as the Internet, and only later do we develop laws to regulate that technology). For Marx this mismatch between (economic) base and (social) superstructure is a major source of social disruption and conflict. Marx understood the "social relations of production" to comprise not only relations among individuals, but between or among groups of people, or classes. As a scientist and materialist, Marx did not understand classes as purely subjective (in other words, groups of people who consciously identified with one another). He sought to define classes in terms of objective criteria, such as their access to resources. For Marx, different classes have divergent interests, which is another source of social disruption and conflict. Conflict between social classes being something which is inherent in all human history: The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. (*The Communist Manifesto*, Chap. 1) Marx was especially concerned with how people relate to that most fundamental resource of all, their own labour-power. Marx wrote extensively about this in terms of the problem of alienation. As with the dialectic, Marx began with a Hegelian notion of alienation but developed a more materialist conception. For Marx, the possibility that one may give up ownership of one's own labour- one's capacity to transform the world- is tantamount to being alienated from one's own nature; it is a spiritual loss. Marx described this loss in terms of commodity fetishism, in which the things that people produce, commodities, appear to have a life and movement of their own to which humans and their behavior merely adapt. This disguises the fact that the exchange and circulation of commodities really are the product and reflection of social relationships among people. Under capitalism, social relationships of production, such as among workers or between workers and capitalists, are mediated through commodities, including labor, that are bought and sold on the market.

Commodity fetishism is an example of what Engels called false consciousness, which is closely related to the understanding of ideology. By ideology they meant ideas that reflect the interests of a particular class at a particular time in history, but which are



presented as universal and eternal. Marx and Engels' point was not only that such beliefs are at best half-truths; they serve an important political function. Put another way, the control that one class exercises over the means of production includes not only the production of food or manufactured goods; it includes the production of ideas as well (this provides one possible explanation for why members of a subordinate class may hold ideas contrary to their own interests). Thus, while such ideas may be false, they also reveal in coded form some truth about political relations. For example, although the belief that the things people produce are actually more productive than the people who produce them is literally absurd, it does reflect the fact (according to Marx and Engels) that people under capitalism are alienated from their own labour-power. Another example of this sort of analysis is Marx's understanding of religion, summed up in a passage from the preface to his 1843 Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right: Religious suffering is, at one and the same time, the expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people. [13,14] Whereas his Gymnasium senior thesis argued that the primary social function of religion was to promote solidarity, here Marx sees the social function as a way of expressing and coping with social inequality, thereby maintaining the status quo. Marx argued that this alienation of human work (and resulting commodity fetishism) is precisely the defining feature of capitalism. Prior to capitalism, markets existed in Europe where producers and merchants bought and sold commodities. According to Marx, a capitalist mode of production developed in Europe when labor itself became a commodity- when peasants became free to sell their own labor-power, and needed to do so because they no longer possessed their own land or tools necessary to produce. People sell their labor-power when they accept compensation in return for whatever work they do in a given period of time (in other words, they are not selling the product of their labor, but their capacity to work). In return for selling their labor power they receive money, which allows them to survive. Those who must sell their labor power to live are "proletarians." The person who buys the labor power, generally someone who does own the land and technology to produce, is a "capitalist" or "bourgeois." (Marx considered this an objective description of capitalism, distinct from any one of a variety of ideological claims of or about capitalism). The proletarians inevitably outnumber the capitalists.

Marx distinguished industrial capitalists from merchant capitalists. Merchants buy goods in one place and sell them in another; more precisely, they buy things in one market and sell them in another. Since the laws of supply and demand operate within given markets, there is often a difference between the price of a commodity in one market and another. Merchants, then, practice arbitrage, and hope to capture the difference between these two markets. According to Marx, capitalists, on the other hand, take advantage of the difference between the labor market and the market for whatever commodity is produced by the capitalist. Marx observed that in practically every successful industry input unit-costs are lower than output unit-prices. Marx called the difference "surplus value" and argued that this surplus value had its source in surplus labour.

The capitalist mode of production is capable of tremendous growth because the capitalist can, and has an incentive to, reinvest profits in new technologies. Marx considered the capitalist class to be the most revolutionary in history, because it constantly revolutionized the means of production. But Marx argued that capitalism was prone to periodic crises. He suggested that over time, capitalists would invest more and more in new technologies, and less and less in labor. Since Marx believed that surplus value appropriated from labor is the source of profits, he concluded that the rate of profit would fall even as the economy grew. When the rate of profit falls below a certain point, the result would be a recession or depression in which certain sectors of the economy would collapse. Marx understood that during such a crisis the price of labor would also fall, and eventually make possible the investment in new technologies and the growth of new sectors of the economy. [15,16]

Marx believed that this cycle of growth, collapse, and growth would be punctuated by increasingly severe crises. Moreover, he believed that the long-term consequence of this process was necessarily the enrichment and empowerment of the capitalist class and the impoverishment of the proletariat. He believed that were the proletariat to seize the means of production, they would encourage social relations that would benefit everyone equally, and a system of production less vulnerable to periodic crises. In general, Marx thought that peaceful negotiation of this problem was impracticable, and that a massive, well-organized and violent revolution would in general be required, because the ruling class would not give up power without violence. He theorized that to establish the socialist system, a dictatorship of the proletariat- a period where the needs of the working-

class, not of capital, will be the common deciding factor- must be created on a temporary basis. As he wrote in his "Critique of the Gotha Program", "between capitalist and communist society there lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."

In the 1920s and '30s, a group of dissident Marxists founded the Institute for Social Research in Germany, among them Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Erich Fromm, and Herbert Marcuse. As a group, these authors are often called the Frankfurt School. Their work is known as Critical Theory, a type of Marxist philosophy and cultural criticism heavily influenced by Hegel, Freud, Nietzsche, and Max Weber. The Frankfurt School broke with earlier Marxists, including Lenin and Bolshevism in several key ways. First, writing at the time of the ascendance of Stalinism and Fascism, they had grave doubts as to the traditional Marxist concept of proletarian class consciousness. Second, unlike earlier Marxists, especially Lenin, they rejected economic determinism. While highly influential, their work has been criticized by both orthodox Marxists and some Marxists involved in political practice for divorcing Marxist theory from practical struggle and turning Marxism into a purely academic enterprise. Other influential non-Bolshevik Marxists at that time include Georg Lukacs, Walter Benjamin and Antonio Gramsci, who along with the Frankfurt School are often known by the term Western Marxism. Henryk Grossman, who elaborated the mathematical basis of Marx's 'law of capitalist breakdown', was another affiliate of the Frankfurt School. Also prominent during this period was the Polish revolutionary Rosa Luxemburg. In 1949 Paul Sweezy and Leo Huberman founded Monthly Review, a journal and press, to provide an outlet for Marxist thought in the United States independent of the Communist Party. In 1978, G. A. Cohen attempted to defend Marx's thought as a coherent and scientific theory of history by reconstructing it through the lens of analytic philosophy. This gave birth to Analytical Marxism, an academic movement which also included Jon Elster, Adam Przeworski and John Roemer. Bertell Ollman is another Anglophone champion of Marx within the academy.

### **Durkheim**

Emile Durkheim (1858- 1917) was concerned primarily with how societies could maintain their integrity and coherence in the modern era, when things such as shared religious and ethnic background

could no longer be assumed. In order to study social life in modern societies, Durkheim sought to create one of the first scientific approaches to social phenomena. Along with Herbert Spencer, Durkheim was one of the first people to explain the existence and quality of different parts of a society by reference to what function they served in keeping the society healthy and balanced—a position that would come to be known as functionalism. Durkheim also insisted that society was more than the sum of its parts. Thus unlike his contemporary Max Weber, he focused not on what motivates the actions of individual people (methodological individualism), but rather on the study of social facts,[17,18] a term which he coined to describe phenomena which have an existence in and of themselves and are not bound to the actions of individuals. He argued that social facts had an independent existence greater and more objective than the actions of the individuals that composed society and could only be explained by other social facts rather than, say, by society's adaptation to a particular climate or ecological niche.

In his 1893 work *The Division of Labor in Society*, Durkheim examined how social order was maintained in different types of societies. He focused on the division of labor, and examined how it differed in traditional societies and modern societies. Authors before him such as Herbert Spencer and Ferdinand Toennies had argued that societies evolved much like living organisms, moving from a simple state to a more complex one resembling the workings of complex machines. Durkheim reversed this formula, adding his theory to the growing pool of theories of social progress, social evolutionism and social darwinism. He argued that traditional societies were 'mechanical' and were held together by the fact that everyone was more or less the same, and hence had things in common. In traditional societies, argues Durkheim, the collective consciousness entirely subsumes individual consciousness—social norms are strong and social behavior is well-regulated. In modern societies, he argued, the highly complex division of labor resulted in 'organic' solidarity. Different specializations in employment and social roles created dependencies that tied people to one another, since people no longer could count on filling all of their needs by themselves.[19] In 'mechanical' societies, for example, subsistence farmers live in communities which are self-sufficient and knit together by a common heritage and common job. In modern 'organic' societies, workers earn money, and must rely on other people who specialize in certain products (groceries, clothing, etc.) to meet their needs. The result of increasing division of labor, according to Durkheim, is that individual

consciousness emerges distinct from collective consciousness-often finding itself in conflict with collective consciousness. Durkheim also made an association of the kind of solidarity in a given society and the preponderance of a law system. He found that in societies with mechanical solidarity the law is generally repressive: the agent of a crime or deviant behaviour would suffer a punishment, that in fact would compensate collective conscience neglected by the crime-the punishment acts more to preserve the unity of consciences. On the other hand, in societies with organic solidarity the law is generally restitutive: it aims not to punish, but instead to reconstitute normal activity of a complex society. The rapid change in society due to increasing division of labor thus produces a state of confusion with regard to norms and increasing impersonality in social life, leading eventually to relative normlessness, i.e. the breakdown of social norms regulating behavior; Durkheim labels this state anomie. From a state of anomie come all forms of deviant behavior, most notably suicide.

Durkheim developed the concept of anomie later in *Suicide*, published in 1897. In it, he explores the differing suicide rates among Protestants and Catholics, explaining that stronger social control among Catholics results in lower suicide rates. According to Durkheim, people have a certain level of attachment to their groups, which he calls social integration. Abnormally high or low levels of social integration may result in increased suicide rates; low levels have this effect because low social integration results in disorganized society, causing people to turn to suicide as a last resort, while high levels cause people to kill themselves to avoid becoming burdens on society. According to Durkheim, Catholic society has normal levels of integration while Protestant society has low levels. This work has influenced proponents of control theory, and is often mentioned as a classic sociological study. Finally, Durkheim is remembered for his work on 'primitive' (i.e. non-Western) people in books such as his 1912 volume *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* and the essay *Primitive Classification* that he wrote with Marcel Mauss. These works examine the role that religion and mythology have in shaping the worldview and personality of people in extremely (to use Durkheim's phrase) 'mechanical' societies. Durkheim was also very interested in education. Partially this was because he was professionally employed to train teachers, and he used his ability to shape curriculum to further his own goals of having sociology taught as widely possible.[20,21] More broadly, though, Durkheim was interested in the way that education could be used to provide French citizens the sort of

shared, secular background that would be necessary to prevent anomie in modern societies. It was to this end that he also proposed the formation of professional groups to serve as a source of solidarity for adults. Durkheim argued that education has many functions:

1. To reinforce social solidarity
  - History: Learning about individuals who have done good things for the many makes an individual feel insignificant.
  - Pledging Allegiance: Makes individuals feel part of a group and therefore less likely to break rules.
2. To maintain social roles
  - School is a society in miniature. It has a similar hierarchy, rules, expectations to the "outside world". It trains young people to fulfill roles.
3. To maintain division of labour
  - Sorts students out into skill groups. Teaches students to go into work depending on what they're good at.

### Max Weber

Max Weber (1864-1920) was one of the pioneers of the discipline of sociology and was one of the early founders of the Interpretivist approach. He addressed the problem of scope and nature of the discipline, and he also established the first dept of sociology in Germany. He pioneered a new approach to study the society which later came to be known as the interpretative approach. This approach puts the individuals and the way the individuals think at the center of analysis of society. Instead of focusing on society at a grand level as the functionalists like Durkheim and conflict theorists like Marx did, he advocated to maintain focus on micro level on the individual and his /her actions only. He is one of the first sociologists to outline social action perspective in detail. He argued that sociological explanations of action should begin with observing and interpreting the subjective states of minds of people. Weber is considered to have bridged the gap between positivism and idealism. He favored the use of scientific method in sociology for the purpose of achieving objectivity and on the other hand he developed the scope of sociology as the meaning attached by the actors to their actions.[22,23] He opposed pure abstract theorizing instead his theoretical ideas are embedded in his empirical usually historical research. According to Weber, the behavior of man in society is qualitatively different from physical objects in the natural world and organisms in the biological world. In his book *Methodologies of Social Sciences*, he defined sociology as science which attempts interpretivist understanding of social action in order thereby to



arrive at an explanation of its cause and effect. He gave distinctive explanations for the social phenomena. According to Weber, the subject matter of sociology is to study social action which he defined as any action is social by the virtue of the meanings attached to it by the actors, it considers the behavior of others and is thereby oriented in its course. In this definition Weber mentions two conditions for any action to become social:

Action is social if some meaning is attached to it by the actor, i.e the actor must be conscious of his or her action. The meanings are in the form of motivation of an individual which is her or his own subjective state. Weber rejected the independent influence of the values on individuals rather the values are interpreted by the actor, according to his or her motivation and according to that an action is taken.

Action is social if it is oriented to some other, i.e. only those actions are social which are taken in orientation to some other object. The orientation can be physical or mental, the other person may or may not be present in a social action. Weber also differentiated between action and behavior. Behavior is a biological concept and is spontaneous in nature with no attachment of meaning. According to Weber, the establishment of cause and effect should be the aim of sociology. Understanding the meanings attached by the actors to their actions can only help us to establish cause and effect relationships.

### **Pareto**

Pareto (1848-1923) gave following concepts:

- Circulation of elites
- Logico- experimental method
- Logical and non-logical action
- Residues and Derivations

### **Circulation of Elites**

Pareto believed that society is unequal mentally and physically some people are more intelligent and capable than others. It is these people who become elite in any social group. According to him there are two types of elites- Governing elites and Non governing elites. Governing elites are those individuals who directly or indirectly play major part in ruling the society while the non-governing comprise the rest of the society. The elites are intellectually more superior. The society degenerates where elites occupy status due to ascription status and through achievements. The ascriptive elites are taken as lions and who become elite through vitality and imagination are foxes. Hence lions are followed by foxes. Since Lions have element of stability of persistence but however lack in manipulative activities hence are replaced by foxes.

### **Logical and Non logical action**

Society is a system in equilibrium. This equilibrium implies that there are certain forces which maintain the form or structure of society. If the outer forces like war try to disturb the system the inner forces push towards restoring the equilibrium. Logical actions are which uses means appropriate to ends and logically links means with ends. These actions are both subjective and objective. Nonlogical are residual and fall outside the periphery of logical actions. According to Pareto nonlogical action are important to study since they explain sentimental actions.

### **Residues and Derivatives[24,25]**

Residues and Derivatives are both manifestation of sentiments which pertain to human nature. This theory helps in jeopardizing the non-scientific theories and beliefs regarding human action. E.g. various religions in different societies. However all religions have some common beliefs. These common and constant features are called derivatives while rest is residue.

Pareto states six classes of residues which are constant throughout the western history.

1. Instinct combination.
2. Group persistence
3. Manifestation of sentiments through actions and outer expressions
4. Power to impose power over society.
5. Residues of personal integrity.
6. Residue of sex.

### **Sorokin**

Sorokin is author of books such as The crisis of our age and Power and morality, but his magnum opus is Social and Cultural Dynamics (1937-1941). His unorthodox theories contributed to the social cycle theory and inspired (or alienated) many sociologists. In his Social and Cultural Dynamics he classified societies according to their 'cultural mentality', which can be ideational (reality as spiritual), [26] sensate (reality is material), or idealistic (a synthesis of the two). He has interpreted the contemporary Western civilisation as a sensate civilisation dedicated to technological progress and prophesied its fall into decadence and the emergence of a new ideational or idealistic era.

### **M. N. Srinivas**

Mysore Narasimhachar Srinivas (1916-1999) was a world-renowned Indian sociologist. He is mostly known for his work on caste and caste systems, social stratification and Sanskritisation in southern India. Srinivas' contribution to the disciplines of sociology and social anthropology and to public life in India was unique. It was his capacity to break out of the

strong mould in which (the mostly North American university oriented) area studies had been shaped after the end of the Second World War on the one hand, and to experiment with the disciplinary grounding of social anthropology and sociology on the other, which marked his originality as a social scientist.

It may be important to point out that it was the conjuncture between Sanskrit scholarship and the strategic concerns of the Western bloc in the aftermath of the Second World War which had largely shaped South Asian area studies in the United States. During the colonial era, the Brahmins or Pandits were acknowledged as important interlocutors of Hindu laws and customs to the British colonial administration. The colonial assumptions about an unchanging Indian society led to the curious assemblage of Sanskrit studies with contemporary issues in most South Asian departments in the U.S. and elsewhere. It was strongly believed that an Indian sociology must lie at the conjunction of Indology and sociology.[27,28]

Srinivas' scholarship was to challenge that dominant paradigm for understanding Indian society and would in the process, usher newer intellectual frameworks for understanding Hindu society. His views on the importance of caste in the electoral processes in India are well known. While some have interpreted this to attest to the enduring structural principles of social stratification of Indian society, for Srinivas these symbolized the dynamic changes that were taking place as democracy spread and electoral politics became a resource in the local world of village society.

By inclination he was not given to utopian constructions- his ideas about justice, equality and eradication of poverty were rooted in his experiences on the ground. His integrity in the face of demands that his sociology should take into account the new and radical aspirations was one of the most moving aspects of his writing. Through use of terms such as "sanskritisation", "dominant caste", "vertical (inter-caste) and horizontal (intra-caste) solidarities", Srinivas sought to capture the fluid and dynamic essence of caste as a social institution.

As part of his methodological practice, Srinivas strongly advocated ethnographic research based on fieldwork, but his concept of fieldwork was tied to the notion of locally bounded sites. Thus some of his best papers, such as the paper on dominant caste and one on a joint family dispute, were largely inspired from his direct participation (and as a participant observer) in rural life in south India. He wrote several papers on the themes of national integration, issues of gender,

new technologies, etc. It is really surprising as to why he did not theorize on the methodological implications of writing on these issues which go beyond the village and its institutions. His methodology and findings have been used and emulated by successive researchers who have studied caste in India.

Important Books by M.N Srinivas

- Marriage and Family in Mysore (1942)
- Religion and Society Among the Coorgs of South India (1952)
- Caste in Modern India (1962), Asia Publishing House
- The Remembered Village (1976)
- Indian Society through Personal Writings (1998)
- Village, Caste, Gender and Method (1998)
- Social Change in Modern India
- The Dominant Caste and Other Essays (ed.)
- Dimensions of Social Change in India

**Gail Omvedt**

Dr. Gail Omvedt is an American born Indian scholar, sociologist and human rights activist. Omvedt has been involved in Dalit and anti-caste movements, environmental, farmers' and women's movements.

Omvedt posits that Hindutva groups foster an ethnic definition of Hinduism based on geography, ancestry and heritage in order to create a solidarity amongst various castes, despite the prevalence of caste-based discrimination. Omvedt endorsed the stand taken by Dalit activists at the 2001 World Conference Against Racism that caste discrimination is similar to racism in regarding discriminated groups as "biologically inferior and socially dangerous." Omvedt's dissertation was on Cultural Revolt in a Colonial Society: The NonBrahman Movement in Western India, 1873-1930.[29] Omvedt's academic writing includes numerous books and articles on class, caste and gender issues, most notably:

- We Shall Smash This Prison: Indian Women in Struggle (1979),
- Reinventing Revolution: New Social Movements in India (1993),
- Gender and Technology: Emerging Asian Visions (1994), Dalits and the Democratic Revolution (1994),
- Dalit Visions: the Anticaste movement and Indian Cultural Identity (1994)

Her more recent works are:

- Buddhism in India: Challenging Brahmanism and Caste,
- Growing Up Untouchable: A Dalit Autobiography Among Others.



### Andre Béteille

Andre Béteille is one of India's leading sociologists and writers. He is particularly well known for his studies of the caste system in South India.

He was a Professor of Sociology at the Delhi School of Economics at the University of Delhi where he is Professor Emeritus of Sociology since 2003. Béteille has written insightfully about all the major questions of the day: India's encounters with the West, the contest between religion and secularism, the relationship between caste and class, the links between poverty and inequality, the nurturing of public institutions, the role and responsibilities of the intellectual.

In 2005, Professor Béteille received the Padma Bhushan as a mark of recognition for his work in the field of Sociology. The same year he was appointed a member of the Prime Minister's National Knowledge Commission. In 2006, following a proposal for increasing caste-based reservations, Andre Beteille quit the Commission in protest. In 2006, he was made National Professor. His famous books are:

- Sociology: Essays on Approach and Method, 2002.
- Antinomies of Society: Essays on Ideologies and Institutions, 2000.
- Chronicles of Our Time, Penguin Books, 2000.
- The Backward Classes in Contemporary India, 1992.
- Society and Politics in India: Essays in a Comparative Perspective 1991.
- The Idea of Natural Inequality and Other Essays, 1983.
- Inequality among Men, Basil Blackwell, 1977.
- Studies in Agrarian Social Structure, 1974.
- Six Essays in Comparative Sociology, 1974.
- Inequality and Social Change, 1972.
- Castes: Old and New, Essays in Social Structure and Social Stratification, 1969.
- Caste, Class and Power: Changing Patterns of Stratification in a Tanjore Village, 1965.

Essays[30]

- Secularism Re-examined
- Race & Caste
- Teaching & Research
- Government & NGOs
- The Indian Middle Class

### G.S Ghurye

Professor G. S. Ghurye (1893-1983) is justifiably considered the doyen of Indian Sociology. On his return from Cambridge, where he wrote his doctoral dissertation under W.H.R. Rivers and later A.C. Haddon, Ghurye succeeded Sir Patric Geddes as Head

of Department of Sociology in the University of Bombay in 1924.

He continued to head the Department until his retirement in 1959. After retirement, he was designated the first Emeritus Professor in the University of Bombay.

Ghurye's contribution to the development of sociology and anthropology in India is enormous and multi-faceted. A prolific writer, Ghurye wrote 32 books and scores of papers, which cover such wide-ranging themes as kinship and marriage, urbanization, ascetic traditions, tribal life, demography, architecture and literature.

Ghurye played a key role in the professionalisation of sociology by founding the Indian Sociological Society and its journal Sociological Bulletin. In addition, he encouraged and trained a large number of talented students who, in turn, advanced the frontiers of sociological and anthropological research in the country. With his own voluminous output and through the researches of his able students Ghurye embarked on an ambitious project of mapping out the ethnographic landscape of India.[28]

### Yogendra Singh

German- American cultural anthropologist Franz's theoretical position is often characterized as historical particularism. He claimed that unilinear evolution was an inadequate model for the known diversity of human cultures.

Progress he said does not follow a particular sequence nor is it necessarily unidirectional from simple to complex. Differing with evolutionary theorists like E.B Taylor he contended that cultural learning is unconscious rather rational. Laws comparable to natural sciences were possible in principle though usually premature in practice. He argued in favor of meticulous collection of ethnographic data before attempting generalization.

The Boasian school established culture as the key concept in US anthropology and has been criticized for its cultural determinism and relativism. However Boas was influential in the development of disciplines of folklore, linguistics and anthropology. He was mostly concerned with recording the symbolic culture of Kwakiuti and other north-west coast tribes and deriving general themes of cultural comparison. [29,30]

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] "sociology". Retrieved 20 April 2020.
- [2] Dictionary of the Social Sciences (2008) [2002]. Calhoun, Craig (ed.). "Sociology". New

- York: Oxford University Press – via American Sociological Association.
- [3] "Sociology: A 21st Century Major" (PDF). Colgate University. American Sociological Association. Archived from the original (PDF) on 18 October 2017. Retrieved 19 July 2017.
- [4] Ashley, David; Orenstein, David M. (2005). *Sociological Theory: Classical Statements* (6 ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- [5] Giddens, Anthony, Duneier, Mitchell, Applebaum, Richard. 2007. *Introduction to Sociology*. Sixth Edition. New York: W.W. Norton and Company. Chapter 1.
- [6] Macy, Michael W.; Willer, Robert (2002). "From Factors to Actors: Computational Sociology and Agent-Based Modeling". *Annual Review of Sociology*. 28: 143–66. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.28.110601.141117. JSTOR 3069238.
- [7] Lazer, David; Pentland, Alex; Adamic, L; Aral, S; Barabasi, AL; Brewer, D; Christakis, N; Contractor, N; et al. (6 February 2009). "Computational Social Science". *Science*. 323 (5915): 721–23. doi:10.1126/science.1167742. PMC 2745217. PMID 19197046.
- [8] Kahle, Lynn R.; Valette-Florence, Pierre (2012). *Marketplace Lifestyles in an Age of Social Media*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc. ISBN 978-0-7656-2561-8.
- [9] Nettleship, H (1894). *A Dictionary of Classical Antiquities*. London. p. 67.
- [10] Halsey, A. H. (2004). *A History of Sociology in Britain: Science, Literature, and Society*. p. 34.
- [11] Mitchell, Geoffrey Duncan (1970). *A New Dictionary of Sociology*. p. 201.
- [12] Wardī, ‘Alī (1950). "A sociological analysis of Ibn Khaldun's theory: A study in the sociology of knowledge". *UT Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. University of Texas at Austin – via University of Texas Libraries.
- [13] Dhaouadi, Mahmoud (1990). "Ibn Khaldun: The founding father of eastern sociology". *International Sociology*. 5 (3): 319–35. doi:10.1177/026858090005003007. S2CID 143508326.
- [14] Hassan, Faridah Hj. "Ibn Khaldun and Jane Addams: The Real Father of Sociology and the Mother of Social Works". Faculty of Business Management. Universiti Teknologi Mara. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.510.3556.
- [15] Soyer, Mehmet; Gilbert, Paul (2012). "Debating the Origins of Sociology Ibn Khaldun as a Founding Father of Sociology". *International Journal of Sociological Research*. 5 (2): 13–30.
- [16] Dr; Akhtar, S.W. (1997). "The Islamic Concept of Knowledge". *Al-Tawhid: A Quarterly Journal of Islamic Thought & Culture*. 12: 3.
- [17] Haque, Amber (2004). "Psychology from Islamic Perspective: Contributions of Early Muslim Scholars and Challenges to Contemporary Muslim Psychologists". *Journal of Religion and Health*. 43 (4): 357–77 [375]. doi:10.1007/s10943-004-4302-z. S2CID 38740431.
- [18] Enan, Muhammed Abdullah (2007). *Ibn Khaldun: His Life and Works*. The Other Press. p. v. ISBN 978-983-9541-53-3.
- [19] Alatas, S. H. (2006). "The Autonomous, the Universal and the Future of Sociology" (PDF). *Current Sociology*. 54: 7–23 [15]. doi:10.1177/0011392106058831. S2CID 144226604.
- [20] Warren E. Gates (July–September 1967). "The Spread of Ibn Khaldun's Ideas on Climate and Culture". *Journal of the History of Ideas*. 28 (3): 415–22 [415]. doi:10.2307/2708627. JSTOR 2708627.
- [21] Mowlana, H. (2001). "Information in the Arab World". *Cooperation South Journal*. 1.
- [22] Granger, Frank (1911). *Historical sociology: A textbook of politics*. London: Methuen & Co. p. 1.
- [23] Sieyès, Emmanuel Joseph (1999). Fauré, C. (ed.). *Des Manuscrits de Sieyès. 1773–1799 1 & 2*. Paris: Champion. ISBN 978-2745302601.
- [24] Scott, John, and Gordon Marshall. 2015 [2009]. "Comte, Auguste" in *A Dictionary of Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press. eISBN 9780191726842. – via Oxford References (subscription required)
- [25] Macionis, John; Gerber, Linda (2011). *Sociology* (7th Canadian ed.). Toronto: Pearson Canada. ISBN 978-0-13-700161-3. OCLC 434559397.
- [26] *Dictionary of the Social Sciences*, Article: Comte, Auguste

- [27] Bourdeau, Michel (2018) [2008]. "Auguste Comte". Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. ISSN 1095-5054. Retrieved 4 November 2011.
- [28] Copleson, Frederick S.J. 1994 [1974]. A History of Philosophy: IX Modern Philosophy. New York: Image Books. p. 118.
- [29] Calhoun, Craig J. (2002). Classical Sociological Theory. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. p. 19. ISBN 978-0-631-21348-2.
- [30] Berlin, Isaiah. 1967 [1937]. Karl Marx: His Life and Environment (3rd ed.). New York: Time Inc Book Division.

