

# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

## Preface

### What is Sociology?

Through out our discussion of the different and major social institutions within a society, I need you to have at least a basic definition of what sociology is all about and what it studies. So let's define what sociology is.

Basically, sociology is the study of modern human *societies*.

The term *society* refers to the largest conceivable *group*, a definite and distinct entity, characterized by:

- A definite territory (geographic location)
- Sexual reproduction (relatively self-sustaining and independent)
- Comprehensive and common culture, and
- Interdependence between its different parts (organized relationship among the parts)

*Group* is two or more people who form an interactional system, who share a feeling of unity, and those who are bound together in a relatively stable pattern of interaction.

A society can be defined broadly or narrowly with respect of the context of speaking.

With an interestingly enough similarity with a living organism, a society has got its own demands and needs to meet and problems to solve on order to survive and perpetuate, that could be referred to as the four functional problems.

The four functional problems of any social system:

1. The problem of making a living from the environment for the system- this problem is referred as the problem of adaptation. The basic needs or necessities of life must be met, they need to be produced and distributed.
2. The problem of achieving the goals of a social system- this problem is referred to as the problem of goal attainment. Peace and order should be kept.
3. The problem of holding the different parts of the system- this problem is referred to as the problem of integration. For people to be part of society, their membership should give them meaning.
4. The problem of replacing the worn out parts of a system and the problem of socializing to the norms and values and etc, of the society- this problem is referred to as the problem of latent pattern maintenance.

The relevance of talking about the four functional problems in relation to the course that we are dealing now with is the social institutions that we are going to discuss about try to meet these functional problems. We've said that society can't exist and persists, unless these four functional problems are solved. Therefore, social institutions exist to meet these functional problems.

# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

## PART ONE

### Chapter One

#### Introduction

AN INSTITUTION in an ordinary day-to-day language refers to an organization or an institution with definite system of interaction or bureaucracies and social and physical boundaries and with definite and specific goals at hand.

Social institutions are of vital significance to the fabric of any society's culture and to the daily experiences of individuals. They are usually conceived of as the *basic focuses of social organization, common to all societies and dealing with the basic universal problems of ordered social life.*

But *social institutions*, on the other hand, are *an organized system of social relationships, which embodies certain common values and procedures, and meets certain basic needs of the society.*

It can be defined as *a system of norms<sup>1</sup>, values<sup>2</sup>, statuses<sup>3</sup>, and roles<sup>4</sup>, which are developed around a major social function.*

Social institutions are composed of and concerned with two elements, which could be examined separately:

- a. With persons who are engaged in interaction with one another. It refers to the study of how persons interact to create, sustain or transform social relationships (a micro-sociology); and
- b. With the patterns of interactions that will develop when the interaction has become routinized or regularized or habitualized. It refers to the study of patterns of social relationships and how they fit together to create a society (a macro-sociology).

As it has been indicated at the outset, there are certain universal and basic tasks that social institutions perform if human societies are to exist and carry on. These minimum tasks or needs of human societies are all *universal* and *vital*.

What are the vital needs or tasks that need to be performed if societies are to perpetuate?

---

<sup>1</sup> Social norm: a shared expectation of behavior that connotes what is considered culturally desirable and appropriate.

<sup>2</sup> Social value: an idea held by people about ethical behavior or appropriate behavior, what is right or wrong, desirable or undesirable.

<sup>3</sup> Social status: a position, which a person occupies in the social structure. "The position of a person in a group"

<sup>4</sup> Social roles: the social expectations attached to a particular social status. "The behavior expected of one who occupies a certain status"

# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

1. New members should be born and socialized to the norms, values, rules and regulations of their society. The *family* is the institution responsible for producing new members and to give them preliminary acquaintanceship with the basic norms and values of their society. The *educational institutions* will further teach and socialize these new members of the society to the standards.
2. The basic necessities of life must be produced and distributed. The *economic institutions* are responsible for the production, distribution, and exchange of the necessities of life.
3. Peace and order should be kept stable. People should feel secured and their integrity intact if they are to undertake their everyday life activities with good spirits. To this end, every society needs *political institutions* that are responsible for maintaining peace and order, and provide some kind of leadership.
4. People should feel that their life is purposeful and worthwhile to live. The *religious institutions* are responsible for providing purpose for life and making it meaningful and worthwhile.

The major social institutions are of five types: the *family*, the *religion*, the *education*, the *polity*, and the *economy*; and in addition to these major social institutions there are such minor items as *recreation, art, health, sport, science*, etc.

## I.1. Origin and Universality of Social Institutions

T. Hobbes and J. Lock's philosophy states that human kind had lived in the *state of nature* without social institutions, and organization and with total individual freedom. People used to live without the help of others-they used to live on their own.

According to this view, man eventually discovered the need for organizations and the advantages they can provide. Then, a social contract was made. Subsequently, co-operations, organizations, and institutions emerged.

But, on the other hand, sociologists argue that *social institutions have emerged with the emergence of man as a distinctive species*. The isolated individual in the state of nature could have never existed, as man can't live without the help of others. They argued that when human kind emerged from the evolution of species, *society* appeared as the immediate context for his existence.

Although there is a difference in the type and functions they perform, social institutions exist in every known culture. They are universal. Any social revolution altering the forms of social institutions and removing the positions that make up the establishments, will in turn establish new positions in the new forms *of the same basic social institutions*. They only change the norms that govern the behavior of the participants. But, the institutions usually exist; they persist.

## **II.2. Functions of Social Institutions**

The fact that social institutions and the functions they perform are universal entails that man can't exist without them, in one way or the other.

Social institutions have primary and secondary functions.

### **Primary Functions: *An Area of Paramount Function of the Social Institutions***

#### ***The Family Institution:***

The family institution performs essentially two major functions for the general society; one is the reproduction of mankind (producing new members) in a regulated and socially acceptable way, and the other the caring of the newborn babies during their infancy and early age and satisfy the human emotional needs and drives.

#### ***The Educational Institutions:***

The perpetuation of the cultural heritage of a society by passing it on to each new generation and socializing<sup>5</sup> of new members of the society are the two major functions of the educational institutions.

#### ***The Religious Institutions:***

Religion is the most dynamic means of social control, even more than social and public legislations by offering people a sense of order, purpose, and direction and by influencing and supporting the dominant values of the society.

#### ***The Economic Institutions:***

Economic institutions supply the basic human needs. Every society organizes economic institutions for the purpose of coordination of production, distribution, exchange and consumption of goods and services.

#### ***The Political Institutions:***

In order for a society to exist and perpetuate, there must be rules and regulations to keep peace and order. In all society there must be some sort of a *power holder- the government*, whose responsibility will be the maintaining of peace and order among individuals with in the society and with the outsiders. Primitive societies also have had traditional forms of government which, however, may not be as sophisticated as the modern ones could be.

---

<sup>5</sup> Socialization by educational institutions refers teaching the young about the culture of their society or the various patterns of living they need to know to live in their social environment. It is a long due process that begins at birth and ends at death.

# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

## **Secondary Functions**

Institutions usually support each other's. Those functions that one institution performs in support of other institutions are known as *secondary functions*.

### **An Example**

For example, we can take the family and see what secondary functions can it perform from other institutions in a society.

#### ***Secondary functions of the family in relation to the educational institutions:***

There are numbers of functions that the family performs in support of the educational institutions:

1. The family lays the basis for the formal education (children learn the fundamental skills, rules in the society from their family-their parents).
2. Starting at an early age, infants are socialized with in the family. Therefore, children receive their first education from the family (the socialization that we receive from our families are more influential than any other socialization in our later life).

It plays an important part in training and socializing the young into acceptable patterns of behavior in the society and therefore transmits the social culture of the society from one generation to the next.

#### ***Secondary functions of the family in relation to the religious institutions:***

1. The family gives the infant his first contact with religious ideals and beliefs.
2. The family through examples reinforces various moral issues, although it's the major concern of the religious institutions.

#### ***Secondary function of the family in relation to the political institutions:***

The political institutions depend up on the family for developing with in the children a respect for authority and demonstrate the qualities of good citizenship, peace and order. It is a useful agency of social control.

#### ***Secondary function of the family in relation of the economic institutions:***

The family assists the economic institutions by acting as a basic unit of production and consumption. In addition, it provides a bridge between the individual and the wider society that he'll encounter when he enters the world of work as an independent adult. It is an informal agency of education.

The million functions of a society are organized in to these five social institutions. These social institutions work together to make the society an efficient and a well organized one. They exit in a

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

constant mutual interaction. There is interdependence between these social institutions. We can't study one institution separately unless we try to understand how it works with other institutions--by seeing a network in which a change in one institution brings changes in other institutions.

## Chapter Two The Sociology of the Family

THE FAMILY is one of the major social systems of any society and that the family life is expected to meet certain needs of the individual and the society. The sociology of the family is the sub-field of sociology that tries to explain the nature of the family, the orders and the disorders in the family. The three major areas of concern of the sociology of family are the following.

- a. The sociology of the family is interested in the organization, the structures and functions of the family.
- b. The sociology of the family is interested in how the family as a social system is sustained and modified. The family had undergone significant changes in its past life span; and that is the subject matter of the sociology of the family-how it changes, what changes and what is its fate in the future.
- c. The sociology of the family is concerned with how the components of the family are interrelated and how the family as a unit is interdependent with other social institutions and how family relationships are formed and changed.

### II.1. Definitions of the Family

It is really difficult to give a universally applicable definition of the family.

In his book of the “Social Structure” which was published in 1949 G. Murdock defined *the family* as ‘a social group characterized by common residence, economic cooperation, and reproduction. It includes adults of both sexes, at least two of whom maintain a socially approved sexual relationship, and one or more children of own or adopted of the sexually cohabitating adults.

The family is the smallest group of the society.

The definition of *the family* in some societies may refer to a set of people related by blood, marriage (or some other agreed up on relationship), or by adoption, who share the primary responsibility for reproduction and caring for member of society.

However, many social scientists contend that a family is a socially approved, heterosexually arranged group made up of a female and male and their children through which procreation and socialization takes place and the life long bonds or kin relations is initiated.

### II.2. Forms of the Family: Institutionalized Structures

There are different arguments regarding the understanding of the family through the view of its varied forms. But the widely accepted and the most formal one in the classification of the types of the family include the following:

# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

## 1. The Nuclear Family

The nuclear family is the family structure composed of two adults of the opposite sexes living together in socially approved sexual relations together with children owed or adopted.

Mostly, during his lifetime, a person is a member of two different and overlapping nuclear families: the *family of orientation* and the *family of procreation*.

### a. The Family of Orientation

It is the family that one is born in to and from which he or she receives basic and initial socialization. It usually consists of the self, siblings and the parents. For the children, a nuclear family is the family of orientation with which they identify themselves as members, even while they are far gone.

### b. The Family of Procreation

It is the family that adults form while leaving their family of orientation and it is composed of the self, spouse, and the children. It is a family that an individual lives by himself independent of the parents.

A nuclear family is alternatively referred to as *conjugal family*. But there is a slight difference in the use of these two terms. For a family to be referred as conjugal, it must necessarily include the husband and the wife. But a nuclear family may or may not include a marrying couple; it may consist of any of the two or more persons that are related by marriage, kinship, or blood relationship.

Generally speaking, a nuclear family is the characteristic feature of the industrialized societies. It is a transitory and a two-generational (the parents and the children) family.

## 2. The Polygamous Family

The polygamous family consists of the two or more nuclear families that are affiliated by having one married parent in common, with the marriage pattern being either polygynous or polyandrous. For example in the case of the polygynous family one man acts as husband and father and thus unites them in to a larger familial group.

## 3. The Extended Family

An extended family consists of two or more nuclear families affiliated through an extension of the *parent-child relationship* rather than of the *husband-wife relationship*, i.e., by joining the nuclear family of a married adult of his parents.

It is usually a patriarchal group dominated by the senior male members. This type of family system is found most often in pre-industrial agrarian communities, where it represents the traditional values and beliefs of the society (such as male dominance, female subservience, and family unity) and



## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

maintains the traditional functions of the family unit. It is responsible for the education, training and welfare of the family members.

In the extended family arrangement, one could find two or more generations living in one house, or in houses close to one another forming one cooperative unit. The head of the family unit is the *eldest* one. The extended families are mostly created to meet the need for cooperation for undertaking some tedious agricultural activities in horticultural societies

Basic differences between the **nuclear** and the **extended** families include the following:

- a. In nuclear families the size of members is much fewer than for the extended families.
- b. The extended families usually persist over generations; the death of a parent may not affect the existence of the family, which is not the case for nuclear families.
- c. In the case of the extended families *blood* is more emphasized criterion of membership, and, as a result, it is called a *consanguineal kin*. But for nuclear families the emphasis is on *marriage* – which is called an *affineal kin*.
- d. The organizational principles of the extended families are more complex than that of the nuclear families.

### **The Modified Extended Family**

The modified extended family exists where the nuclear families, although they may be living far apart geographically, maintain regular contacts and mutual support through visits, phone calls, and letters.

### ***Advantages of the Extended Family***

- a. Continuity of Generations:** It ensures continuity of families over generations by linking parental families with new families of procreation.
- b. Maintenance and Transmission of Family Holdings and Traditions:** It is a more effective structure for maintaining family traditions and for the transmission of family holdings from one generation to the next.
- c. Large Kin Network:** It exposes children to the large networks of kin relations.
- d. Provide Comfort and Companionship:** It reduces strains for family members at times of such crises as death of a member of a family, divorce, or illnesses, since there are more people who can provide assistance and emotional support.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

**e. Large Economic Unit:** The extended family constitutes a larger economic unit than the nuclear family, which enables its members to undertake various tasks taking advantages of the economies of scale.

Murdock found the nuclear family to be a universal human social grouping, whether it was the only type of family system or was joined together with other nuclear families to form a polygamous or extended family. This prevalence of the nuclear family may be in part explained by two of its basic functions:

1. Its role in providing both social cohesion and a reciprocally beneficial exchange (*reciprocity*).
2. Its reproductive and socialization activities with regard to new members of the society (*legitimation*).

### Other Types of Family Arrangement

In addition of these conventional classifications, sociologists and anthropologists have another classification of the family types:

#### The Reconstructed Family

It is a family where one or both partners had been previously married, and where they brought with them children of the previous marriage. Such family is common in the western world because of the increasing rate divorce and remarriage.

**A Single Parent Family:** it is a family in which there is only one parent present to care for the children. This is a family type that arises from the death of one of the parents, or from a divorce, or from lack of desire to get married.

**A Symmetrical (Dual-Career) Family:** this is one where the roles of the husband and the wife or cohabitating partners have become alike, or symmetrical and equal. In this type of a family (usually in the most developed countries) both partners are most likely to be wage earners.

Still there is another classification of family types for those intellectuals whose main concern is *how power is distributed* among the members of a family:

- ✓ **Patriarchal:** where by the male members of the family make the major decisions, and the authority resides in the father and his kinsmen.
- ✓ **Matriarchal:** here the major decision making power in the family resides on the mother and her close relatives.
- ✓ **Equalitarian:** where by authority in the family resides both on the father and the mother, more or less, equally.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

For those whose concern rest on the system of decent that exists with in the family or lineage, the classification include:

- ✓ **Patrilineal:** here names, obligations, duties, etc. are only transferred through the father's line.
- ✓ **Matrilineal:** where by names, obligations, duties, etc. are only transferred through the mother's line.
- ✓ **Bilinal:** in which case names, obligations, duties, etc. are transferred through both the father's and the mother's lines.

And for those whose concern is residence, the classification of family types include:

- ✓ **Patrilocal (Virilocal):** newly married couples reside with in the premises of the husband's parent's residence.
- ✓ **Matrilocal (Uxorilocal):** newly married couples reside with in the premises of the wife's parent's residence.
- ✓ **Neolocal:** newly marries couples reside on their own house independent of their parents.

### II.3. Marriage: An Institutionalized Arrangement

Norms that arrange for an institutionalized marriage differ from one culture to another. Traditional social norms viewed marriage as a sacred phenomenon; considered it as a divine institution, created and maintained by God. In many societies however, marriage is considered as a mechanism that provides for the legitimation of children. As a result, children born with in marriage are considered to be *legitimate*<sup>6</sup>, while children born out of parents without marital engagement are considered *illegitimate*.

Similarly, *Ira Reiss* 's defines *marriage* as *a socially accepted union of individuals in husband and wife roles, with the key function of legitimation of parent-hood.*

*E.R. Leach* defines *marriage* as 'a **bundle of rights**' (a bundle- *marriage* as a collection that includes legal father hood, legal mother hood, and the monopoly of sexual access between marriage partners, rights to domestic services, rights over property, recognized relationship of affinity, and etc.).

---

<sup>6</sup> A legitimate child is a child who is born from a socially approved marriage. It refers to a parent-child relationship.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

These definitions of marriage demonstrate to us that marriage involves several common criteria that cross-cuts its historically and culturally variable nature:

1. It is a heterosexual union.
2. It legitimizes sexual relationships and child bearing.
3. It is a binding relationship that assumes permanence.
4. It is a public affair rather than a private personal matter.
5. It involves reciprocal and mutual rights and obligations between the spouses.
6. It is a highly patterned and institutionalized arrangement<sup>7</sup>.

Marriage can also be defined by the social functions it performs for the society:

*Marriage is an institutional means of providing for the performance of tasks concerned with procreation, rearing of future generation, and the transmission of material and cultural possessions, when the means concerned involves a reordering of relationships of kin groups and/ or of the persons to be, already or potentially, the genetic parents of children.*

Marriage is concerned with the transference of rights between groups, which determine the patterns of inheritance and group membership of the children of the union thereby.

Marriage marks the re-ordering of domestic relationships as well as establishing those of descent and, if the domestic unit is an economic unit, of economic relationship as well. It also involves the transfer of rights in the persons of the spouses. And this takes *two* forms: the domestic and the sexual.

a. **Domestic Rights** is usually determined by patterns of residence, i.e., whether the couples are residing in their own or they are residing in the husband's or the wife's parent's. For example, in the patrilocal arrangements, the right of the domestic services is transferred from the wife to the relatives of her husband. In the case of matrilocal patterns the rights to domestic services are transferred from the husband to the relatives of his wife. But if the couples decided to live on their own by setting up a new domestic group, their domestic service is shared. In the case of a natolocal pattern<sup>8</sup>, their own relatives maintain the domestic services of each couple.

b. **Sexual Rights**; marriage is primarily a transference of rights between the groups. Here marriage transfers rights in the wife's sexuality not exclusively to the husband but to the males of the husband's sibling group, or rights in the females of a sibling group to a husband of one of them. Since the rights in the child born of a woman to whom her husband's brothers have had *privileged access* will, in a patrilineal society, be regarded as belonging to her husband on the principle that the social father is the rightful husband of its mother, whoever the genetic father may be. This is not the case of *plural marriage* but one of *privileged mating*.

---

<sup>7</sup> There are norms, values, obligations, and duties that secure it.

<sup>8</sup> A Natolocal arrangement is a pattern in which the wife continues to reside with her brothers and the husband may merely visit her.

## II.4. Forms of Marriage

### 1. Monogamy

In most Christian countries, monogamy is the only accepted and existing form of marriage. It is a form of marriage in which a person can only have one marital partner *at a time*. In such societies, where monogamy is the only form of marriage, if a man or woman enters into a new marital arrangement before he or she settles the first one, it is considered as a crime and it's called **bigamy**.

### 2. Serial Monogamy

This marital pattern exists where some people just keep on divorcing and remarrying, but each time each marriage is a monogamous in its form (one at a time, one after the other, and they don't last long).

### 3. Polygamy

In some other societies it is perfectly acceptable to have more than one partner at a time. A general term referring to a marriage between one member of a sex and two or more members of the opposite at the same time is called **polygamy**. It might be a surprise to you to learn that most societies throughout the world, past and present, have preferred polygamy *not* monogamy. Anthropologist George Murdock sampled 565 societies and found out that 80% had some type of polygamy as their preferred form.

There are *two* basic types of **polygamy**. According to Murdock, the most common- endorsed by the majority of the cultures he sampled- was **polygyny**, which refers to the marriage of a man to more than one woman at a time. The various wives could be sisters, who are expected to hold similar values and have already had experienced sharing the household. In this case, the marital arrangement is called **sororal polygyny**. On the other hand, when a marital arrangement involves wives who aren't related (not sisters or kin), the arrangement is called **non- sororal polygyny**.

A specific form of sororal polygyny is the inheritance of a sister of kin of one's dead wife, which is known as **sororate**. Gumuz and the Zulu are peculiar examples of this type of marriage.

**Polyandry**, the other basic type of polygamy, has been accepted by some extremely poor societies, and by those who carry out female infanticide (the killing of female girls) and thus have a relatively small number of women. It is the union of women to several men at the same time. It is a very rare form of marriage found in the very isolated cultures of the world (e.g. the Toda culture of the Southern India, Marquesan Islanders in the Pacific). In this case too polyandry has two distinctive forms: *fraternal*<sup>9</sup> and *non-fraternal*<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> By fraternal we are referring to that arrangement where the husbands are all brothers (where the several men are brothers.)

<sup>10</sup> By non-fraternal we are referring to that arrangement where the husbands are not brothers or related.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

A specific form of fraternal polyandry is levirate, where a widow inherits her dead husband's brother.

Polyandry creates one problem that polygyny doesn't—the biological father of the newborn is not known, and no tracing (descent as well as inheritance) pattern is possible.

Nevertheless, there are some justifications for the existence of such a practice. Some say it is a mechanism of *adjustment to poverty*—regions where polyandry exists is very hostile to human settlement and to earning a livelihood.

Others contend the practice is because of the *unbalanced sex ratio* that exists between the male and the female population (which results from the practice of the killing of newborn female infants). These people on this line of contention also cite one advantage of the practice of polyandry; it enables to keep the birth rate low.

### II.5. Modes of Acquiring a Wife

There are several modes of acquiring a wife devised by diverse societies depending on their own cultural context. The most common ones are:

#### 1. *Bride wealth*

in societies with descent groups, people enter in to marriage not alone, but with the help of their descent group. Descent group members often have to contribute to bride wealth, a customary gift before, at, or after marriage from the husband and his kin to the wife and her kin. It's the most common way of acquiring a wife. Another word for bride wealth is bride price, but this term is inaccurate because people with the custom don't usually regard the exchange as a sale.

Functions of the bride wealth:

1. It compensates the brides group for the lose of her *companionship* and *labor*.
2. It makes the children born to the woman full members of her husband's descent group, fro which it is called a *progeny price*.

**2. Dowry:** it's a marital exchange in which the wife's group provides substantial gifts to the husband's family. Dowry best known from India correlates with low female status. Women are perceived as burdens. When a man and his family take a wife, they expect to be compensated fro the added responsibility.

**3. Bride Service:** this is a practice where by a marrying man serves for a specified time for his wife-to-be family before he gets the permission to marry her.

**4. Gift Exchange:** this refers to an equivalent exchange of gifts between the families of the marrying couples at marriage.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

**5. Abduction:** it is practiced in many different cultures. Here a person settles this marital arrangement with the use of force.

**6. Elopement:** this is the capturing of the wife-to-be without the use of force. Here it's assumed that there is a prior agreement between the marrying couples. It usually occurs when the two contracting couples are agreeing to form a marital relationship while their families failed to approve the affiliation.

**7. Inheritance:** this refers to a condition where a man of a house dies, there by his brother inherit his wife and assume his responsibilities, and vice-versa.

**8. Adoption:** in this case a man may obtain a wife by being adopted to a family-or a girl may obtain a husband by being adopted to a family.

**9. Sister Exchange:** it refers to an exchange between two families both having brother and sister to one another as husband and wife.

### **II.6. Marriage Contract**

Marriage contract is a formal contract, when a person gets married, having the objective of defining the rights and obligations of the spouses. It regulates the marital arrangement.

Although marriage unites the two spouses the society is always the third party; the society involves itself in the affairs of the spouses.

#### **II.6.1. Types of Marital Contracts**

##### **Customary Marriage**

It is a type of marital arrangement practiced in most agrarian communities, and it is usually arranged by parents. Parents in trying to form a marital arrangement for their kids, they look for the right type of person in status and social rank. It is rather a marriage between the families than a marriage between the spouses. Hence, romance doesn't have a place in arranging the relationship.

##### **Church Marriage (Religious Marriage)**

Historically marriage is the concern of the church before it becomes the state's. And therefore the church considers the right to recognize any marital relationships as its jurisdiction and fails to recognize all other marriages that take place outside of it.

##### **Civil marriage**

Is the most common type of marital arrangement in most urban areas, for which the state provides a certificate for recognition. And equally, all other types of marriage contracts (customary and church) are recognized by *the state*.

### II.7. Mate Selection and Restriction on the Choice of Mate

**Mate selection:** is the process that results in the getting together of two spouses.

Some societies give no chance to individuals to choose whom they wish to marry. There are some guidelines; there is always strict control imposed over individuals by the society on the choice of whom to marry and whom not to. This stronger control resulted from what is known as *incest*-a sexual relationship between too close kin relatives. Therefore society has established what is known as *incest taboo*.

Every known society prohibits sexual relationship between kin, although there is a variation. And in almost all known societies a sexual relationship within a nuclear family is a universally taboo practice (except for the husband and the wife). An individual should have a sexual relationship or get married outside of his close kin, which is acceptable and institutionalized. Hence, in some societies, even a marriage between remote kin is forbidden but in some societies *cross-cousin marriage* (marriage between children of brothers and sisters) is allowed. Incest taboo exists and prohibits a sexual relationship between parents and children and marriage or sexual relationship between brothers and sisters.

A taboo that prohibits a sexual relationship between parents and children is called *intra-generational incest*. And the one which prohibits a sexual relationship between brothers and sisters is called an *inter-generational incest*<sup>11</sup>.

All cultures define who is an acceptable candidate for marital relationship for someone by providing regulations.

#### II.7.1. Incest Taboo is Universal: Why?

Explanations of incest taboo have led to many and varied theories. However, one simple traditional explanation to incest taboo is that if it happens it will lead to disaster in the society as a result of the disappointment of the supernatural powers.

#### *Six Theories to Explain Incest Taboo:*

1. **In-Breeding Theory:** It asserts that the mating of close kin produces bad results, such as abnormal, enfeebled, and insufficiently numerous offspring. The incest taboo is therefore adaptive because it limits inbreeding, and arose on that account. However, the theory assumes genetics beyond the capacity of the societies of the early times. In some societies, for example, cross-cousin marriage (between children of brother and sister, as it is the case in Afar) is allowed.

---

<sup>11</sup> The best known examples of intra-generational incest come from the Inca-Peru, ancient Egypt and traditional Hawaii. Those cultures allowed royal brother-sister marriages. Privileges endogamy, a violation of the incest taboo that applied to commoners in those cultures, was a means of differentiating between the rulers and the subjects.

Among the aristocratic families of the Ancient Egypt, there was a marriage between the members of the nuclear family, but because of two reasons: to keep the aristocratic family blood pure; to keep property and power within the family members. Except for such cases, incest taboo within the nuclear family is universal.



## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

2. **Family Theory:** This theory states that unregulated sexual competition is disruptive for any group, which the family is crucial group, and the incest taboo is needed to maintain the family intact. S. Freud and B. Malinowski develop this theory. Freud argued that there is always a sexual attraction between the parents and the children of opposite sexes (which he identified as the Electra complex-the daughter's sexual attraction towards her father-and the Oedipus complex-the son's sexual attraction to his mother). So according to this theory, incest taboo is established to avoid this sexual conflict, to protect and maintain the family and safeguard the society at large. If there is no incest taboo, roles will be confused, who the mother is, who the father is, and who the children are aren't known. This theory has its own shortcomings. It tries to explain incest taboo within the nuclear family. But it doesn't explain its existence outside of the nuclear family.

3. **Socialization Theory:** It asserts that the regulation of and control of erotic impulses is an indispensable part of socialization. Therefore these impulses should be frustrated and directed outside the nuclear family. In order for this learning to occur, the socializing agent must control but not directly gratify the child's erotic impulses.

4. **Demographic Theory:** This theory holds that for the early man, the short life span, small number of offspring to reach maturity, spacing of those offspring, and random sex ratio of the offspring, taken altogether made interfamilial inbreeding a virtual demographic impossibility. Later when technological improvements resulted in longer life, interfamilial mating becomes possible; but the already existing pattern of familial exogamy was given normative backing through the creation of the familial taboo.

5. **Social and Cultural Theory:** This theory holds that, left for their own devices, human beings prefer to mate within the family; but the need for wider group (for sharing cultural innovations, for mutual aid and for economic security) makes family and supra-family exogamy highly adaptive as a device for joining families or larger kinship groups.

6. **The Indifference or the Revulsion Theory:** According to this theory, the incest taboo is either a formal expression of the sexual indifference of the kinsmen towards each other, or a formal expression of an instinctive horror of sexual relations among kinsmen. If people live together for long time, they will develop a strong relationship, and they think of no sex. But it fails to answer the question, "it is instinct, why some people violate it? Does that mean these people have no instinct?"

In addition to these theories Murdock had come up with a theory, an ***Eclectic Theory of Incest Taboo***, which takes and integrates the good elements of each theory in order to explain why incest taboo is universal.

### **II.8. Rules of Exogamy and Endogamy**

Many societies have explicit or unstated rules that define potential mates as acceptable or unacceptable. These norms can be distinguished in terms of endogamy and exogamy and they refer to the question of selectivity.

**Rules of Exogamy** (*exo: outside*)

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

This rule requires an individual to marry someone *outside* of his or her culturally defined group (kinship) to which he or she belongs. This is an extension of incest taboo that prohibits a marital relationship between family members. Nonetheless, exogamy is *broader* than the incest taboo by the fact that it needs a culturally defined group (a tribe, a clan, etc.).

### **Rules of Endogamy (*endon: with in*)**

This rule requires a person to find a marrying couple within a culturally defined group, or kinship to which he or she is a member (a tribe, a clan, an ethnic group, a religious group, a social class, a race, etc.). The most vivid example of an endogamous marriage is the Indian Caste System. The Aderie in Ethiopia could also be considered as an endogamous group. Endogamy is intended to reinforce the cohesiveness of the group by suggesting to the young that they should marry someone of "*our own kind*". Endogamous restrictions can be seen as preferences of one group over another.

### **Other Types of Control over Mate Selection**

In certain instances, the parents, or the society at large may regulate the choice of partner. Therefore, love and mate selection do not necessarily coincide. Many of the world's cultures give priority in mate selection to factors other than romantic feelings. The newly married couple is expected to develop a feeling of love after the legal union is formalized.

### ***Child Marriage***

This is a sort of arrangement in which contracting parents enter to before the child had time to establish any attachment. In this type of marital arrangement, the parents or other members of the family might settle the marriage contract. In this type of marital arrangement the child has no right to marry what he or she wants or wishes to marry.

### ***Child Isolation***

This is marriage in which a similar effect to child marriage may be achieved by isolating the child, usually the girls, so that she will have no contacts with individuals of the opposite sex, and therefore she will be totally dependant on members of her family regarding the choice of mate.

### ***Supervision without Segregation or Isolation:***

It involves controlling without segregating the child from any contact with individuals of the opposite sex. This supervision is made possible through the parents teaching their kids about the great social value of *sexual purity, virginity* at time of marriage. 'Premarital sex' is shameful both for the girls and their families'.

### ***Indirect Parental Supervision***

In this case the choice of the partner is formally free, and in fact free as long as the partner comes from the right social category or milieu. The theory doesn't specify how the person's 'rightness' is to be determined and thus the way is wide open to the advice of more 'experienced' people, i.e., parents.

It ought to be noted here that the occurrence of these different types of control over choice of marriage partner can be understood in terms of the ideas that a society has about sexuality on the one hand, and the uses to which the system of marriage and affinity is put to, on the other.

Despite these restrictions, the general trend in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the new millennia is that there is a transition from the selection of a mate for a child by the parents to the selection of mate by the child himself or herself.

### II.9. Kinship and the Family

All societies have found some forms of family organization a convenient way to deal with problems faced by all human groups: the need to facilitate economic cooperation between the sexes, the need to provide a proper setting within which child rearing may take place, and the need to control sexual activity. Though efficient and flexible family organization may be in rising to solve challenges connected with such problems, the fact is that many societies need to deal with problems that are beyond the ability of family organization to deal with. For one, there is often a need for some means by which members of one local group can claim support and protection from individuals in another. This can be important for defense against natural and/or man made disasters. For another, there frequently is a need for some means to share rights in some means of production which can't be divided without its destruction. Finally, there is often a need for some means of providing cooperative work forces for tasks that require more participants than can be provided by family alone.

There are many way to deal with these sorts of problems. One way is through the development of a formal political system with personnel to make and enforce laws, keep the peace, allocate resources and perform other regulatory and other societal functions. A more common way in non-industrial societies is through the development of the kinship groups.

The study of kinship is the study of how people feel, or how they ought to behave to people in different genealogical categories. It is the study of how people should behave to the ones who are related to them by blood, marriage, etc. It is so basic as to be taken for granted.

#### II.9.1. Definition of Kinship

***Kinship** is a social relationship based on family relatedness, as culturally defined, on marriage, or on adoption. It is the state of being related to others. It is culturally learned and is not totally determined by biological ties.*

*Kinship is a social relationship, which is not as such a biological relationship, which differs from society to society. The way societies classify people as kinsmen vary from culture to culture.*

#### II.9.2. Classification of Kin group

There are two basic types of kin classification: *consanguineal* and *affineal* kin. The first one referred to those people who are related by bonds of blood (mother, father, sister, brother, etc.). It is also sometimes called *cognatic*.

On the basis of distance from an *ego*, the mother and the father are the *first degree ascending generations*, while children are the *first degree descending generation*.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

The second type of kin classification is the so-called the affineal kinship. It refers to those people with whom one is related by marital ties (brother-in-law, sister-in-law, etc.).

### **II.9.3. The Universality of Kinship**

Kinship, like the family, is a universal phenomenon that exists in all known cultures. However, in industrial societies its cohesiveness is declining as relationships depend less and less on blood and other familial ties. People develop different forms of organizations and institutions that would replace the roles of the kinship network in the modern world. Nevertheless, kinship still is one of the universal human cultures.

There are two major approaches that try to explain kinship as a universal human phenomenon.

Most attempts to explain the universality of kinship relation are related to the '*extension theory of kinship*' developed by B. Malinowski. He argues that, *kinship* can be explained *in terms of the natural feelings of loyalty and affection that arose between members of biological group of parents and offspring, which were extended to remote categories of related persons.*

One major criticism against this theory of kinship universality is the fact that if kinship is so natural, we could have expected to have the same type of kinship systems everywhere in the world, which is, however, not the case. And the theory has also failed to account for the sentiments and feelings of affection that existed in children prior to the existence of a kinship system.

Another explanation to the universality of kinship was attempted in terms of the functions it performs: *for social life to be possible language and the rest of society's accumulated possessions should be transmitted to the next generation and an arrangement for its nurture during infancy and childhood must be made. Then, in the absence of any alternative arrangements, which are not likely under primitive conditions, and the kinship group must perform these activities.*

### **II.9.4. Functions of the Kinship Group**

#### ***1. Mutual aid and security***

In a kinship group there exists an implied principle between members: that 'you should reach out for your relatives when they are in need of assistance.'

#### ***2. Defines and regulates marriage and sexual relations***

Who should to marry and who not to? At what age? And a kinship group regulates incest taboo.

#### ***3. Legal function and conflict resolution:***

Particularly in traditional societies a kinship group assumes every actions of the government. It is a kinship group that first handles every conflict that arose between the families, the kins, and other members of the community. It is a legal and universal unit and a first starting point of social organizations and other basic principles.

#### ***4. Economic functions***

A kinship group usually settles the question of the ownership and inheritance of a property.

### **5. Religious or ceremonial functions**

Kinsmen usually worship together. It links an individual to the past, present and the future.

### **6. Continuity over generations**

It provides a link between one older generation and the younger generation.

## **II.10. Descent System or Patterns**

Kinship is a basis for a descent system. Descent system is a pattern of organized relationship, which is used for the transmission of duties, obligations, etc. All societies use the links of kinship for their descent system.

### **II.10.1. The Major Descent Patterns**

#### **a. Unilineal descent system** (sometimes called unisexual or unilateral)

It establishes a descent line exclusively through the male or the female line.

##### **a.1. Patrilineal descent system**

In patrilineal societies, the males are far more important than the females, for it is they who are considered to be responsible for the perpetuation of the group. Therefore, the rights, duties, etc. is transmitted through using the male line.

##### **a.2. Matrilineal descent system**

In matrilineal societies the duty of transmitting the rights and the duties from one generation to the next falls on the female members of the group.

#### **b. Ambilineal or Cognatic descent system:**

Ambilineal descent provides a measure of flexibility not usually found under unilineal descent; each individual has the option of affiliating with either the mother's or the father's descent group-which determines his or her descent system.

#### **c. Double descent or the double-unilineal descent system**

Here descent is reckoned both matrilineally and patrilineally, and it is very rare. But this is the case where property is divided between patrilineal line and matrilineal line possessions.

For example, in the Yako of the Eastern Nigeria, the patrilineage owns and transmits perpetual resources such as the land, whereas the matrilineage owns and transmits consumable property, such as livestock.

#### **d. Parallel descent**

It involves a descent system of transmitting resources through a sex specific group, i.e. from the mother to the daughter and from the father to the son.

#### **e. Cross descent**

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

It involves a descent system of transmitting resources from the father to the daughter and from the mother to the son.

### **II.11. Structure and Functions of the Family**

The family has varied functions and activities to undertake: it has those functions that it performs for other social institutions, and those activities that are performed within the family; and also those functions that it performs for the individual personality.

#### **II.11.1. the Family and the Other Social Institutions**

The relationship between the family and other social institutions can be conceived of as a *series of functional interchanges*. In these interchanges, the external systems regard the family, to some extent, as a *corporate and separate* unit. The individual family member is viewed as a representative of his family, and the actual interchange between the family and the external system may take place either as a family acting as a unit or an individual acting as a representative of his family.

#### **1.1. the Family and the Economy**

The economy may be defined as that part of society that is concerned with the creation and distribution of material values and services. One interchange between the family and the economy is the *contribution of labor* by the family in exchange for *rewards for services*. The family, in addition to providing the individual with his basic skills and motivations, it allocates certain of the performance capacities of its members to the economy.

In some instances, the family contributes *finished and semi-finished products* and not labors; and in exchange the family receives the *functional equivalent of wages*. In general, wages are not determined by supply and demand but basically by the needs of the family.

In the consumption interchange, the family exchanges its *assets* for *consumer goods*. The family purchases are governed in large part by the supplies available in the economy. Any individual family has relatively little power in deciding the terms of this exchange.

#### **1.2. the Family and the Polity**

Every social system has some type of administration of its activities to attain the goals of the system. The subsystem, which fulfills these functions for the society, may be termed as the *polity*.

The nature of societal leadership requires that policies be made at a very general level; and thus with first interchange with the polity, the family contributes *loyalty* in exchange for *leadership*.

To some extent there is always a gap between the interests of the family and the interests of the state. In general, the time perspective of a single nuclear family being much shorter than the time span of the state, such projects as state expansion, austerity programs for basic state development, military programs and the like frequently require sacrifices from the family for which there is very little immediate motivation.

On the second level of interchanges, between the polity and the family, the family supplies *compliance* in exchange for *decisions* made by the polity. This depends, in part, on the polity's

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

ability to deal successfully with the problems of the society. If the polity's decisions provide considerable benefits to the family its degree of compliance will be greater.

### 1.3. the Family and the General Community

All social systems face the problem of integrating the various activities and parts of the system; this problem is solved by the institutionalizing patterns of behavior and by using mechanisms of social control to motivate members to conform to these patterns. The sub-system of society concerned with this problem may be termed as *the community* defined as not as a single concrete group such as the village or the neighborhood, but as diffuse affective relationship of various social networks concerned with this task.

Even in a simpler society where a single group or a few overwhelming groups constituted the community and the polity; there is often a functional differentiation between the community and the polity. Whether one single group serves as both community and the polity, whether there is a variety of different 'communities', the diffuse affective bond to the community serves to integrate the family in to the society.

As one of the functional interchanges, the family *participates* in the community activities in exchange for *support* of the community. Ordinarily, the community reinforces the bonds of solidarity with in the family, but it may also prohibit the family from such intensive involvement in its own internal processes that it with draws from participation in community affairs. Thus from the view point of the community, both strains and involvements with in the family must be kept below a certain level, so as not to intervene with community activities. For example, not only is the family exempted from participation in the community activities at the times birth, marriage, death, and serious internal problems, but the community offers social support to the family, just as society gives special exemptions and therapy to the 'sick' person.

In the other functional interchanges the community offers the family an *identity* in exchange for *adherence* to the community patterns. At a minimum, the family is recognized as a legitimate part of the society, and usually the community provided the family with a *specific status position*, along with appropriate standards of behavior and rewards that accord with these norms.

In exchange for *identity*, the family *adherence* makes concrete the community patterns. While various members of the family have differential commitment to the various segments of a 'community' or to different 'communities', at a minimum the family gives tacit permission to its members to behave in accord with these various standards. As Durckheim argued, this attachment to the group strengthens adherence to the norms, i.e., the community becomes a *reference group* for the family and its relationship with other social institutions.

### 1.4. the Family and the Value System

No society, however simple, can persist in an orderly fashion without general orienting principles. These principles are at a higher level than the concrete patterns for governing specific behavior, and they constitute a reference point for the more concrete patterns of behavior. Value patterns do not simply influence family behavior, but there is an active interchange between the family and the value system, and problems arising from attempting to live up to values may lead to modifications and changes in the value patterns.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

While it is true that some societies have more flexible values permitting adaptability to contemporary situations, as a whole, the ultimate values have considerable stability over time.

The significance of the family, with regard to the society's value system, stems from the fact that the family is the smallest social unit responsible for the preservation of the value system. It's the family's duty to see that new members are socialized in to the value system. The family also has a significant part in insuring that all members continue to abide according to the societal values.

An exchange between the family and the value system takes place in that the value system *specifies standards* and the family *accepts* them at a more general level than the community's specification of norms and the family's adherence to them. The value system defines what behavior is legitimate and desirable. The ultimate values in a society may also be embodied in certain aspects of the educational system, particularly if there is no specific religious education in the society. The family accepts the standards presented by those representatives of the ultimate values of the society. Ordinarily, children internalize these values through relationships in the family, and the family thus aids in the preservation of these values.

A second interchange between the family and the value system; the value system gives *approval* and the family supplies *conformity*. Not only do the representatives of the value system specify what the values are but also they offer approval for conformity to these values. Ordinarily, this approval or disapproval is internalized with in the personality at an early age, and the internal sanction operates to select and reject, to approve or disapprove of alternative behaviors. This internalization is reinforced by the community, which operates to see that the family conforms, at least to some measure, with the more specific norms derived from basic values.

The family strives to maintain a satisfactory relationship with societal value system, because it is concerned with approval, both internal and external. Typically, this means conformity to the basic values. If there is no conformity, then there is, ordinarily, an attempt to establish a relationship with the value system through modification of the basic values. Often, there is a cleavage between the ideal value system of the society and the specific concrete norms enforced by the community.

### **1.5. the family and Religion**

The three major religions (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam), in all of which man's duty is to live according to ethical standards revealed by a personal God, have all attempted to regulate kinship relations, especially marriage and the family. There is some evidence that religious commitment may help to keep down the rate of divorce. Protestants in the US, for example, have a higher divorce rate than the Catholics, primarily as Protestants are less committed to their religious system of belief than the Catholics. Other studies have also found out that a higher percentage of happily married couples than of unhappily married couples are religious.

### **II.11.2. Internal Family Activities**

The family must carry on internal activities related to the external exchanges, and must perform other internal activities directly for its own benefits. Most activities carried out in the family have



# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

functional significance for the family itself and the external system. The general functional problems facing the family are similar to those facing the society as a whole, and those facing any other social system in it. In the case of the family, the functional problems may be termed as:

1. Task performance
2. Family leadership
3. Integration and solidarity
4. Pattern maintenance

## **2.1. Task Performance**

Task performance within the family always occurs in the context of the family relationships with external systems. The internal activity is governed in part by *the requirements of the external interchanges* and in part by *the amount of goods obtained in the external interchange*. Yet task performance is also related to internal family characteristics, such as the standards of living and the solidarity and integration of relationships within the family. These tasks can't be performed except, as they are made consistent with the existing patterns of interpersonal relationships within the family. At a minimum, family members participate in the care and maintenance of the family possession. In addition, the family performs a variety of tasks that may be referred to as '*finishing*'. If there are dependent members of the family, then other members are expected to perform various tasks in connection with their welfare.

## **2.2. Family Leadership**

Because the family is a stable group with the same membership over a relatively long period of time, its division of leadership is ordinarily structured.

## **2.3. Integration and Solidarity**

For a group to maintain close relationships between members over a long period of time requires some commitment and feelings of solidarity.

Solidarity gives members the motivation to abide by the norms. If there is little solidarity within the family, the obligations imposed by the group may seem *oppressive*, but if there is a great deal of solidarity, the obligations may be accepted as natural and not even felt as obligations. In addition, feelings of solidarity are very important in dealing with individual *tensions* and *personality problems*. Family ritual activities and family symbols are all important elements in keeping intact solidarity in the family.

External institutions are also concerned with maintaining family solidarity and the family may be aided directly or indirectly in preserving itself by these institutions.

## **2.4. Pattern Maintenance/ the Family Value System**

Through their relationship with each other, family members come to have certain expectations about how other members should behave. These expectations are associated with the feelings of rightness and wrongness. This value system provides a hierarchy of goals and a body of rules for their attainment. The family attempts to maintain this value system because it gives meaning and purpose to the specific family activities. Often there is a disparity between what is explicitly legitimate and what is implicitly accepted as legitimate.

### **II.11.3. The Family and Personality**

If a social system is to operate successfully, the members must have, to a considerable extent, similar orientations to the group activities within it, to themselves, and to each other members and they must have motivational commitment sufficient to maintain the system and to meet its functional requirements. Now personality can be conceived of as a system of activities, orientations, motivations, etc, which has some internal boundaries.

The internal activities of a family, i.e., task performance, leadership, integration and solidarity, and pattern maintenance all to an extent or another have wide ranging effects upon the developing and the developed personality.

### **II.11.4. Functions of the Family**

The family fulfills a number of functions, such as providing religious training, education, and recreational outlets. Yet there are six paramount functions performed by the family (William Ogburn, 1934).

**1. Reproduction:** for a society to maintain itself, it must replace dying members. In this sense, the family contributes, to human survival through its function of reproduction.

**2. Protection:** human infants need constant care and economic security. Infants and children experience a long period of dependency, which places special demand on older family members. In all cultures, it is the family that assumes ultimate responsibility for the protection and upbringing of children.

**3. Socialization:** the family is the first agent in the socialization process, typically having more importance than peer groups, schools, churches, and the mass media. The personality of each new generation takes shape within the family, so that ideally, children grow to be well-integrated and contributing members of the larger society. Even then, the family continues to socialize us throughout our life cycle.

**4. Regulation of sexual behavior:** *sexual* norms are subject to change over time and across cultures. However, whatever the time period or cultural values in a society, standards of sexual behavior are most clearly defined within the family circle.

**5. Affection and companionship:** ideally, the family provides members with warm and intimate relationship and helps them feel satisfied and secured; the family is obliged to serve the emotional needs of its members.

**6. Providing social status or social placement:** we inherit a social position because of the “family background” and “reputation” of our parents and siblings. The family unit presents the newborn child with an ascribed status that determines his or her position in a society’s stratification system.

### **II.12. The Universality of the Family**

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

Concerning contemporary societies, one can say that the nuclear family is a universal human social grouping understood either as the sole prevailing form of the family or a basic unit from which more complex familial forms are compounded. Professor Murdock, as specialist in the area, maintains that the universality of the family is explained by the fundamental nature of the functions it fulfills for society. Thus he wrote: 'without provision for the sexual and reproductive functions, society would become extinct; without the economic, life itself would come to an end; without the educational, culture would cease to exist.'

One ought to bear in mind the fact that the family undergone dramatic changes and the rate at which these changes have been taking place has been further accelerated with the emergence of the modern industrial or the urban society.

### **II.13. Changes in the Family**

The family has undergone some fundamental changes starting from time immemorial, but especially from the days of industrialization. These changes include cultural, socio-economic and also structural ones.

The major changes that have been commonly thought to happen in the family include:

**1. *The changing role of the family in the society:*** some of the fundamental tasks once being performed by the family were removed and given to other social institutions, including the state.

*a. Reproduction and procreation:* this function of the family has not been taken over by other institutions, but the high prevalence of contraceptives and the couples being less interested in having children is making the reproductive role of the family a losing one.

*b. The family and the kinship network:* in the past the family is used to depend on the kinship network for their needs of assistance. But these days, the family becomes less dependant on kinship relationship, as social securities and other social insurance benefits could be obtained from the government and other welfare agencies at times of need.

In the developed countries, all people who need some sort of assistance from the public are entitled to those services by virtue of their citizenship. For example, unemployed people are entitled to get unemployment benefits or allowances.

*c. Socialization and social control<sup>12</sup>:* the family is the primarily responsible agent of socialization. But this function has been taken over by the school system. And the social control role of the family has been taken over by the police, the courts and the political institutions.

*d. Production function:* before the development of the factory system, the family is a predominant unit of production-it produces what it wants for its survival. The family nowadays no longer produces goods and services that it needs for its own subsistence. Therefore, the contemporary family

---

<sup>12</sup> Social control is a mechanism of that any society exercises to punish those who break the norms and to reward those who follow the norms.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

is a unit of consumption rather than a unit of production. It is dependant on the economic institutions for its consumptions.

*e. Religious function:* in the past religion is performed in the family by the family members. It is within the family that the members of a traditional family perform religion. But now it becomes the responsibility of the church or the religious institutions to perform religious rituals of other functions of religious nature.

*f. Affective function of the family:* the family is supposed to provide some sort of emotional support for its members. But lately the relationship becomes more of impersonal within the family. The family becomes a place of danger and hostility rather than being a place of emotional and sentimental support.

*g. Changing patterns of sexuality:* these days, extra marital sex, re-marital sex, adultery, pre-marital sex, etc. have been increasing in an unprecedented rate. Homosexuals and lesbians have been increasing in number and they are gaining more acceptance.

**2. The emergence of a privatization of the nuclear family:** the family type of the modern world is that of privatized nuclear family which resulted from the breakdown of the classical extended family.

**3. The emergence of the symmetrical family:** as a result of the emergence of the nuclear family in the modern world, there developed a family in which the roles of the husband and the wife are the same.

**4. Changes in the household size:** there occurred a decline in the average size of the family size.

**5. Increase in the single parent household with children:** particularly of those of the female headed families increases as a result of a large number of factors that affected the family.

**6. Reconstituted families with their multiple ties:** remarrying families are on increase.

**7. Un marrying and cohabitating couples:** are on increase.

**8. A move towards a more child centered families:** there is a change in the position of children in the family. In the past, children have a very low status in the family; they are not even expected to be seen. But 20<sup>th</sup> century families have become child centered. Parents put their children at the center of any decisions made within the family. The welfare of the children is given the major priority even if it means a great cost or crisis to the family.

### **II.14. Current Family Issues (the 'darker side' of the family)**

Today's family is characterized by an intensive emotional and mental stress between the husband and the wife, between the children and the parents, and also between the children themselves. Far from being the base of a society, today's family with its narrow privacy becomes the center of the production of certain social evils. Instead of creating a warm and supportive environment for its

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

members, it is becoming a hostile and dangerous place. This hostile environment within the family results from the privatization of the modern way of family life, which leaves the family without the support of the other extended kin relatives. As the members dreadfully privatize the family life, they become isolated from the wider community, as a result of which they lack the necessary support of the community, which would make life much easier.

The conflict in the family may lead to child violence, divorce, depression, anxiety, crimes, and also mentality decay. The modern family is not characterized by love and affection but rather by unresolved conflicts between members of the family and physical and mental abuse of children. And in some contemporary families violence has become an everyday fundamental occurrence. This is what we call the darkest side of the family. There is a discrepancy between the actual and the ideal (the supposed to be family type) type the family.

### **II.14.1. Family Disorganization and Dissolution**

Every family in the modern world suffers from one or another form of family disorganization and dissolution. It affects the functions of the family that it performs and also its members. Therefore, when we talk of family disorganization, we talk of mal-adjustment, mal-functioning, psychological decay and the existence of problems in the family.

**Definition of family disorganization-**According to W.J. Goode, *family disorganization* is the break up of a family unit, the dissolution or fracture of a family structure, of the social roles, when one or more members failed to perform adequately in their role obligations.

A group can be labeled as an organized group when those individuals who can perform their roles adequately occupy all its statuses. By the same token, a family can be seen as an organized one if it consists of the mother, the father and children who could execute their roles properly. And therefore a family disorganization and dissolution occurs when one or more members of the family fail to perform their roles adequately, or if one is missing from the group. The family is a disorganized one as it has a status that has not been filled by an appropriate personality.

By this definition there are different types of family disorganization and dissolution:

a. **Illegitimacy:** the word derived its origin from a Latin word “*illegitimus*” which means ‘not in accordance with the law’. And in sociology it refers to the incomplete family unit along with unoccupied status.

b. **Annulment:** the word “annul” means ‘to reduce to nothing’. In sociology it means the legal ending of a marital relationship because as a result of conditions that existed prior to the marriage. The legal institutions of a society can declare that a marriage did not come into existence in the first place if certain essential element<sup>13</sup> or elements is or are lacking.

---

<sup>13</sup> Examples of the lack of an essential element includes: being under age, the discovery of the existence of another marriage, the existence of an incurable disease in either of the partners, the existence of an incestuous relationship, insanity, etc.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

c. ***Separation***: it refers to the willful abandonment of one's spouse, children or both without any legal justification. It is usually a run away style. Sometimes it is used to threaten the partner to resolve conflicts, but it is just a step away from a permanent separation or divorce.

d. ***Divorce***: of all the changes that have taken place in the family life in the modern society, divorce is the most apparent one of all. There has always been a family disorganization. But in the past it was the out come of the death of one or both of the parents. But today's family disorganization seems to be more of because of divorce. There has been a sudden increase in the number of marriages that end up in divorce. It seemed that divorce is an institutionalized social arrangement for the termination of marital relationships.

All known cultures in the world allow divorce. Through out the history of the human social life there has not been a society that prohibits divorce, although it dissolves the durial tie that was established by marriage.

### *Explanations of the rise in the rate of divorce*

There are many changes in the society that have made divorce a more practical and a socially accepted way of terminating a broken marriage.

1. *Changing social attitudes towards divorce*: divorce has become more socially accepted, there is less social disapproval and condemnation of the divorcees and there is less stigmatization<sup>14</sup> and ostrasization<sup>15</sup>. Divorce has no longer an impact on peoples' personal growth and promotions. There become less negative social consequences of divorce on individuals. People, therefore, are becoming less afraid of the unpleasant consequences of divorce and they are more likely to seek a legal ending to their unhappy marriage (therefore, an increase in rate of divorce).

2. *The growing secularization*: as we have seen earlier, in traditional societies, marriage seems more of a sacred institution and there is much religious sentiments attached to it. Therefore, the ending of a marital relationship through divorce is considered as sinful and offending to the supernatural powers. But, these days, divorce is never considered as something that is a morally wrong intention, or do, or breaking of a religious order.

3. *The growth of the privatized nuclear family*: in today's families it is virtually impossible to seek for advice or any support from relatives or kin, during any marital crisis. And there is also a very loose interference from their relatives to necessitate the couples to work on their marriage and keep it from ending. And this is the result of the ever-increasing privatization the family life by the members.

4. *Higher expectations in marriage*: marital satisfaction is the most important determinant in keeping any marriage intact. At present times, peoples' expectations of what should marriage look like is far reaching from their parents in the past. The media and other aspects of social life depict a very romantic picture of what marriage is. People therefore, expect more sexual compatibility, more understanding, more companionship, in their marriage, as opposed to the demand for an economic

---

<sup>14</sup> Stigmatization means to give a person a nick name because he have some things that members of his group think are or is out of the proper social behavior or acting.

<sup>15</sup> Ostrasization means excluding a person form a group to which he belongs because of his misdeeds.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

security of their parents in the times of yore. Therefore, couples are more likely to close up their marriage in divorce, when these expectations are not met.

5. *The changing role of women:* in modern times, women are less likely to accept the traditional mother role of house-keeping and child-rearing, particularly if it means the sacrifice of their own life advantages.

The factory system has reduced the importance of the as a production unit and has provided jobs for women, freeing them from the economic dependence on men; and when they are in unhappy marital relationship, their ability to earn a living by themselves make them less worried to end their marriage with no fear of who could support them financially or materially.

All these changes that have occurred in the development of the family have aggravated the rate of divorce at current times.

The impact of divorce on individuals is very grave. People who have undergone through divorce feel loneliness, depression, anxiety, incompetence, and will have low work efficiency. They may also have suicidal feelings and intentions.

Children from a divorced family show a high degree of anti- social or aggressive behavior, feelings of anger, sadness, etc<sup>16</sup>.

e. *Empty shell family:* refers to a type of family in which family members continue to dwell together but have little communication or interaction with one another; refraining from any form of emotional support to each others. Here persons may occupy statuses, but they don't play out their role appropriately.

f. *Unwilled absence of one spouse:* some marriages and families may dissolve because the husband or the wife has died or is jailed, or is separated from the family because of war and other conditions.

g. *Unwilled major role failure:* when a person can't discharge his role because of factors beyond his control including severe mental, emotional and physical pathologies (sickness).

### II.14.2. Voluntary Childlessness

Both preferences and rates of voluntary childlessness have increased in industrial countries; particularly professional women give a small fraction of their time and emotion for bearing children. In addition, education, in industrial societies takes a long period.

### II.14.3. Conflict over Marital and Power Roles

Decision making in the family depend on a number of factors:

1. The personality of the spouses.
2. The overall status of women as related to men in the society

---

<sup>16</sup> Children from two parent families do better in education or in any other activities as compared to children from divorced families.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

3. Resources, such as income, education, occupation, etc.

Resource Theory of Marital Power states that men have more power than women in many societies. Resources are the primary determinant of who makes a decision in the family. The more resources one has got, the more he will have a dictation over the other.

Women who are working have more power and dictation over others than housewives, since they have more resources; and the increase of resources will increase the power of the one over the other.

Although the family faces these problems, it has got some functions to perform; therefore it will remain to be an *omni-present* and an *enduring* social institution.





### **Chapter Three** **the Sociology of Religion**

Religion is a cultural universal-general practice found in every culture; and religious institutions are evident in all societies. Religion exists through out the world because it offers answers to such ultimate questions as why we exist, why we succeed or fail, and why we die. Though it is difficult to determine with certainty when religious behavior began, anthropological evidences suggest that such behavior was evident, from remains of burials, at least 100,000 years ago (Schaefer and Lanun, 1995: 393).

Many individuals and groups approach religion from different angles in their studies. Some have tried to prove that religion is a supernatural power, while others have tried to explain that religion is nothing but a *man created myth*. For the Enlightenment thinkers' religion is just irrelevant; and it disappears as human rationality increases.

The sociological study of religion concerns itself with the relationship and interaction<sup>17</sup> between the religious institutions and other social institutions.

The fundamental concerns of the sociology of religion include the following:

1. The analysis of the interaction of religion and society, and the forms of interaction which takes place between them (here the major concern is the dynamic and dialectic relationship that existed between religion and the society).
2. The understanding of the role and significance of religion in the society.

---

<sup>17</sup> Interactions in this case refer to those that are primarily of religious in nature.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

3. The understanding of the diversity, and the social forces and influences that shape it (there are counter religious movements in the world. Why is such diversity? What are some of the forces and influences that shape this diversity?).

The subject matter of the sociology of religion may further be classified when we consider what sociology of religion is not:

1. The sociology of religion is not the investigation of whether or not religious ideas are true. This is because, such a question is not something that can be experimentally validated. For example, ‘*Does God exist?*’ is not a sociological inquiry. But ‘Do people believe that God exist?’ is a sociological question, because one can investigate and assert whether that people believe in the existence of God or not.
2. The sociology of religion is not an attempt to answer the question as to whether or not religion is good. With regard to this sociologists have to try to be value free and have some objectivity.
3. The sociology of religion as not an attempt to indicate that one set of religious values<sup>18</sup> is right and the other is wrong.
4. The sociology of religion is not an attack on religion. The modern sociology of religion is not an anti-religious movement. It, like other academic disciplines, has developed from different backgrounds.

**III.1. A historical review of the sociological theory of religion:** it would be impossible to present all the major contribution of sociologists in the formulation of a theory on religion and society. Hence we will single out some major writers who left their marks on the sociological study of religious systems.

**Auguste Comte:** a French philosopher, who often refers to as ‘the father of sociology’ published his *treatise on sociology* in 1854. He pictured all of history as a three-staged evolutionary process. The *first stage*, beginning with the dawn of history and reaching to the European Middle Ages, was characterized by a religious understand of man, the world, and society. Ancient man, in Comte’s view, responded with awe and wonder to a world he couldn’t understand. He saw the world under the control of the supernatural spirits who must be placated. Since he couldn’t understand the world and the society, he attributed it ‘fate’ or ‘the gods’ everything that happened. When he tried to explain his life he used myth and symbolic theology.

The medieval man, according to Comte’s theory, came one step closer to the modern world. He abandoned religious language of explanation for more abstract, *philosophical categories*. Instead of a pantheon of gods he substituted terms like *nature of things* and *substances* as ways of understanding reality.

Finally, since the 17<sup>th</sup> century, modern man has discovered science. He must abandon religious or philosophical ways of talking about the universe. Whatever of religion and philosophy, which

---

<sup>18</sup> Religious values are values that the followers of a religion are expected to tag on.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

remain in the modern world, are like the human appendix vestigial remnants from man's historic past. Comte predicted that religion based on God or the mystery of life would yield to a secular religion of humanity founded in science.

**Karl Marx:** another 19<sup>th</sup> century social thinker, K. Marx, is well known for his dictum, 'religion is the opiate of the people.' Like Comte, Marx thought that religion is only one stage in social evolution. He predicted that in the communist utopia religion would wither away.

"Religion," for Marx, "is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the feelings of a heartless world.... It's the opiate of the people."

By calling religion, 'the opiate of the people,' Marx was objecting the preaching of the business oriented ministries of religion who told the laboring classes that their poverty was the will of God, and stressed that the poor should accept their lot in life as unchangeable. The poor will get their rewards in the afterlife. As the slogan puts it, the hungry poor would finally get their 'pie-in-the-sky.' Like opium or alcohol, pie-in-the-sky religion dulled the sensibilities of the poor to the injustices they suffered from greedy capitalists and made them inert about doing anything to better their social position.

Marx conclusion is that religion always reflected the values and the interests of the ruling class in society. The ruling class used religion as a weapon of social control over the multitude. Religion was essentially conservative, not revolutionary. 'Blessed are the poor' was a statement calculated to keep the poor content with their social environment. When asked 'what function does religion play in society?' Marx's theory replies, religion is a mechanism of social control that justifies the economic interests of the ruling class and prevents dissatisfaction among the poor by diverting their eyes and attention from the problems of this life at present to the rewards of the afterlife.

**Emilé Durkheim:** the best known French sociologist in the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, introduced in his book, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, a distinction between sacred and the profane areas of life. Besides its distinction between the everyday world (the profane) and certain aspects that transcend the ordinary (the sacred), religion involves a set of beliefs and practices that are uniquely the property of religion as opposed to other social institutions and ways of thinking.

In profane areas of living, man uses rational techniques, such as science and industry, to control his environment. Even primitive man tries to use the best methods of fishing, hunting, or harvesting crops. The sacred, according to Durkheim, is characterized by an attitude of respect or awe, which men take toward certain objects, places, times, and religious legends. Believers have faith in the sacred; this allows them to accept what they can't understand.

According to Durkheim religion is a symbolic expression of the moral authority in law and society. Durkheim had proposed that society is always the real object of religious belief and worship. Religion is the social means of expressing and reinforcing those sentiments, which are most essential to preserving a society: respect for the law, a sense of group solidarity at times of crisis such as death.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

**Max Weber:** a contemporary of Durkheim, German sociologist Max Weber, has made the most significant contributions to the sociological studies of religion. Against Karl Marx, Weber contended in his classic study, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, that religion doesn't always reflect and justify current economic arrangements in society. He contends that religion is not always a conservative force in society. In opposition to Durkheim, he asserted that religion was not restricted to the explanation of ultimate crisis and frustrations such as war and famine, or death, by pointing out the obvious fact that religion often influences the every day choices and attitudes of men.

In another study, *The Social Psychology of the World Religions*, Weber drew on his wide knowledge of various world religions to illustrate his method of an 'ideal types' in sociology. An ideal type is a category which sets out the essential characteristics of a social phenomenon.

**S. Freud and T. Parsons:** the 20<sup>th</sup> century produced major contributions from a psychologist and a sociologist for an empirical study of religion. Sigmund Freud counteracted Durkheim by stressing individual psychological aspects of religion. He pointed out the key role of family upbringing in determining religious attitudes. Freud tried to explain the origin of religion in his book '*Totem and Taboo.*' Freud and some of his followers tend to define religion as a psychological delusion. Many extremists of this school of thinking describe religion as *a psychological response for which there is no stimulus.*'

Talcott Parsons, a student of Max Weber, advocates what is called 'the functionalist theory'<sup>19</sup> of religion. Functionalist theory maintains that religion interacts with other parts of the social or cultural system. Sometimes religion acts as a cause of changes in other areas of society. These and other changes in the society, in turn, also affect religious practices. Religion must somehow contribute to the preservation of society-otherwise it would not survive.

### III.2. Definitions of Religion

The search for a definition of religion is very difficult and has many difficulties, as religion can't be scientifically knowable. Therefore, there are many definitions that are provided by many scholars.

In a narrower sense, **religion** means *a set of theological beliefs held and rituals performed by members of a particular group.*

However, the most famous definition of religion is the one that was provided by E. Durkheim: *a unified system of beliefs and practices related to a sacred thing, that is to say things set apart and forbidden after- beliefs and practices which unit in one single moral community called a church, all of those who are here to them.*

Religion is divided in to two: the secular and the sacred:

---

<sup>19</sup> The functionalist theory of society is the **principle** of useful purposes. And this **principle** is defined as *the belief that any ideas, custom, belief, or attitude that is wide spread in a society and persists over a period of time must be assumed to have some useful purpose for that society, contributing to social order and promoting the survival of that culture.*

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

The **secular** or the **profane**: it refers to *the empirically observable objects that can be proven right or wrong by scientific investigation.*

The **sacred**: it refers to *the things that we can't understand, but that we can understand by some kind of extra-ordinary power or experience or by some divine power.*

**Religion** is a system of beliefs and practices that are related to the sacred issue only. Religion focuses on the supernatural thing.

**Religion** is defined as a human phenomenon that unites the cultural, the social and the personality system in to a meaning full whole. This definition suggests that religion is the creation of man and it is part of the human culture. Although there is no single generally agreed up on definition of religion, an organized religion is more likely to include all or some of the following features:

1. A belief in a supernatural and sacred things, or symbols. They believe in the existence of a power, an event that is beyond the human control. That power is an *extra-ordinary*, an *indefinite*, an *omni-present* and that can't be tested or touched, or heard, or smell. One can't prove or disprove the existence of the supernatural thing. And in many case all accidents, successes, fortunes and misfortunes are attributed to this supernatural power. In addition, people believe in the worshipping of some other things like man himself, cows, rivers, stones, etc. Some people believe in some mysterious supernatural power beyond their understanding and sensation (extra-ordinary, indefinite power) in the universe and some other people still believe in the existence of such a power simply by faith rather than by empirical evidence.
2. A set of teachings and beliefs (theology), usually based on a holy book such as The Bible and The Koran.
3. A series of rituals or ceremonies to express their beliefs either in public or in private, such as baptism, marriage taking place in church, funerals, fasting, singing and dancing, praying, sacrifices offering.
4. Some form of organization of the worshipers or the believers.
5. An organized institution (of religion) is likely to include a set of organized values and moral values that guide or influence the every day behavior of the believer. Religion usually provides a direction to be pursued by its followers and defines how to interact with one another and define what is ethically good and what is not. As a result of sharing the same beliefs and practices, people who belong to the same religious group or church have common values.

### III.3. Concepts Related to Religion

**Animism**: is the belief that spirits of souls permanently or temporarily inhabits all objects, both animate and inanimate. It involves the beliefs in objects, as these objects that exist around us have spirit and consciousness like human beings. These spirits of souls could reside in physical environment, like in rivers, animals, rocks, etc.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

**Animatism:** is the belief that a supernatural force or power exists in persons, human beings, animals and inanimate objects. Many traditional groups believing in animatism consider their chiefs to be possessed by a supernatural power.

**Polytheism:** is the belief in a number of gods and the powerful deities. Here one god has a particular sphere of influence, and one could be more powerful than the others and it may oversee or control the activities of the others.

**Monotheism:** is the belief in the existence of only one God. In the evolutionary theory of religion, many scholars argued that religion has evolved from *animism* to *animatism*, from *animatism* to *polytheism*, and from *polytheism* to *monotheism*. And they considered monotheism as the final stage of the evolution of religion.

**Totemism:** totem is an ordinary object such as a plant or an animal that has become a sacred symbol to particular group or clan. And often members of a clan or group consider themselves as having been descended from that object. Here the particular example is the Australian Aborigines.

Totemism is a complex system of belief related to a totem. It is a belief organized around a totem. According to Durkheim, each clan worships a totem but that totem represents their own clan not god as such. For him religion is a system of belief that people worship their own society not god as such. As from the Durkheim's perspective, a totem is a symbol of their own common social identity.

### III.3.1. Religion and Magic

Max Weber used the term "magic" to refer to religious action believed to be automatically effective, whether the goal is empirical (observable) or non-empirical (unobservable). For the well-known anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski magic is a source of power or control over the gods, or the use of supernatural means to try to obtain empirical ends; but he distinguished magic from religion. Magical words and ceremonies force gods to grant what a man desires. Magic either wards off evil influences or wins favors. Religion doesn't control god but tries to worship him, as religion means submission to and worship of the divine power up on which man feels dependant. But for Harry Johnson (1960) to regard magic as part of religion is technically justified on the ground that in magic, as in other religious activities, there is concern with the supernatural order and with the problem of salvation.

### Relationships between Religion and Magic

These two concepts are closely related in many societies, as they commonly share a concern for supernatural powers- in a power that exists beyond the human scientific understanding and grasp. Both use different techniques to operate that supernatural power in their own interest. Both religion and magic are communities' ways of adapting to the problems, frustrations, and dangers that they face in their daily life.

The major differences between religion and magic include:

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

a. The concern with the animate and the inanimate powers: magic is a belief in the impersonal (inanimate) powers, forces or objects. Religion is a belief in s personal supernatural beings.

Magic is more manipulative in its techniques; it is an active attempt, usually using coercion and force, to control the spirits. Magicians order or command power. While on the other hand, religious approach to the supernatural power is characterized by an attitude of humbleness, politeness, and with a broken heart. Religious people don't command their God to do what they want him to do, but they pray for his good will.

b. A magician serves only those who are willing to pay the necessary fee for the service, but religion is not that way. Magic is the re-substitution of techniques that are used to influence the gods. If one attempt doesn't work another is tried. But religion is not that way. The way of approaching God is not substitutable. In general, magicians are manipulative of power whereas religion is usually requester of help (supplicative) from the supernatural powers.

c. The goals of magic are specific and limited: magic is obtained for obtaining some specific objectives and goals and is designed to help those individuals who use it. On the other hand, religion permits or pursues more general goals for its followers. It is mostly used for a group rather than for an individuals as illustrated by the fact that when people of a church pray they not only pray for people who are members of the church but the prayer extends to those who are not.

Religion is concerned with the whole philosophy of life whereas magic's concern is specific, limited and atomistic.

d. Magic is more of a private practice than a group activity. Magic has more of a personal character than a communal nature. There is also a difference in the organization of rituals, belief systems. While these systems are more formalized, organized, or institutionalized in the case of a religion they aren't as in the case of magic. Magic does not organize its follower in to a unifying system or group where they can lead a common social life of their own. The organization of magic is based on the relationship between the clients and the magicians themselves that is how the interaction takes place. There contacts are transitory and accidental, whereas in the case of religion, members are united in to a moral community.

e. Magic involves less emotion, whereas religion members are so emotionally involved to their religion. This might be because of the fact that magic is potentially more anti-social than that of the religion.

### **III.3.2. Religion and Science**

These two concepts seem to exist at two extremes of explaining the existence and futurity of things in the universe. As science is dependent up on empirical facts and scientifically observable phenomenon, religion is based on beliefs, speculations, and faith in the existence of God.

However, their similarity lies in their attempt to explain the universe, the natural order, but in different languages and methods. Both are views of the natural order.



## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

In religion every thing is attributed to God, but it is more than a dogma, it explains everything in the social and natural world.

### III.4. Theories of Religion

Theories of religion try to explain how religion evolved or came in to existence, what functions it serves in the society, and why people believe in religion.

**Evolutionary theory of religion:** this theory perceives religion as an expression of stages in man's cognitive development. Personalities who belong to this group of theorizing argue that progress comes with time and age, and people progress from simpler to the more complex. They also contend that every society progresses through stages of ever increasing complexity until they reach at some final stage of perfection. They saw religion as a *primitive, pre-scientific* effort to explain and predict natural events. For Comte, as we have seen earlier, for example, the human intellect has passed through three stages of explaining thing in and around his social milieu:

1. The theological stage;
2. The metaphysical; and
3. The positive or the scientific stage.

In the theological stage, thoughts and ideas were religious in nature. Comte again divided this stage in to three different sub-stages.

- i. The fetishism: in which both the animate and the inanimate objects had been animated by a life of soul, like a human being;
- ii. The polytheism: in which there was a belief in the many gods.
- iii. The monotheism: which is characterized by the development of organized institutions?

Human intellect passed through the metaphysical stage where people used reason and faith in combination for the purpose of explaining the natural phenomenon.

And finally the second stage gives way to the final (positive) stage where people explain everything in terms of scientific reasoning.

Comte's conclusion is that when people reach the positive stage they will worship science, as the importance of religion in the social life declines.

According to Taylor, religion had evolved through the following stages. The first is the belief in the souls, which is followed by the belief in deities and the animism. The third stage is the polytheism. And the fourth and the final stage is the monotheism. And he contends that after people reached the stage of monotheism, religious beliefs will slowly declines.

According to the, many social-evolutionary theorists the origin of religion is animism and it developed to polytheism and finally it culminated in monotheism.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

***De-evolutionary Theories:*** this theory exactly reverses the arguments of the evolutionary theorists by arguing that later of development in religion is a regression from an early and universal monotheism. It points out that it was not animatism or animism, or polytheism that was the earliest form of religion, but was monotheism. All animism, or animatism or polytheism are the later developments of monotheistic religion.

Religion is considered as a stage of degeneration from a primitive revelation. During the early period God revealed the one true religion. But other developments are simply degenerations.

According to the de-evolutionary theorists man's spiritual evolution proceeds and inversely related to that of his social and cultural sophistications. As man advances in science and technology, his spiritual development will decline, and the importance of religion in his life will decline and people may turn to other developments. As a result the world will come to an end and the cycle will start a fresh again. According to these theorists, there are a number of vices because of which man's spiritual power declined. Therefore, man's refusal to obey the commands of the sanctified power, and other developments in the society has led to the decline on the spiritual power of the society.

***Psychoanalytic and Anxiety Reduction Theories:*** with development, man may abandon religion but he will not rationalize, rather become unrestrained anomic and lacks direction. The theory considers religion as a projection of, and therapy for emotional problems and needs. People usually follow religion when they are uncertain of the future.

A prominent psychoanalytic theorist who had developed this theory was the scholar Sigmund Freud. For him life involves privatism-the lack of what is needed for existence (material and emotional). Because of this the inevitable consequence is that of individuals suffer from feelings of frustration. And nature also holds a number of threats and fears in it. Because of all these man-made and natural problems the life of man is uncertain. Therefore, for Freud, religion is an attempt to coup up with these threat and danger by humanizing it. And this gives him a great relief and conciliation and it gets rid of terror in nature.

Freud also tried to make an analogy between the parent-child relationship and the relationship between the gods and the people. The way people relate themselves to their gods is similar to the way a child relates himself to his parents. A small child is help less, and Freud argues that a child fears his father, but at the same time is sure of his protection from and danger.

Freud says that ***religion*** is an *illusion-any belief true or false that is held not because there are good grounds for holding it but because there is a strong desire or need to believe it.*

Freud believes that as man becomes progressively aware of the sufficiency of his own reasoning, the need for religion will disappear. Like for Marx, *religion* for Freud is *like opium to the people that gives false hopes and dreams about the next world.*

In conclusion, there is one thing needs to be noted. There is no way of telling whether one theory is valid than the other as one could not be able get a theory that constitutes all the truth, but one could only get grains of truth from a theory.

### III.5. Religion and Other Social Institutions

There is an active, mutual, and reciprocal relationship between religion and other social institutions.

#### III.5.1. Religion and the Polity

Religion actively engages in the political affairs and activities that take place in a given country.

\*Religion usually states, justifies, and reinforces the values of the society and these values are usually translated in to political behaviors and laws of the government.

\*Religion promotes the activities of the government and maintains peace and order.

\*In some industrialized countries religion promotes the concern of the interest or the pressure groups<sup>20</sup>.

\*Religion also serves as a source of reconciliation; it preaches the citizens to be obedient to the laws of the government. Government in religious societies appears to its members as an inherent government. No distinction could be made between religious leaders and government leaders. In such a society most of the people belong to that single moral community. The moment they are born they believe that kings have a divine power to rule.

In traditional sacred societies religion has had a strong influence on the incumbent government and there is a closer relationship between the two. As a society moves from the sacred to that of the secular order, we find a meaningful distinction made between the religious and the political leaders. Religious institutions began to be confined to an ever-narrowing social influence; people turn to the secular forces for guiding in their daily life.

In such societies where there exists a distinction between the government and religion, there we will find three types of relationship that exist between the government and religion:

1. The government supports one religion and rejects or discriminates the rest. e.g. the Anglican Church in England.
2. The government supports or tolerates religion in general, but gives no marked preferential treatment to anyone's religion. e.g. The US constitution prohibits any state owned religion
3. The government rejects all religion. e.g. the Communist Countries.

#### III.5.2. Religion and the Economy

Religion and the economy could be mutually supportive or antagonistic. Religion has a major function of providing a moral definition and values, and these values and definitions may affect the economic institutions negatively or positively. Religion influences productivity, handwork, and investment positively or negatively, as some religions define the use of certain materials<sup>21</sup> as morally appropriate and others may define it as morally inappropriate.

---

<sup>20</sup> *Interest or pressure* group is a group that persuades the government or the decision-making bodies to make decisions that are in their interests.

<sup>21</sup> Materials could be the tree, the animals, etc.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

The most important and the famous book depicting the relationship between religion and the economy was written by Weber, and it was entitled *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.

Both Marx and Weber were interested in questioning 'why capitalism emerged in W. Europe?' Marx simply answered that the abundance of the material conditions in w. Europe was the main reason for the emergence of capitalism. At this point Weber asks one question: if that was the case (the main impetus for the emergence of capitalism in the Western Europe was the material condition), why did it have to wait till the industrial revolution?

He agrees that, it is not the material abundance that led to the emergence of capitalism, but was the existence of favorable cultural value systems. He further develops his theory by saying that the values and beliefs of a society determine the economic base of a society.

Making reference to the 17th century beliefs in predestination<sup>22</sup> and asceticism<sup>23</sup> Weber made his argument for the emergence of a capitalist mode of production/system. These two forms of beliefs were associated with the French protestant theologian and theorian John Calvin (1509-64) and his followers. His ideas, therefore, came to be known as Calvinism. Predestination and asceticism are the two-central underlying principles of Calvinism.

According to Weber, Calvinists adopted an attitude towards work and money, which radically changed their daily life. Because they wanted to be members among the elect, the Calvinists took hard work, strict discipline self-control and economic success as ways of salvation. And, on the other hand, asceticism led them to frugal or thrift way of life. Saving occupies a higher place in their value system. As a result, the Calvinist way of life opened the door to capital accumulation. This capital then was reused for the investment in the emerging new industries. Good Calvinists who wish to save their lives from the hands of the damned were engaged in many industrious activities and frugal way of life.

It was this, according to Weber, which contributed to the rise of capitalism. The development of the economic system was based on religious beliefs, beliefs that an individual Calvinist protestant hold to ease the pain of living in predestination. However, according to Weber, as Judaism, Islam, and other Asiatic religions didn't offer the necessary framework for the emergence of capitalism as did the protestant religion, and that is why capitalism emerged in w. Europe, not in the Middle East or Asia, and after the 17<sup>th</sup> century, not before.

### III.5.3. Religion and Education

Religion is part of the culture of a given society, and it is acquired through the process of interaction. We can't learn religion without a social interaction. We learn religious beliefs, values,

---

<sup>22</sup> Predestination refers to the uncertainty of human eternal fate as belonging to the elect/favored or to the damned/cursed.

<sup>23</sup> Asceticism refers to the belief in a limited satisfaction or in self-denial.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

norms, etc through the process of education, both formal and informal. This is evidence of interdependence that exists between religion and education.

Throughout history and all over the world, religion has been responsible for the establishment of formal educational systems. First established schools were religious ones. Religion has been the bases for and contributed a lot to the secular education: medicine, law, arts, and philosophy.

### **III.6. The Role of Religion in Society**

Weber, Radcliff, Durckheim, and other social thinkers have been concerned with what role religion could play in the present day society. And they criticized the evolutionists who concern themselves with the evolution of religion and the decline in the importance of religion in society.

For these social thinkers religion, since the emergence of mankind, has played a number of roles. Sociologists divided these roles in to three categories.

**1. Individual support:** this is connected with the roles a religion could play for an individual. *Religion* can play an important role in a number of ways for an individual.

a. *Religion* can provide a source of comfort, explanation, and meaning for individuals when faced by strains and crisis in their lives such as wars, deaths, accidents, and natural disasters. It provides psychological support, and avoids uncertainties that people face in their everyday life. This can be illustrated by a recent study that claims the majority of those who faced strains and stress in their daily activities preferred to see a priest than a psychotherapist or a psychologist.

b. *Religious ceremonies* can give their believers a feelings of identity and security, and a sense of belongingness to a group that cares about them, and unite them around a shared moral code of behavior. It avoids the feeling of powerlessness.

c. *Religion* can provide a source of explanation and understanding or justification for an individual's social position. In all societies there is a social inequality between individuals as well as between groups. There is status difference between the powerful and the powerless for which any religion can give an approved explanation of by its members.

d. *Religions* carry out some important welfare roles for individuals. Providing a welfare service for the needy in general and for the poor religious followers in particular was initially the role of the religious institutions, before it was taken over by some other institutions as the polity.

**2. Social Integration/ Cohesion:** religion helps to maintain cultural tradition, as it is a part of the general culture of the society. This purpose of religion arise from the assumption that a given society can only survive, if its people share some common belief about what is right and what is wrong. And religion usually serves this purpose, as at least the majority of the members of the society must have a common understanding of the good and the bad. Religion encourages people to accept the central values whose internalization is important for the adequate integration of the various parts of the given society. Religious groups usually lend their theological support and prestige to ratify and sanctify values already prevalent in the general community.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

The French sociologist E. Durckheim<sup>24</sup> argued that religion is a social glue that integrates individuals as well as the major parts of the society together. Religion persuades the integration of individuals to the society by encouraging them to accept certain basic social values. He considers religious rituals as serving as social cement. Worshiping together reinforces the sense of unity, solidarity among individuals. And it is partly through the religious practices that people get used to the values of the society in which they live and in way they become socialized. Religion reinforces social norms, for sometimes violations of secular laws is also violation of religious laws.

In ethnic minorities, religion is a means for the maintenance of their cultural identity tradition, and a means of integration.

**3. Social Control:** for Marx religion is an instrument that the powerful and the privileged used to oppress the poor and then powerless. Religion is the heart of the heartless, the sound of the oppressed creature and the soul of the soulless. It is the *opium* of the people, the mass. Religion is an illusion, an anesthesia that attempts to justify the existing arrangement by encouraging people to accept them.

Religion makes the poor to be passive and accept the existing system without questioning and challenging it. He pointed out that religion justifies the existing inequalities in a society by pronouncing that it is the will of God. The position of the poor in a society is considered to be because of the will of God.

The poverty of the poor is considered as a virtue. Religion provides comfort for the poor and draws their attention from their present misery, inequality, and injustice with a promise in the life after death. The poor are encouraged to post pone their personal happiness for a reward in the heaven. For Marx this can only benefit the wealthy, the powerful, or the privileged class as the poor are persuaded to find a better way through religion than challenging the unjust system.

The whole point here is the fact that religion makes people conform to the social control laid down by the powerful. Needless to say, for the majority of those who write from a conflict perspective or point of view, religion is a conservative force that inhibits social change by lending sanctity to dominant culture values just as they are.

However, religion can also be a source of social conflict and social change. Religion could be a source of social conflict as a result of the fact that members of one religious sect consider their own religion and religious practices a superior to any other's religion. On the other hand religion could play a significant role in the fight against political dictatorships, inequalities, poverty, injustices, and many other forms of social inequalities that were evident in the secular aspects of the society. For example, in Iran there was a revolution called 'the Islamic revolution' which overthrown the monarchy and established the Islamic republic<sup>25</sup> (1978/79).

---

<sup>24</sup> Durckheim's view of religion: he viewed religion as one means of creating social solidarity. Because traditional religion was declining in his days, he desperately tried a functional substitute (a specific one) for it.

<sup>25</sup> Islamic fundamentalism: is a major force of change in many Islamic countries in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It fought and still fights for the removal of the western culture in Muslim countries and for social change in these countries. It also fights

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

Religion can be used to resist the existing systems, the corrupt ones, and as a means of protesting and bringing down of that corrupt system.

### III.7. Secularization

In contemporary industrial societies, scientific and technological advances increasingly affected all aspects of life, including the social institution of religion. The term secularization refers to the process through which religion's influence on other social institutions diminishes.

It is an isolation of religion from its influence on the important decisions of national and everyday life. It is a process where by religious thinking, practices, and institutions, loses their social significance in a society, which they are part of. Religion and religious values and beliefs are declining in importance both for the individual and the society.

Secularization can be examined in three aspects:

**1. Religious thinking:** the significance of religion on peoples' lives has declined. People do no longer want religion to be the influential part of their everyday life activities. There is a growing lack of interest in religious customs, practices, and a lesser readiness to lead their life in terms of religious beliefs and values.

Today people have developed a more positive, at least tolerant, attitude towards divorce, and other vices as homosexuality, lesbianism, pre-marital sex, etc. which any religion prohibits and condemns. People are adopting more non-religious explanations of events that happen around them. For example, sickness is explained in terms of sanitation or viruses, or in terms of bacteria, or other reasons, not in terms of God's punishment for certain misdemeanor.

**2. Religious practices:** the level of church membership and church attendance is declining, which is an indication of secularization as a result of preoccupation with activities other than religious.

**3. Religious institutions:** secularization can be measured by the extent to which the church and other religious institutions have maintained their social influence and wealth. There was a very close relationship between the religion and the other aspects of the society. But nowadays, in many respects, religion is not maintaining its influence over the society. For many reasons the church's activities are over taken by the government and other secular organizations of the society.

#### III.7.1.Reasons for the growing secularization

A combination of a number of intellectual, political, economic, social, and other factors result in the growing secularization of the modern society.

**a. The growth of the welfare state:** this development has removed many of the tasks performed by the religious institutions. For example, the government started to provide family allowance for the

---

for the changing of the position of women in the society of Muslims. Women in Muslim societies should dress up including their face, they should go in to public places accompanied by men, they should not drive, and they should not be given access to schooling, and other out side home occupations, etc. and the establishment of legal measures against those who come against these restrictions.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

needy family, elderly allowance for the old age, unemployment benefits for the unemployed section of the population. This reduces the significance of religion in the lives of people in the society.

**b. *The development of the mass media:*** this advancement, especially the TV, has replaced the church as the main source of authority and knowledge for many people. People nowadays form their attitudes and outlook on the basis of what they see from the TV, what they read from the newspapers, rather than on the basis of what religious institutions said or their interpretation of the do.

**c. *In many countries there is a complete total separation between the church and the state:*** Many of the central parts of the government were used to be occupied by religious believers of one sect. The church used to have a control over the education so that the educated ones would have the values of that particular church. There were days and still does when both the church and the state used to be managed by persons who share the same or common church values. Only few, these days, governments rely on the supports that come from the religious institutions. State power focuses on ethnic and political affairs than on religious affairs.

**d. *The modern world is more complex with too many problems for religion or magic to offer an effective solution:*** there is a decline in the confidence that religion can provide a more acceptable and plausible solution to the problems of the modern world than scientific solutions. There is a strong belief that today's problems demand socially planned solutions by the expertise and trained scientists in the area. Beliefs and good wills are not enough in the modern world; people need more practical solutions to their problems.

**e. *Advances in the scientific and technological arena:*** these advancements now provide a more scientific and verifiable explanations for the questions, which were posed by the social problems of the society, traditionally answered by religion. The miracles of yesterday have become the scientific discoveries of today. These mounting in the scientific knowledge and explanations tend to undermine religious beliefs of the members. There is growing conviction that the responsibility of man's destiny should be in his own hands.



## Chapter Four The Sociology of Education

EDUCATION is an important part of socialization-the life long process of learning the attitudes, values, and behavior appropriate to individuals as members of a particular culture. Socialization may, therefore, occur in the classroom, it may also take place through interactions with parents, friends, and even with strangers. Socialization results as well from exposure to books, films, television, and other forms of communications. When such learning is explicit and formalized-when people consciously teach while others adopt the social role of learner-this process is called *education*.

The sociology of education is a branch of sociology that tries to analyze the social processes and patterns in the educational system. It is the scientific analyses of the educational system.

This part, the sociology of education, will focus on:

1. The analysis of the relationship between the educational system and other social and cultural systems of the society. It examines how education as a social institution is influenced by the social and cultural values and forces of the society and vice versa.

It tries to see the relationship between the power system, social control system, and education.

2. The examination of the function of education in the social and cultural changes of a given society and in the maintenance of the existing system or the status quo<sup>26</sup>.

3. The analysis of the school as an on going social system. Educational sociologists try to see the school subculture, and its relationship with the general culture of the society. They try to see the general pattern of interaction, or the structure of the school system. By taking the school system as subculture, sociology of education tries to analyze how education as a social institution is organized and functions.

---

<sup>26</sup> How education contributes to the creation of social classes and strata in a society? What roles education plays in maintaining inequality among the members of a group? What opportunities education provide for the poor in upgrading their status position? How education promotes unbalanced racial and ethnic relations?

# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

Education from a sociological point of view begins at the day we are born and ends on the day we die. It is a continuous process that comes in many different forms. For some scholars education is a consciously controlled process where by changes in behavior are induced within the group. It is a controlled social process in the sense that we learn everything as we interact with others.

## **Defining Education**

### **Parsons Definition of Education**

Probably a very restrictive definition of education (to the formal one) is provided by the well known American anthropologist Talcott Parsons: *it is the process through special institutional arrangements and formal procedure, individual members of the society are brought to know, command and/or become committed to the important elements of the cultural traditions of the society.*

In simple societies, socializing (a word almost synonymous with education in primordial societies) new members and transmitting the values and norms of the society from one generation to the next is the responsibility of the family, the kinship system and the community. Learning occurs at the family level and it is called the *informal*. Education as a separate institution doesn't exist. People learn through association, interaction, and friendship experiences. There were no specialized training institutions and centers.

In complex societies, on the other hand, education takes place in a school setting and in specialized training centers. There are strict rules, regulations, and bureaucratic procedures-when and by who to be thought and usually it involves a sort of payment-school fees. It is such type of education that we call *formal* education.

When societies become more and more complex (as they move from the simple to the complex societal arrangement), the educational system evolve from the informal to the formal structure to prepare the young for an adequate participation in their societies. As a result, in modern societies, a distinction is made between education and socialization process. Socialization is more of an upbringing (and rearing of children), and it is informally undertaken by the family. Education is more formal and needs a more structured arrangement; and it is taken over by the school system. The family's responsibility becomes feeding and teaching children some mannerism, but training them to fit in to the society is left to the school system. However, this doesn't mean that there is no socialization in the educational system and there is no education in the socialization process. It can only mean that education is a special form of socialization, which involves the systematic and formal transmission of *skills, knowledge* and *other aspects* of the social culture.

## **Perspectives on Education**

Learning is a fundamental mechanism for adapting to our environment. Learning is critical to social life. Many societies transmit certain attitudes, knowledge and skills to their members through formal and systematic training-the institution we call education. Education is one aspect of the many sided process of socialization by which people acquire those behaviors essential for effective participation

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

in a society. Both the functionalist and the conflict perspectives are in agreement on the importance of education, but they differ in their conception of the part it plays in modern life.

### *Structural Functionalism Perspective*

The perspective strongly rests on the belief that social pattern is best understood in terms of its functions and contributions to the integration and maintenance of a society. Norms, values, customs and institutions are all structures and are there to serve some purpose and they are necessary.

This school of thought considers the human society as an organism composed of many parts functioning in an integrated manner to maintain the whole system going. It draws an analogy between the human society and the biological organism.

The basic characteristics of the society are agreement, consensus, integration and nationalistic feelings. In addition, it assumes that all people agree on the norms and values of the society. If conflict exists in a society, it's rather an exception than a rule.

### *Conflict Perspective*

The perspective usually argues that it is an illusion to assume that a modern society is in a harmonious balance. As a term implies, for the conflict theory proponents, society always experiences conflict, and its basic condition is not agreement, integration and consensus; the basic conditions of the society are competition for scarce resources, power, and advantages; and there can be no consensus as the functionalists claim there to be.

The functionalist perspective examines education in terms of the functions it fulfills in the society; such as cultural transmission, socialization, social control, transmission of academic knowledge and skills and etc. The conflict perspective, on the other hand, perceives the educational system as an instrument of securing power and privileges in the modern society. Education is a means or an instrument to maintain inequality that exists in a given society.

### **Structural Functionalist and Conflict Perspective on Education – A Comparison**

1. While structural functionalists' emphasizes the fact that education contributes significantly to the stability, integration and the conflict-free existence of the modern society, and provides the poor with the opportunity for changing their position and environment by providing access to scarce resources, conflict theorists make the claim that education perpetuates the existing inequalities among the members of the modern society, since most of the time it is the wealthy and people with high status who get the chance for better education.
2. While functionalist perspective argues that schools pass knowledge and academic skills that make it possible for people to participate in the central activities of the society, the conflict perspective is less optimistic. According to the conflict perspective, formal education

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

seems to be more of a status achieving mechanism than a mechanism for imparting new knowledge. Conflict theorists, like Randall Collins, argue that the school system teaches very little to people, but they simply assign a rank and these people are not more knowledgeable than others. It is just a means of acquiring a status (Credentialism<sup>27</sup>).

3. While functionalist perspective argue that education serves in promoting social and political integration, the conflict theorists see the educational system as a means of maintaining the status quo: the existing socio-economic system. For conflict theorists, the function of education is to produce people that the government and the economic institutions need to maintain their system going. Most teachings learned at school are not in accordance with the formal curriculum; rather it teach what is known as the hidden curriculum - society's attitudes and values learned in school that prepare children to accept the requirements of adult life and to fit in to the social, political, and the economic systems (Philip Jackson, 1968). It refers to the standards of behavior that are deemed proper by society and are taught subtly in schools. Schools, for the conflict theorists, are instruments of national and political policy of a given country.

According to the conflict theorist, the school systems have several important functions in service of the existing capitalist system or class:

- a. The school supplies students with cognitive, intellectual, and technical skills required by the capitalist class.
- b. Students are discipline, punctuality, and blind obedience to authority.
- c. The school teaches students loyalty to the state and obedience to the law.

4. As to the question of 'Why compulsory education expanded in the industrial societies?' the structural functionalists contend that it is a response to the demands of increasingly specialized occupations that require skilled workforce. It is a response to the extensive economic and social development. Industrialization created new occupational structures and these developments required more specialized and skilled manpower, which could only be successfully met by the expansion of educational institutions and compulsory education rather than by the family as it has been in the earlier period.

Viewed from the conflict perspective, the increase in the secondary and higher education and in the educational requirements for jobs in many industrial countries resulted from the desire of status groups to maintain their positions in the operational hierarchy than from the need for more formal training.

For the conflict theorists, the well educated are doing similar jobs as the less educated ones used to do. Formal education doesn't provide the necessary training in the actual job skills needed. Most skilled workers acquire their skills when they do the job, not by teachings and trainings.

---

<sup>27</sup> For a discussion on the concept refer to a book by James W. Vander Zanden the social experience: an introduction to sociology , 1990 p. 495

# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

From the conflict perspective, beyond the stage of mass literacy, formal education does not necessarily lead to economic development. Education serves as a means or resource in the struggle of power, wealth and prestige. Educational qualifications are being used in the struggle for advantages and prestige. Social institutions are instruments of the powerful to control and dominate others. By the same token, education is an instrument of the elite domination, rather than a means of preparing skilled manpower for the requirements of the economy, and the market.

## **Functions of Education**

*(As illustrated by the Functionalists)*

Social institutions exist because they meet one or more basic needs of the society. Like wise, the educational institution performs various vital functions for the modern society. These include:

### ***1. Cultural Transmission***

Through schooling, each generation of young people is exposed to the existing norms, beliefs, and values of the culture of the society. Although schools mainly concentrate in teaching the basic academic skills (like writing, reading, mathematics, and etc.), they also pass on basic values, norms, beliefs and attitudes of the society. Cultural transmission must always take place for the society to endure. The educational institutions contribute to the perpetuation of the culture of a society by formally passing on the cultural heritages from one generation to the next.

### ***2. Social Control***

In performing the manifest function of transmitting knowledge and culture, schools go far beyond teaching basic skills. School children are introduced to standards of proper conduct in public life.

Like such basic social institutions as the family and the religion, education prepares the young to lead a productive and orderly live as adults by introducing them to the norms, values and sanctions of the larger society.

Through the exercise of social control, students are taught the various skills and values that will be essential in their further positions within the labor force. They learn punctuality, discipline, scheduling, and responsible work habits. In effect, schools serve as a transitional agent of social control - between parents and employees in the life of most individuals. This function of social control is undertaken by schools not only through transmitting the existing culture but also by recreating within their walls the social control mechanism found in other institutions such as government and the economy.

### ***3. Social and Political Integration***

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

The educational system remains to be the major agent of social integration. Formal education provides the means of transforming people with different backgrounds into a common cultural identity. Attending schooling together, learning the same type of education and being exposed to similar environment result in most cases in the development of attitudes and values that contribute to social integration, stability and consensus. As a result, the members of that particular society will become more or less homogenous with respect to their values, beliefs, norms and attitudes.

### ***4. Agent of Change***

Education can stimulate or bring about desired social changes. It promotes social change by serving as a meeting ground where society's distinctive beliefs and traditions can be shared among people of different social, cultural, political and religious backgrounds. On the other hand, increased years of formal schooling is associated with openness to new ideas and more liberal social and political viewpoints that encourage people to question established 'truths' and practices.

### ***5. Selection and Screening of Talent***

Schools are usually places where people's talent and innate abilities are identified and screened out. By using exams and IQ tests, schools usually place students according to the consistency of their abilities.

### ***6. Promotion of Personal Growth and Development***

Students are exposed to diverse perspectives, models, experiences, and an environment that promote the development of individual abilities and intellectual creativity and advancement in the verbal and artistic means of personal expression. Schools also enable a person to be able to get a place in the occupational structure, in that they promote the development of personal abilities and talents that provide for the greater range of social mobility (Refer to a book by Richard T. Schaefer and Robert P. Lamm, 1995 *SOCIOLOGY* (fifth edition) p.457-8.).

### ***7. Creation, Dissemination and Preservation of Knowledge***

The creation or the innovation, i.e., the discovery of new knowledge through research and ingenious thinking is the function of the educational institutions, and traditionally, this is thought to be the role of, and carried out at the higher educational level.

Dissemination can be taken to refer to the teaching and learning process that takes place in a classroom setting. It takes different forms: written, audio-visual means that could reach a hundreds or thousands of people. The task of preservation of knowledge can be achieved through such activities as maintaining a manuscript, artifacts or publishing a report. For example, writing a book is both a dissemination of knowledge and a preservation of it.

### **Student (College) Subculture**

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

When people observe high schools, colleges, or universities from the outside, students appear to constitute a cohesive, uniform group. However, the student subculture is actually much more complex and diverse.

Burton Clark and Martin Trow (1966) – and more recently, Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz (1987) - have identified distinctive subcultures among college students.

### **Collegiate**

The collegiate subculture is a world of sports, dates and fun. Its symbols are the star athlete, the homecoming queen, and the fraternity dance. The collegiate subculture usually recruits its most active supporters for the upper and upper-middle classes, for it takes money and leisure to pursue round social activities. This subsystem of values and activities is compatible with strong college loyalty. Its graduates often become devoted alumni, sentimentally tied to the college through happy memory of things of the past. However, the collegiate subculture is resistant to involvement with ideas beyond what is required to pass courses and gain the diploma.

### **Vocational**

A second orientation is the vocational subculture. In this sub world, students are narrowly and directly concerned with job preparation and see college as course and credits leading to a diploma and a better job. Symbols of this subculture are the placement office and the slide hanging from the engineering students' belt. Its patterns are most fully represented in the student who is poor and have dependants.

The vocational subculture is not usually compatible with strong college loyalty since its members do not participate intensely in the extracurricular life of the college. Like the collegiate, the vocational subculture is resistant to intellectual demands beyond what is required to pass courses. This subculture is likely to flourish in colleges that recruit primarily the sons and daughters of lower-middle and working class homes. It usually has little social unity.

### **Academic**

A third blueprint for behavior is the academic subculture, the way of life of serious students who identify with the intellectual concerns of faculty members. This subculture is carried by students who work hard, get the best grades, talk about their course work outside of class and let the world of ideas and knowledge reach them.

Their symbols are the library, laboratory and seminar; they are liked by the instructors but are 'greasy grinds' in the eyes of the collegiate crowd. The academic subculture is generally

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

compatible with college loyalty, through identification with the faculty. It is the dominant portion of the climate found at the academically strongest colleges.

Students with serious academic orientation come from all social strata and cultural groups, but proportionally more of them are likely to come from upper-middle homes where parents are well educated, value books and learning and have the financial resources to support their children study.

### **Nonconformist**

The fourth orientation is the nonconformist subculture. There are many types of nonconformity among the college students, but a principal type is the nonconformist intellectual. The nonconformist intellectuals are critical of the 'establishments' and they seek to be independent, and they are usually hostile to the college administration and somewhat detached from the college as a whole.

These students are often deeply concerned with issues of the classroom, but even more with issues current in art, literature and politics of the wider adult society.

Nonconforming students often strive for a personal identity, and in the process they adopt distinctive styles of dress, of speech, and of attitude. In the eyes of their more conforming classmates, they are the unwashed. The nonconformist subculture involved with ideas but not identified with the college, apparently attracts participants from all social backgrounds. It offers the rebellious student shelter and intellectual support for his rebellious idealism.

These four types of subculture emerge from the combination of two factors: the degree to which students are involved with ideas and the extent to which students identify with their college

### **Educational Inequality**

It is assumed that education will provide an opportunity for individuals to develop their skills, and abilities and modify their attitudes and behaviors. When universal education (at least primary education) in some industrialized countries was declared a couple of decades ago, it was assumed that it would provide the young with the necessary skills and trainings to enable them to find a valued position in their society. However, there is a still going on debate on the fact that education as one means of reducing inequalities between individuals and groups. There is a strong argument that states 'education is just a means of expressing, perpetuating, and reaffirming the existing inequalities in power and privileges between individuals and groups than acting to change it in any way'. In support of this argument, many researches show the fact that, there is a differential treatment in education, i.e., a system that rewards some and penalizes others.

Traditionally, equality in education was defined as referring to the availability of schools to all regardless of their ascriptive factors, such as family background, race or gender. Those scholars, on the other hand, who wanted to go deep in to the essence, they take in to account the quality of



## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

teachers (the extent of their training), the quality and equality of educational materials, the age and quality of the school and etc.

Sociologists, however, take a different stand. They tried to shift the notion of equality of education from mere exposure to the effects and results of education. Accordingly, educational equality is a situation where the distribution of educational outcomes is independent of students' ascriptive characteristics. If students from different background score similar grades, and earn equal incomes when they are employed for the same job, then that is what they call equality in education.

### **Educational Inequality by Social Class**

Family's socioeconomic position affects how far youths will go in schooling and how well they will perform in school. Families influence the careers of their children by socializing them to high educational and occupational aspirations and by providing them with the support necessary for achieving these aspirations. On average, the higher the social class of children's families, the greater will be the number of formal grades the children complete.

The higher the socioeconomic status of students' families, the more academic honors and awards the children are likely to receive, the more better off offices they are likely to held and the greater the children's participation in extracurricular activities is likely to be.

In sum, success depends heavily on the socioeconomic position of one's family of origin. Sociologists have identified a number of explanations for these patterns:

#### ***1. The Home Circumstance***

The home circumstances where children come from affect their attendance and performance in schools. Most lower class families experience acute poverty because of low family income. There is a higher level of sickness in lower class families as they can't support basic medical care for family members. Besides the overcrowded living arrangements, low class families usually fail to support the so-called 'the hidden educational costs' of their children. Books and other educational materials are very scarce in the lower class families.

Combination of these factors result in low educational attainment of children from low class families compared to children from high class families.

#### ***2. Parents' Attitude towards Education***

Subcultural differences also play a part. Many studies show that middle class families show a keen interest in their children's education and supervise their progress and advancement at schools. Middle and upper class parents usually make it clear to their children that they are expected to apply themselves to school tasks. Their children typically enter school already possessing a variety of skills that children from other backgrounds lack. Perhaps, even more important, middle class children are much more likely than lower class youngsters to have the conviction that they can affect their environment and their future.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

In addition, the interest showed by middle class families towards the education of their kids acts as a strong motivational factor. For example, research evidences suggest that middle class families visit schools more frequently to discuss on their children's educational performance. This keen interest of middle class families towards their children education is partly because of the role education played in achieving their social position in the society.

### ***3. Parents' Level of Education***

In most societies, middle class families are better educated, and they understand the school system better. They know about the school, the examinations, the career opportunities and the occupational system; and therefore are in a better position to advice and guide their children to schools and departments that provide a promising future.

### ***4. Teachers' Attitude towards Students of Different Social Class***

The social class or background of the children influences teachers' 'judgment of children' abilities in education. Teachers' expectation of students to perform in education, to some extent is influenced by their physical appearance, parental occupations, and the type of dress they wear. Even if children are of equal abilities, they are most likely to expect the upper and middle class students to be better thoughtful and intelligent than the lower class students.

### **Educational Inequality by Gender**

When we speak of a person's 'sex', we ordinarily are referring to the biological status of being a female or male. However, cultures assign different meanings to the definitions of 'male' and 'female'. To differentiate it from the term 'sex', the term 'gender' frequently is used to denote the definitions and assignments that different groups and cultures associate with the sexes. In other words, 'gender' is a cultural construct.

Educational inequality by the sex of a child is virtually found in all societies. Some social customs and norms hinder or at least adversely affect the girls' educational progress. Although the general trend is changing, the number of women decreases as the level of education progresses or advances.

In a society (at one point in time), males are more likely to attend or receive any type of formal training as compared to their female counterparts. In addition to the fact that women are less represented in the formal educational institutions than the men relative to their population size in a society, their misrepresentation varies along a social class. Girls from a lower social class have lower chances of advancing their education to the next higher level.

Women have lower chances of attaining any formal training and qualifications as compared to males, and attending education at higher educational institutions. Even when they are able to find a place in higher institutions there are differences in the subjects they study. Traditionally, in many societies, females tend to study art or social science subjects: history, languages, literature, commerce, home economics, typing, nursing and other caring professions. Males, on the other hand,

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

naturally tend to do better on science and other technical subjects, which most likely lead to the betterment of the life of the professionals on the field.

The way children are socialized also reveals the difference in the expectations of both the society in general and the family in particular. Girls are socialized to take the role of housewives, in their later years, and a position subordinate to men; they are expected to play the roles that are restricted to the domestic sphere. Boys, on the other hand, are expected to take a role in the public domain or perform roles for the social good, and be the breadwinner of their families.

As a result of this differential expectations and treatment of children, girls give more precedence to marriage, love, motherhood, and children, but less to out side home jobs, or career moves, etc.

One other factor, related to the socialization factors that affect achievements of the girls in education, is what we call *self-fulfilling prophecy*. In some instances, people may respond to stereotypes and act up on them (girls who are considered as lazy in a family may consider themselves as lazy and think of their laziness as a normal behavior), with the result that false definition become accurate. In other words, a person or group is described as having particular characteristics (such as girls lack self-esteem and ambition for formal education) and then begins to display the very traits that were said to exist. It means people will behave as effected by others to behave. So children will behave according to the parents, who want them to behave in certain manners.

### **Educational Inequality by Geography**

Educational inequality is also apparent in the mal-distribution of educational facilities and opportunities between the rural and the urban areas. There is a shortage of qualified teachers and other staffs, adequate books, libraries, laboratories, media (radio and TV education), and other facilities in rural areas that are relatively better available in urban areas.

Besides, students of both rural and urban areas are required to take the same exams, either in type and quality, to join higher educational institutions or for other screening purposes, with no distinction with reference to the availability of educational facilities. Therefore, there is inequality between the rural and urban areas.

Children in rural areas, in most cases, are not permitted to attend schooling, for their labor is very much needed in the family farms. Even those who are enrolled at school, perform very poorly as they do not have the time to study on their courses.

## Chapter Five Political Sociology

### Introduction

So long as there is a power difference between individuals, or groups, and it's exercised, there exists politics. Almost all social relations involve politics - the relationship between a father and a son, between a foreman and a daily laborer, and etc. As to Aristotle, man is by nature a political animal<sup>28</sup>; and that only gods and beasts can exist without the confines of the sheltering city. Politics, therefore, exists in every aspect of human life. It also means that, it is not only the politicians who exercise power and play politics, but all of us do when we are in some kind of interaction with others.

Societies, ranging from clan groups to nation states, have always used customs, norms, rules, values and regulations to govern relationships between members. They regulated the interests and behaviors of individuals, groups and communities. So, political institutions refer to the social institutions or to that complex of social norms and roles that serve to maintain social order, to exercise power, to compel conformity to the existing system of authority and provide the means for changes in the legal or administrative systems.

Political institutions are those relatively permanent institutions whose concern is the study of how different aspects of power is distributed and exercised.

### Political Sociology: Its Meaning and Subject Matter

Political sociology is a science that stands across the gap between the two important social science disciplines-sociology and political science. It is a product of cross-fertilization of sociology and political science. It examines the link between politics and society and analyses the relationship between social structure and political structure, and social behavior and political behavior in society.

The subject matter of political sociology includes the following:

---

<sup>28</sup> Aristotle recognizes no basic difference between political and social associations. To him all associations are political in as much as they aim at a common good through joint action; the state differs from other associations in that it aims at the highest good, the general advantage of all.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

1. Political sociology studies the interrelationship between politics and the society or the interplay between political and social institutions as mutually interdependent and complementary to each other.
2. Political sociology studies the social origin of politics in general. The understanding of the roots of political thought, the views and the ideas of the major political thinkers is the subject matter of the sociology of politics.
3. Political sociology studies the distribution and exercise of power in the society. How are the different aspects of power distributed within the society?
4. Political sociology also tries to understand the structure of the political process.

### **Political Science and Political Sociology**

Political science is a discipline in the social sciences that has two branches: political theory and government administration. Political theory studies the origin and development of political ideas and thought, while government administration tries to describe the formal structure and functioning of the government. Political science restricts itself to the study of power as embedded in formal organizations. Traditionally the discipline is concerned with the study of the state, the government, and public administration. None of these does study the political behavior in depth.

Political sociology, on the other hand, emphasizes on the study of political behavior, (as can be exemplified in voting behavior, political party affiliation and popular participation in decision-making and the like, in more depth than the political science - and that is the difference between the two.

Political sociology, as compared to the political science, has got a number of advantages:

- It allows a student to deal with the relations and structures of the society as a whole, not with the segment of it. It studies power as distributed in all the relationships in the society, not only as embodied in the formal governmental structures. It sees the state and the government as only one aspect of the political institutions; which in turn are part of the society in which they exist.
- It tries to have a holistic approach. Political sociology tries to link up politics with the general theories of society.
- It allows the examination of the variety of structures and institutions that might otherwise be missed-politics in private organizations, in the family, in working places, etc.

By understanding these kinds of distinction between the political sociology and political science, we can define political sociology as a branch of sociology that is mainly concerned with the analyses of the interaction between politics and society.

It is the study of politics at four levels:

1. The political conflict and struggles between states, namely the sociology of international relations;
2. The nature and the role of the state within societies;
3. The nature and organization of political movements and parties; and
4. The participation of individuals in politics, as shown, for example, in voting behavior.

## Political Thought

### Early Intellectual Roots: The Greeks

Political sociologists place themselves in a number of traditional thought, particularly in the analyses of the so-called the problem of '*the social order*', defined as the process where by the interaction of the members of a social group become patterned or stable over time and the form which they take from time to time.

Efforts to provide answer to the problem of the social order and distribution of power in the society go back at least to the Greek thinkers. And all modern political thinkers can't afford to exclude the influence of the Greek thinkers on modern political sociology. The reasons could include:

1. The Greek socio-political thought was fairly systematized and the problem of social order was nearly spelled out.
2. There occurred a transition from naïve monism<sup>29</sup> to that of critical dualism<sup>30</sup>.
3. The Greeks were the first to discover the problem of the autonomy of the individual and its place and participation in the society.
4. At the time when the theory of society was developed, Greek was like Europe as the time when sociology was developed.

The imperishable contribution of the Greeks to Western civilization lies in the cultivating of man and nature through reason. In the pre-Greek world, advanced people had learned to live with nature by wresting from it, through patient observation, some of its secrets, and by applying them to gainful purposes. The pre-Greek conception of nature viewed physical phenomena as essentially individual, unique, and incalculable rather than about recurrent regularities of inanimate events, but they were the first to develop-going beyond observation and knowledge-the scientific attitude, a new approach to the world that constitutes to this day one of the distinctive elements of western life.

In the field of human relations, too, Greek inventiveness and originality lay, not in this or that political theory, but in the discovery of the scientific study of politics.

### Plato (427-347BC)

Because he believes that people are ignorant and he characterized the mass as usually acting in mob, and because he sees the mass usually as irresponsible, he rejected democracy as an efficient form of government. For him, there is no order in democracy. His understanding of the democracy, of course, is very much different from that of the modern understanding of the concept. For him, democracy is the system of government where everybody directly participate in the decision making

---

<sup>29</sup> Naïve monism is a belief that society lives in unchanging circles of taboos, laws and customs, which are felt to be inevitable as the rising sun, the cycle of seasons and of similar obvious regularities of nature.

<sup>30</sup> Critical dualism is a conscious differentiation between man enforced laws and natural regularities, which are beyond his power.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

process. And he rejects it as he says there should be a division of labor. This division of labor shall enable individuals to occupy social positions based on their fields of specialization.

Therefore, he tries to replace democracy by the Republic where only men of virtue should participate in the decision making process.

The Republic is opposed to democracy on two levels of argument: a more obvious explicit level and a less obvious implicit level. The explicit opposition of the Republic to democracy rests on the threefold division of the population in to rulers, fighters, and producers (farmers, artisans, traders). A numerically small aristocracy of rulers, in command of a well-trained body of soldiers and administrators, governs the third class, or producers, which constitutes four-fifth of the total population. Plato claims that the threefold class division of the city is an extension of the principle of the division of labor. Ruling or defending a state, Plato argues, is just as much a specialized craft as shoemaking from making furniture; he is equally excluded from ruling, or defending and administering, the city-functions that constitute special and specialized crafts. The democratic theory of politics challenges Plato not only in his basic assumption that the capacity to govern is possessed by only a small class, but that such capacity can be transmitted, in general, by selective inbreeding. This platonic concept of a hereditary aristocratic ruling class, not too hermetically closed to talent from below, is rejected by the democratic theory of man and the state that wisdom and understanding may be found in the most unexpected places, in log cabins as well as in stately mansions-in fact, that it is more likely to be found in log cabins.

Plato assumes (in the Republic as in his other writings) that Truth is something eternal, unchanging and unchangeable, and that it can be made accessible to a select few through an ingeniously devised training reserved for the future fighters and rulers. The platonic conception of the Truth is challenged by the modern view of the truth as something much more tentative, hypothetical, fluid and changeable and subject to constant checking and verifying. Further, modern philosophers insist that truth is intimately related with experience, that it can never be fully grasped, that it is an endless process of testing new hypotheses against new experiences, that is not something that exists prior to man, but that is consistently made and remade in doing, rather than discovering in intellectual speculation or in flash of mystical insight.

Plato using the fable developed by Socrates describes the city population of the Republic as composed of three groups and indicates their capacity accordingly:

The Gold people: the class or rulers (guardians in the narrower sense) intellectuals, who have the capacity to administer the masses, to whom he referred to as the philosopher-kings.

The Silver people: the class of military and civilian executive aids (auxiliaries) warriors, soldiers, physically equipped and strong; who can defend their country.

The Iron or the Bras people: the class of producers and the handworkers' ordinary citizens, merchants, artisan, workers, farmers. Plato was an aristocrat who exhibited the bias against labor and business so characteristic of aristocrats in all ages, and the lack of regulations of the economic order of the producing class in the Republic indicate the contempt of the noblemen for the prosaic existence of those who must work for a living.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

According to Plato, the perfect society could only exist when power is in the hands of the Gold people who can understand the absolute moral truths. The rulers should not be allowed to have private property and even their own family. The life of the rulers of the Republic should not be different from that of the rest of the population. If they are allowed to possess private property they would be self-seeking, and self-centered. He contends that the Gold people should be allowed for selective inbreeding, in order to transmit their intellectual and ingenious thinking abilities.

Nevertheless, Plato anticipated the eventual decline of the best state and its degeneration into progressively lower types of constitution. The first of these forms of the state is timocracy, based on the ambition and love of honor and war, “so commonly admired.” The second is oligarchy or plutocracy, the rule of the wealthy; the third is democracy, the rule of the people; the fourth, and the most imperfect, is despotism, which develops inevitably out of the anarchy of the democratic state. In his classification of forms of state, Plato considered democracy the second worst type of government.

### **Aristotle (384-322BC)**

Aristotle opens his book the Politics with two important ideas: 1. the state is a community, and 2. that it is the highest of all communities, which embraces all the rest, aims at good in a greater degree than any other, and at the highest good. Aristotle may not be the first to consider the state a community, but he was the first to define it clearly as such, and thus he laid the foundation for the organic conception of the state, one of the two major types into which all political theories of the state may roughly be divided. According to him, the state is a natural community, an organism with all the attributes of a living being. The other major type views the state as an instrument, a mechanism, a piece of machinery to be used for purposes and ends higher than itself. This type, called the instrumentalist view of the state, is actually older, having been propounded by the Sophists a century before Aristotle; however, it was rejected by Plato and revived only in the modern times by Hobbes, Locke, and John Dewey.

But Aristotle maintains not only that the state is a community but that it is the highest community aiming at the highest good. The family is the first form of association, lowest in the chain of social evolution, and lowest on the rung of values, because it is established by nature for the supply of men's everyday wants. The village is the second form of association, genetically more complex than the family, and aiming at something more than the supply of daily needs, meeting at least some rudimentary and primitive cultural wants that the family cannot satisfy. The third and the highest form of association is the city state, highest in terms of social evolution and highest in terms of value and purpose: while family and village exist essentially for the preservation of life and the comforts of the companionship, the state exists for the sake of a good life, and not for the sake of life only, and political society exists for the sake of noble actions, and not for mere companionship.

In considering the general problem of the various forms of the government, Aristotle says, in an obvious reference to Plato, that there are some who would have none but the most perfect. The knowledge of the best state may have some value as a norm and standard, but on the other hand, the best is often unattainable, and therefore the true legislator and statesman ought to be acquainted, not



## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

only with (a) that which is the best in abstract, but also with (b) that which is best relatively to circumstances. Where the attention Plato is centered on the desirable kind of state, Aristotle holds that we should consider, not only what forms of government is best, but also what is possible and what is easily attainable by all. Each forms has its perversion, of which there are also three; tyranny, oligarchy and democracy (the rule of the poor).

In classifying the forms of the state, Aristotle distinguishes governments that are carried on with a view to the common interest from those that serve private interests, whether of one, of few, or of many. Of true governments, there are three: kingship (the monarchy), aristocracy, and constitutional government.

1. **The Monarchy**<sup>31</sup>: of the three true forms, Aristotle holds monarchy to be the most ideal kind of government. If a man pre-eminent in virtue can be found, who surpasses in virtue and political capacity all the rest, he cannot be regarded as a part of the state, subject to the law like everybody else. Since there is no law for pre-eminent virtue, monarchs are themselves a law. Their superior virtue and political capacity give them the right to practice compulsion and still live in harmony with their cities, if their government is for the interests of the state. Like Plato, he puts virtue of the rulers above the consent of the ruled, although both would prefer to have the ruled submit voluntarily to their rulers to avoid the necessity of compulsion.
2. **The Tyranny**: results from the corrosion of the monarchy. This, as that of the monarchy, is a form of government where there is only one ruler. But he is a cruel, unjust and corrupt one. He rules for himself, not for the mass.
3. **The Aristocracy**: Aristotle defines aristocracy as a government formed by the best men absolutely, and not merely of men who are good relatively, that is, in relation to changing circumstances and constitutions. But Aristotle admits that, in addition to such a pure form of aristocracy, which is based on the merit and virtue only, there is a type of aristocracy that also takes in to account the elements of wealth. Generally, however, Aristotle speaks of monarchy and the aristocracy as the perfect state, the government of the best, both forms aiming at the general good; the main difference between the two consist in the fact that that the monarchy virtue is centered in one pre-eminent man whereas in aristocracy virtue, and therefore the power, is diffused among several men.
4. **The Oligarchy**: the deteriorated form of aristocracy is oligarchy in which the government by the wealthy is carried on for their own benefit rather than for the whole state. Whereas merit and virtue are the distinctive qualities to be considered in selecting the rulers in an aristocracy, wealth is the basis of selection in an oligarchy.
5. **The Polity (the Constitutional Government)**: it is defined by Aristotle as that constitutional form of state where citizens at large are administered for the common interest. This form of

---

<sup>31</sup> It is a kingly rule; there is one sole ruler. It can be defined as a system of government where there is only one educated ruler-like the philosopher king in the case of Plato.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

government avoids both the extremes of oligarchy and democracy. Constitutional government is a compromise between the two principles of freedom and wealth, the attempt to unite the freedom of the poor and the wealth of the rich, with out giving either principle exclusive predominance. Aristotle concedes that the doctrine of the multitude being supreme rather than the few best, though not free from difficulty, yet seem to contain an element of truth.

6. **The Democracy:** the degenerate form of constitutional government (polity) is called by Aristotle democracy and defined as a system in which the poor rules. It is government by the poor, and for the poor only, just tyranny is government by one for his own benefit, and oligarchy government by the wealthy few for their class benefit. But of the degenerate forms, government of the poor for the benefit of the poor (democracy) is the most tolerable of the three.

Points on Aristotelian *political sociology*:

1. The basis of classification is the ethical values of the ruler-particularly the moral and the intellectual virtues. The ethical and moral values and the technical and manual virtues are not evenly distributed among the members of the society, and therefore he who has the more intellectual qualities should assume the position for leadership.
2. He believes in what is called the cyclical theory of social change, that there is no straight line of progress from the simple to the complex, and from the bad to the good.

### Early Intellectual Roots: the Roman

#### Cicero (106-43 B.C.)

The only political thinker who has exercised enduring influence throughout the ages is Cicero (106-43 B.C.). Characteristically, he was not a professional philosopher and leader of a school or academy of his own, but a lawyer and statesman whose works are reflections on politics rather than on political theory.

Cicero's two main works on government are his Republic and Laws, written in obvious reference to Plato's two works of the same title. Superficially there is a great deal in Cicero's two works that appears to be a close imitation of Plato and Aristotle. Yet when it comes to the inner meaning of Cicero's political views, his temper and outlook, there is a remarkable freshness and difference. Most important of all, perhaps, Cicero had a sense of the world, whereas Plato and Aristotle were never able to go beyond the conception of the city-state as the ultimate in the political organization. Both Plato and Aristotle had no place for mankind in their political theories; the world is divided in Greeks and others, who were barbarian and-as Aristotle clearly avowed-inferior to the

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

cultured Greeks, who had the right to enslave them. By contrast, Cicero had a more universal outlook, fostered by his political and administrative experience in Rome and the empire.

Cicero believed that the whole universe is one commonwealth of which both gods and men are members, and that there is a law valid for all nations and all times. Whereas the Greek view, as typically expressed by Aristotle, held that some people were superior to others, Cicero said that there is no human being of any race who, if he finds a guide, cannot attain to virtue.

One of the characteristic assumptions of both Plato's the republic and Aristotle's politics is the implicit faith that, once general principles of government are laid down, the process of government can be safely entrusted to the rulers. Philosophy, not law, is the queen of both Plato's and Aristotle's masterpieces. By contrast, Cicero-the Roman and the practicing lawyer, the experienced administrator, the fighting statesmen-always speaks of the law whenever he discusses the state: in one of his briefest definitions, the state is a community of law. The rule of the law is important to him, and he says that although we cannot agree to equalize men's wealth, and equality of innate ability is impossible, the legal rights at least of those who are citizens of the same common wealth ought to be equal.

In his reflections on the various forms of the state, Cicero follows the Aristotelian principle that the distinguishing criteria is the end of the state; when its purpose is justice, it makes little difference whether the form is kingship, aristocracy or democracy. More skeptical than Aristotle, however, Cicero did not advocate any of the three desirable forms of the stat, because he feared that kingship might develop too easily in to tyranny, aristocracy in to plutocracy, and democracy in to anarchical mob rule. Cicero therefore considered a balanced combination between kingship, aristocracy, and democracy the best constitution; his belief in the virtue of the mixed constitution went back to Aristotle, but it was also a lesson of Roman political history that an astute observer like Cicero could hardly have missed.

Where Cicero goes further than Aristotle is in his stress on popular consent as the foundation of legitimate government, and on liberty: liberty has no dwelling place in any state except that in which the people's power is the greatest, and surely nothing can be sweeter that liberty; but if it is not the same for all, it does not deserve the name liberty. The principle of popular consent as a source of the law was a commonplace to a Roman lawyer; the conception of the people as a political and legal force in the process of government acquired in Roman constitutional hierarchy connotations and undertones similar to those the word people has acquired again in modern times in the world wide struggles for democracy and popular government. Plato and Aristotle know of the polis, the city-state, and of social classes, but not of the people. The conception of the people in western thinking is a contribution, not of Roman philosophy, but of Roman public law.

### **The Medieval Political (Christian) Thought:**

#### **St. Augustine (354-430 A.D.)**

The medieval period fills the ten centuries between the fall of the Roman Empire in the fifth century and the revival of ancient thought and learning in the fifteenth century.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

When the Visigoths sacked Rome in the A.D. 410, a popular explanation was that it was the fault of the Christians. Christianity had been officially tolerated in the Roman Empire from A.D. 313, and eighty years later it became the official religion of the state, paganism being proscribed and prohibited. Because the fall of Rome in A.D. 410 occurred so soon after the triumph of Christianity, many pagans and perhaps even some Christians were inclined to see a connection between the rise of Christianity—so long as considered officially subversive movement—and the weakening of Roman power.

St. Augustine was moved especially by the pagan attacks that attributed the fall of Rome to the victory of Christianity. He set out to answer two main questions. The first concerns the pagan challenge to Christianity. The rebuttal of paganism, however, is only the more negative part of “The City of God” (a book by St. Augustine). Having demonstrated the hollowness and the inconsistency of paganism, materialism, and worldly success, Augustine proceeds to his more constructive task: the vision of the heavenly city, as contrasted with the earthly city.

As a theologian and passionate Christian who took his faith seriously, St. Augustine was primarily concerned with ways of life and not with organizations of life. The great struggle in the universe is, then, not between the church and the state, but between the opposing ways of life: in the earthly city, the love of self, the lust of power predominates, whereas in the heavenly city the love of god, even to the contempt of self, is the foundation of order. St. Augustine therefore divides the human race into two parts, the one consisting of those who live according to man, the other of those who live according to god. And these we also mystically call the two cities, or the two communities of men, of which the one is predestined to reign eternally with god, and the other to suffer eternal punishment with the devil. St. Augustine himself thus emphasizes that the two communities of the heavenly and earthly cities can be called cities only in mystical or allegorical sense.

If man is to become worthy of entry into the eternal kingdom of heaven, the city of god, there must be some agency on earth, St. Augustine realizes, that leads in the right direction. Although the central meaning of heavenly city is a way of life dedicated to the service of god, St. Augustine also uses this term mystically, that is symbolically for the church. It is part of the heavenly city that exists on earth and lives by faith, and it lives like a captive and stranger in the earthly city.

Just as the heavenly city symbolically represents, but is not identical with the church, so the earthly city is symbolically reflected in the state. Strictly speaking, the earthly city is not identical with any empirical social or political organization but is the community of the unrighteous, including sinful members of the church and excluding righteous citizens of the state.

### **St. Thomas Aquinas (1226-1274)**

St. Thomas suggests two reasons for the necessity of the government even in the state of innocence, before the occurrence of sin and evil: first, man is naturally a social being and so in the state of innocence he would have led a social life. Because there must be some organization of social life, government emerges as the specific organ of looking after the common good. Second, if one man surpasses others in knowledge and justice, it would be wrong to disregard such superiority for the

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

benefit of all. St. Thomas thus bases the need for government on man's social nature, and the organization of government on the superior wisdom and morality of the ruler for the benefit of the ruled.

St. Thomas agrees with Aristotle that man's social impulse is the origin of the state, and the good life its purpose. But from here on St. Thomas, the Christian theologian, goes beyond Aristotle. For the Greek, bound to this world, the good life of the community included practical and spiritual ends that could be attained by joint communal effort here and now. St. Thomas cannot be satisfied with the community as the ultimate point of reference and the creative source of spiritual values. His Christian, other worldly concern leads him to the view that the Aristotelian doctrine of the good life is still one step short of the ultimate purpose of existence, because through virtuous living man is further ordained to a higher end, which consists in the enjoyment of God. Whereas Aristotle, whose philosophy and ethics were humanistic and this worldly, saw the end of man in values that exist within himself, St. Thomas sees, in addition to such man-centered values, an extrinsic good that does not exist in man himself and that is yet the supreme value, namely, final beatitude which is looked for after death in the enjoyment of God.

Because society has the same end as the individual, the ultimate purpose of social life is not merely virtuous living, but through virtuous living to attain the possession of God. If man and society could attain this supreme end by human power, the king (as the supreme representative of human power) could guide them in the right direction. However, St. Thomas argues, the possession of God can be attained only by divine power, and human government is unable to guide men towards this end. The ministry of the kingdom of God is not in the hands of earthly kings, but of priests, and above all the chief priest to whom all kings are to be subject as to Christ himself.

St. Thomas has always looks on the world in hierarchical terms, and his system of values is hierarchical, too. Applying the Aristotelian principle that the one to whom it pertains to achieve the final end commands those who execute the things that are ordained to that end, St. Thomas arrives at the conclusion that secular government is subject to the church because the former is concerned with intermediate ends, whereas the latter is concerned with the ultimate end, the salvation of souls.

As to the nature and form of political authority, St. Thomas Aquinas starts with the premise that government is related to the divine order. Therefore, because the commandments of God include the duty of obedience to superiors, disobedience to the commands of a superior is a mortal sin. St. Thomas follows Aristotle in classifying the forms of government in to good types, in which the interest of the governed is served, and the bad types, in which the interest of the ruler or the rulers prevails. But, whereas Aristotle, with some hesitation and only under qualified circumstances, preferred the monarchy as the best form of government, St. Thomas is much more unequivocal in his choice of monarchy.

Aristotle preferred monarchy because he believed that it was not likely that superior moral and intellectual qualities could be found in more than one man; his hesitation in committing himself absolutely can be attributed to his doubt that the right man can be found. St. Thomas, on the other hand, derives his preference for the monarchical form of government from his religious view of the world. He noticed that in the whole universe there is one God, Maker and Ruler of all things. In the

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

multitude of bodily members, the heart rules all the others; among the bees, there is one king bee, and generally every natural government is government by one. The governing element represents, in a multiplicity of things, their purpose and guiding principle. In political society, the main practical task and purpose is the unity of peace. St. Thomas identifies unity with peace; he is therefore led to the conclusion that one ruler is most likely to maintain the peace that goes with complete unity, whereas a government made up of several persons might endanger social peace and stability through disagreement.

But St. Thomas seeks to delimit monarchy so that it will not disintegrate in to tyranny<sup>32</sup>. First, he prefers elective to hereditary kingship: elective heads ruled both papacy and empire. Second, he suggests that the king's power be so tempered that he cannot easily fall in to tyranny. St. Thomas stresses the important concept that all should take some share in the government, and he also views sympathetically the idea of the mixed constitution in which aristocracy supplements monarchy and popular elements of participation in government.

### **Renaissance and Reformation Political Thought:**

Only in the fifth century Athens has the world seen the dazzling artistic brilliance and fabulous intellectual vitality that characterized the Renaissance. The rebirth and rediscovery of antiquity were both cause and effect: on the one hand, the renaissance helped to revive the rational, this-worldly, secular, scientific spirit that had lain dormant through many centuries of medieval encasement; on the other hand, the renaissance was itself the effect of man's growing relentlessness as well as of changing social and technological conditions.

The most important discovery of the renaissance—more significant than any single work of art or any one genius—was the discovery of man. In antiquity the sense of tribal kinship had not favored the growth of individualism, of isolation from the community. Displacing God, man becomes the center of the universe; the values of this new solar system is inevitably different from those of the God-centered universe.

Among the centers of the Renaissance, Florence was always first, reaching at its climax in Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), who most perfectly represented, and lived, the renaissance ideal of universal man, creative in painting and the arts, inventive in science and engineering and accomplished in philosophy and letters. In the study of politics, the new learning finds its clearest expression in Nicöölö Machiavelli (1469-1527).

Renaissance and reformation are inextricably interwoven with the birth and growth of the modern national state. In the field of secular thought and experience, the renaissance brought about the rediscovery of the ancient world and witnessed the immense broadening of man's horizon through the discovery of the New World. In the field of religious thought and experience, the renaissance opened the gates to a new religious world through the Protestant Reformation.

---

<sup>32</sup> St. Thomas relates the tyranny of the ruler to the sins of the ruled; tyrant s rule by divine permission, as a punishment for the sins of the subjects. If God is to help them against the tyrant, the people must desist from sin.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

The first leaders of the reformation denied any revolutionary intentions and merely claimed to return to the early sources of Christianity, faith and the Scriptures. In this sense, Protestantism was a part of the general process of rebirth, the religious aspect of the renaissance. In the fifteenth century, the conciliar movement had attempted to reform the church from within but failed. Yet in its very failure it had revived the important conception of the congregational character of church authority, with its corollary that office was in the nature of trusteeship rather than an inalienable power. When reform from within failed, revolution from without took its place.

Prior to the thirteenth century, as long as the church had withstood the attacks of critics who did not take any religion seriously, it was able to win easily, either by disregarding its critics, by trying to persuade them, or by burning them alive on the stake. The strength of reform movements from the thirteenth century on lay in the fact that the critics of Rome were passionately religious. They assailed the papacy for having lost the original ideals of Christian faith and for having become corrupted by the worldly ambitions of lust, wealth and power. For three centuries, therefore, the reform movements within the church had to be held down by all sorts of compulsion and kept in isolation; in the end, the pressure for unity within the church proved stronger than the forces for reform.

In the sixteenth century, however, the reformist tendencies-now driven into revolution by the obstinacy of the church-were more successful because they were allied with other social forces of the time. Nowhere was the issue purely religious; in all countries it was mixed with political, dynastic, economic and diplomatic considerations. Although the age of reformation was truly religious, unscrupulous persons to cloak less lofty aspirations readily used religion.

From the viewpoint of the expansion of political liberty, the first protestant church, Lutheranism had little effect, either in Germany or elsewhere. Martin Luther (1483-1546) stressed the inner aspects of religious experience, faith rather than good works: faith alone is the righteousness of a Christian and the fulfilling of all the commandments. Luther argued that liberty is in the conscience and spirit of man, and has no relation to his political or social condition, for that is making Christian liberty an utterly carnal thing. His ideas on government and the relations of the rulers and the ruled were most clearly and systematically expressed in his book "Secular Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed" (1523). Luther emphasized that government is ordained by God, and that the subjects must obey their rulers, even though their rule be unjust or cruel. His profound pessimism about men in all stations-rulers and ruled-was reflected in his statement that the world is too wicked, and does not deserve to have many wise and pious princes. Frogs need storks.

As long as Protestantism was mainly Lutheran, it made little headway in France. But there was a vigorous tradition of anticlericalism and antipapalism in France from the Middle Ages on, and the sense of urgent change grew stronger in the sixteenth century. Protestantism became a national force in France, with an intellectual character of its own, after the appearance of a French leader, John Calvin (1509-1564).

Unlike Luther, Calvin admitted the right of resistance to tyrannical rulers, provided that resistance was in the hands of the magistrates and organized estates, rather than lawless mobs, or in the hands

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

of a secular savoir selected by God to deliver the people from tyranny. In the total doctrine of Calvin, the stress was more on obedience than on resistance.

### Nicöölö Machiavelli (1469-1519)

The most revolutionary aspect of The Prince<sup>33</sup> is not so much what it says as what it ignores. Before Machiavelli, all political writings-from Plato to Aristotle through the Middle Ages to the renaissance-had one central question: the end of the state. Political power was assumed to be a means only- a means in the services of higher ends, such as justice, the good life, freedom, or God. Machiavelli ignores the issue of the end of the state in extra political (ethical, religious, cultural) terms. He assumes that power is an end in itself, and he confines his inquiries in to the means that are best to acquire, retain, and expand power. Machiavelli thus separates power from morality, ethics, religion, and metaphysics, and sets up the state as an autonomous system of values independent of any other source.

If he follows the value system of the state, the statesmen may violate other value systems, such as religion, ethics, or morality. Machiavelli thus develops the idea of the reason of the state, under which many acts are permissive, even obligatory, that would be considered heinous crimes if judged in the courts of religion or morality.

In the actions of rulers the end justifies the means. Let the prince therefore aim at concurring and maintaining the state, and the means will always be judged honorable and praised by every one. In The Discourses, Machiavelli defines the reason of the state even clearly: for where the very safety of the country depends up on the resolution to be taken, no consideration of justice or injustice, humanity or cruelty, nor of glory or shame, should be allowed to prevail. But putting all other considerations aside, the only question should be: what course will save the life and liberty of the country?

Machiavelli never praises immorality for its own sake; his basic attitude is not one of nihilism: he neither assumes that there are no values in this world, nor wishes to create a world in which all values would be destroyed. Machiavelli is aware that civilization implies some sort of values. His amorality implies therefore, not the denial of moral values in all situations, but the affirmation that,

---

<sup>33</sup> 1. Constant readiness for war: a prince should therefore have no other aim or thought, nor take up any other thing for his study, but war and its organization and discipline, for that is the only art that is necessary to one who commands, and it is of such virtue that it not only maintains those who are born princes, but often enables men of fortune to attain to the rank. And one sees, on the other hand, that when princes think more of luxury than of arms, they lose their state. The chief cause of the lose of states, is the contempt of this art, and the way to acquire them is to be well versed in the same.

4. Cruelty and clemency: is it better to be loved or feared? There arises the question whether it is better to be loved more than feared, or feared more than loved. The reply is that one ought to be both feared and loved, but as it is difficult for the two to go together, it is much better to be feared than loved, if one of the two has to be wanting.

Still, a prince should make himself feared in such a way that if he does not gain love, he at any rate avoids hatred; for fear and the absence of hatred may well go together, and will be always attained by one who abstains from interfering with the property of his citizens and subject or with their women.



## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

in the specific situation of the statesmen, the rules of power have priority over those of ethics and morality. What is evil from the viewpoint of morality and religion may therefore be good from the viewpoint of the reason of the state, if it serves to acquire, retain, or expand power.

Good and evil are thus reduced from absolute categories, and it depends on the basic assumption of a system of value whether a particular action is good or bad. If the basic assumption and the objective of conduct is friendship, service, fellowship, justice, or God, the individual action will be judged good or bad to the extent that it agrees with, or deviates from such assumptions and goals. If, as for the ruler, the basic assumption is power, the decision as to whether a particular action is good or bad will depend on the extent to which it furthers the gain, retention, and growth of power. Assuming power as the end of politics, goodness thus coincides with efficiency: an efficient means of acquiring, consolidating, and expanding power is good; an inefficient means, bad.

Efficiency in politics thus is analogous to virtue in morals or religion, and inefficiency replaces the concept sin. Machiavelli himself still uses the term virtue for the successful ruler, but he mean the ambitious, ruthless, crafty, successful ruler, and not the ruler who is regular churchgoer, mindful of other men's wives, and generally a practicing moralist.

Machiavelli's views on morals and religion illustrate his belief in the supremacy of power over the other social values. He has no sense of religion as deep personal experience, and the mystical element in religion-its supernatural and suprarational character-is alien to his outlook. Yet he has a positive attitude towards religion; albeit his religion becomes a tool of influence and control in the hands of the ruler over the ruled. Machiavelli sees in religion a poor man's reason, ethics, and morality put together, and where religion exists it is easy to introduce armies and discipline.

The role of religion as a mere instrument of political domination, cohesion and unity becomes even clearer in Machiavelli advice that the ruler support and spread religious doctrines and beliefs in miracles that he knows to be false. The main value of religion to the ruler lies in the fact that it helps him to keep the people well conducted and united, and from this viewpoint of unity it makes no difference whether he spreads among them true or false religious ideas and beliefs.

Unlike later Machiavellians, Machiavelli himself was saved from extremism by prudence and moderation. In both The Prince and The Discourses there are numerous passages in which Machiavelli counsels the prince to be temperate, not to be uselessly cruel or arrogant, for to incur hatred without any advantage is the greatest temerity and imprudence. The ruler should use threats or insults, because neither diminishes the strength of the enemy but makes him only more cautious and dispose to hate.

As one examines the references to rulers in The Prince more closely, one finds that Machiavelli was not interested in all forms of state, nor in all forms of power. What fascinated him above all was the dynamics of illegitimate power; he was little interested in states whose authority was legitimate, as in hereditary monarchies, but was primarily concerned with new dominions both as to prince and state. He realized that there is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor more doubtful to handle, than to initiate a new order of things. His primary concern with founders of new governments and states illuminates his attitude on the use of unethical means in politics. The

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

founders of the new states are, in effect, revolutionaries, and it is inevitable that in reducing politics to war and revolution, one arrives at an outlook in which the extraordinary becomes the ordinary, and the abnormal the normal.

Because of his admiration for the outstanding man (and only outstanding man can successfully found a new dominions), Machiavelli was little interested in the institutionalized framework of politics. He realized that in a period of institutional instability there is less need of the adventurer. In fact, as Machiavelli clearly sees, democrats hate war and revolution: the normal restraints and decencies are then imperiled by the necessity for sheer physical survival, and the habits of institutional stability are more easily subverted than in normal peace time.

### **Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679)**

Unlike most defenders of the absolute government, who start out with the gospel of inequality, Hobbes argues that men are naturally equal in mind and body. As to strength of the body, the weakest has enough strength to kill the strongest, either by assassinating him secretly or by allying himself with others for the purpose. With regards to mental faculties, Hobbes finds ever a greater natural equality. Prudence is a matter of time and experience that can be acquired by everybody. Most persons think that they have more wisdom than their fellow men, but this in itself, Hobbes remarks cynically, is proof that men are equal rather than unequal.

This basic equality of men is a principal source of trouble and misery. Men have, in general, equal faculties; they also cherish like hopes and desires. If two men desire the same thing, which cannot both obtain, they become enemies and seek to destroy each other. In the state of nature, therefore, men are in a condition of war, of every man against every man, and Hobbes adds that the nature of war consists, not in actual fighting, but in the known disposition thereto. Force and fraud, the two cardinal virtues of war, flourish in this atmosphere of perpetual fear and strife, fed by three psychological causes: competition, diffidence, and glory. In such a condition, there is no place for industry, agriculture, navigation, trade; there are no arts or letters; no society; no amenities of civilized living, and worst of all, there is continual fear and danger of violent death: and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.

Pessimism as Hobbes may seem, he is not hopeless about man's ability to overcome the mess in which he finds himself in the state of nature. The fear of death is the passion that inclines men to peace: the attractions of power and glory give way to the desire for securing, as a minimum, life, and-if possible- the means of ample existence. Once man realizes that his fear of death is primarily due to brutal competition, resulting in perpetual war of all against all, reason shows the way out: to accept the principle of not doing that to another things which seem unreasonable to be done by another to yourself.

However, on the basis of Hobbes analyses of the nature of man, a contract among men not to do to one another what they would not wish to have done to themselves would not be sufficient. Though man has the capacity to learn prudence and moderation from his fear of death, his desire for power and glory may tempt him to break his pledge unless there is a restraining power strong enough to keep him to his promise, because covenants, without the sword, are but words, and of no strength to

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

secure a man at all. If men are peaceable enough, Hobbes notes, to observe covenants without a superior authority for their enforcement, there would be no need for government in the first place, because there would be peace without compulsion. To make the counsel of prudence, born of the fear of death, issue in effective peace, a sovereign authority—one man or an assembly of men—must be created to whom all power is transferred.

The social contract of Hobbes is made between subjects and subjects, not between subjects and the sovereign. The sovereign is not a party to the contract, but its creation. In this conception of the social contract, the sovereign cannot commit any breach of covenant, because he is not a party to it.

The question of the best form of state is not one of logic, according to Hobbes, but of convenience, that is, of the aptitude of the state to produce the security and peace of the people for which the government is instituted. However, on purely practical grounds Hobbes considers the monarchy the best form of state because it suffers less from competition for office and power than do aristocracies and democracies; also, it is easier for one than for many to act resolutely and consistently. Hobbes was solely concerned with the practical question of effective government and legitimacy did not interest him at all.

Sovereign power is incommunicable and inseparable, and Hobbes attacks any institution, town or private corporation, that may weaken the supremacy of the state. He is strongly opposed to division of powers or mixed government.

To keep the authority of the state strong, Hobbes advises the sovereign not to allow the growth of groups and institutions that intervene between the state and the individual. Hobbes is particularly anxious to prevent churches from interfering in any way with the activities of the state. He reminds the clergy that it is not essential to the commonwealth, and that the safety of the church depends on the state rather than the state on the safety of the church.

Worth noting essentials in the Leviathan:

- ✓ First, the government is set up, according to Hobbes, by a covenant that transfers all power and authority to the sovereign.
- ✓ Second, Hobbes assigns to the state the ordinary business: to maintain order and security for the benefits of the citizens.
- ✓ Third, Hobbesian state is authoritarian, not totalitarian. Above all, Hobbes pleads for equality before the law, so that the rich and mighty have no legal advantages over the poor and obscure persons.
- ✓ Fourth, Hobbes holds that the sovereign may be one man or an assembly of men.
- ✓ Fifth, Hobbes recognizes that war is one of the two main forces (the other being the danger of internal disorder) that drive men to set up a state. But whenever he speaks of war, it is defensive war, and there is no glorification of war, let alone of aggressive war, in the Leviathan.
- ✓ Sixth, the Hobbesian sovereign desires merely—for purposes of maintaining the peace—outer conformity of the subjects to the law. The subject is bound to obey the law, but not bound to believe it, and human governors can take no notice of his belief and interior thought. What Hobbes is concerned about is social peace, not Truth.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

- ✓ Seventh, and finally, the Hobbesian state doesn't completely swallow the individual: a man cannot lay down the right of resisting them that assault him by force to take away his life. Since the purpose of a civil society is the preservation and protection of man's life, Hobbes recognizes the inalienable right of the individual to resist when his life is at stake, because man by nature chooses the lesser evil, which is danger of death is resisting, rather than the greater, which is certain and present death in not resisting

The Hobbesian theory of politics rests largely on a hypothesis-the solitary, combative, competitive character of man-that is only a half-truth. It is difficult to see how the brutes who lead a life of nasty savagery in the Hobbesian state of nature should suddenly display the prudent reasoning and cooperative effort that go in to the making of the social contract creating the sovereign. A group that knows the institutions of the contract is well beyond the state of nature, and it would perhaps be truer to say that contract is the product of society rather than society the product of contract.

### **John Locke (1632-1704)**

Like Hobbes, Locke starts out with the concept of the state of nature. Yet from this starting point on, Locke travels in a different direction and arrives at a different destination. Unlike Hobbes, whose state of nature is little different from the jungle in which force and fraud reign supreme, Locke takes an optimistic view. In the Hobbes state of nature there is no natural law, only natural rights, each individual doing as he sees fit his preservation and enhancement of power. By contrast, Locke's conception of man in the state of nature is not noticeably different from man in the organized society. Lock cannot conceive of human beings living together without some sort of law and order, and in the state of nature it is the law of nature that rules: the state of nature has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges every one; and reason, which is that the law, teaches all mankind who will but consult it, that, being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty or possessions.

The law of nature, through the instrument of reason, defines what is right and wrong; if a violation of the law occurs, the execution of the penalty is, in the state of nature, put into every man's hands, whereby every one has a right to punish the transgressors of that law to such a degree, as may hinder its violation. Locke notes that without some agency of enforcement there can be no, law, and that in the law of nature the injured party is authorized to be judged in his own case and to execute the judgment against the culprit.

The law of the state of nature is thus deficient in three important points. *First*, it is not sufficiently clear. If all men were guided by pure reason they would all see the same law. But men are biased by their interests and mistake their interests for general rules of the law. *Second*, there is no third-party judge who has no personal stake in disputes. Men who judge their own conflict are apt to be carried away by passion and revenge. *Third*, in the state of nature the injured party is not always strong enough to execute the just sentence of the law: thus mankind is quickly driven in to society. The purpose of the social contract is to establish organized law and order so that the uncertainties of the state of nature will be replaced by the predictability of known laws and impartial institutions.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

After society is set up by contract, government is established, not by a contract, but by a fiduciary trust. The legislature is the supreme power to which all other powers, particularly the executive, must be subordinated. Yet the legislature is only relatively supreme among organs of government. Above the legislature there is still something higher: the people. Locke conceives of the institution of the legislature as a fiduciary power.

When Hobbes described the establishment of society and government, he carefully confined the act of covenant to the subjects; they set up the sovereign, transferring to him all power. There was no contract between subjects and the sovereign, only between subjects and subjects, because Hobbes was anxious to avoid a conception of the government that had duties, under a contract, toward the governed. Similarly Locke confines the act of covenant to the sitting up of society but not of government; yet his aim is exactly the opposite of Hobbes's. Locke's government is not a party to any contract with the people, because he does not wish to give the state any rights against the people. Locke's state never becomes the Hobbesian sovereign but always remains an instrument of the purposes that a society sets for it. As a strong believer in natural law, Locke assigned to government the task of finding the law rather than that of making it in the Hobbesian manner. Law precedes the state in Locke, but follows it in Hobbes.

Hobbes was strongly impressed with the need for compulsion to maintain social cohesion that he could not envisage society without government. The dissolution of the government meant for him the end of all order and restraint, the cessation of civilized living, and the return to the barbarous state of nature. Locke enunciates one of the principal doctrines of classical liberalism by drawing a sharp distinction between the state and the society. Of the two, society is by far the more important and enduring. The dissolution of the government doesn't entail that of the society, whereas if society is dissolved, it is certain that the government of that society cannot remain. But when government is dissolved, Locke doesn't anticipate chaos-as did Hobbes-but trusts that society will set up a new government to serve its ends and purposes.

Absolute monarchy is, according to Locke, no form of civil government at all, and, in fact, worse than the state of nature. In the latter, everybody is judged in his own case, whereas in absolute monarchy there is only one person who has that liberty: the king.

Locke's insistence that there is a higher law above the law of the state has led to the conception, so deeply ingrained in the traditions of democratic nations, that obedience to the law is a high, but not the highest, civil virtue. Opponents of democratic government have charged that making political rule dependent on consent of the ruled lays ferment for frequent rebellion, as Locke puts it. Locke does not deny the charge, but asserts that his hypothesis invites anarchy and rebellion no more than any other. *First*, when the people are made miserable, they will rebel under any form of government. *Second*, Locke emphasizes that men do not revolt up on every little mismanagement in public affairs. *Third*, government by consent, coupled with the right of the people to rebel is the best fence against rebellion. The more the channels of free communication and consent are maintained in a society, the less the need for revolution.

Locke's defense of the right to rebel seemed to the makers of the American Revolution highly reasonable. Thomas Jefferson, in many respects a Lockean rationalist and lover of freedom and

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

toleration, expressed the American version of Locke's theory of rebellion in the classical phrase that the tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants.

### **Modern Political Thought:**

#### **Karl Marx (1818-1883)**

##### **Marx's Philosophy**

The notion of labor is fundamental in Marx's thought. Basically, Marx argued that it is human nature to transform nature, and he calls this process of transformation "labor" and the capacity to transform nature labor 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.

Beyond his claim about the human capacity to transform nature, Marx makes no other claims about "human nature."

Although "labor power" for Marx is human nature, he 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 of production, literally those things, like land and natural resources, labor, and technology, that are necessary for the production of material goods, and the social relations of production, in other words, the social 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 base and 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.

Marx was especially concerned with how people relate to that most fundamental resource of all, their own labor-power. Marx wrote extensively about this in terms of the problem of alienation. As with

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

the dialectic, Marx began with a Hegelianian notion of alienation but developed a more materialist conception. For Marx, the possibility that one may give up ownership of one's own labor -- 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 people come to believe that it is the very things that they produce that are powerful, and the sources of power and creativity, rather than people themselves. He argued that when this happens, people begin to mediate all their relationships among themselves and with others through commodities.

Commodity fetishism is an example of what Marx and Engels called false consciousness, which is closely related to their 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 wrong; 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 produced them is literally absurd, it does reflect the fact (according to Marx and Engels) that people under capitalism are alienated from their own labor-power. Another example of this sort of analysis is Marx's understanding of religion, summed up in a passage from the *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.

### **Marx's Critique of Capitalism**

Marx argued that this alienation of labor power (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 sell their own labor 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 is a "proletarian." The person who buys the labor power, generally someone who does own the land and technology to produce, is a "capitalist" or "bourgeois." (NOTE: Marx considered this an objective description of capitalism, distinct from any one of a variety of ideological claims of or about capitalism).

Marx distinguished capitalists from merchants. 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

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

commodity in one market and another. Merchants 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 the price for labor was lower than the price of the manufactured good. Marx called this difference "surplus value" and argued that this surplus value was in fact the source of a capitalist's profit.

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 believed 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.

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 empowerment of the capitalist class and the impoverishment of the proletariat. Finally, 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.

### **Max Weber (1864-1920)**

His ideas are discussed in detail in the following sections: bureaucracy, the theory of domination, and etc.

### **Concepts in Political Sociology**

#### **Politics**

In a very narrow, restrictive sense, limiting the concept to formal government structures, Weber defines politics as "striving to share power or striving to influence the distribution of power whether among states or groups within a state". For him politics refers to the peculiar social structure known as the state. This definition of the concept excludes politics in stateless societies, in business organizations and in other non-formal non-governmental institutions.

On the other hand, the sociological conception of the term stresses the presence of politics in all social relationships. In this tradition, politics is argued to be used for the resolution of human conflict, and for the allocation of resources in the society. Therefore, it is a process by means of which society makes decisions and evolves policies and it is also an instrument for the exercise of power and influence in the society. And again politics is argued for the maintenance of public order



## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

not necessarily through the employment of the police, the courts but also through chiefs and other personalities.

Politics has got to do with the exercise of power in all social relationships, so long as there is a power difference. Politics, therefore, from this perspective is endemic to social life.

### **The State and the Government**

#### **The State**

The definition of the state includes the following three elements:

1. Set of social institutions: the state recruited personnel man these institutions.
2. There is always geographically bounded territory: the set of social institutions exist within the geographically delimited territory. The state claims legitimacy and sole sovereignty in the defined territory.
3. State monopolizes the making of rules and evolving of policies within that territory.

On the basis of these, Weber offers a definition of the state as “a community that successfully claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical forces within a given territory”. For him the state is a compulsory political association, for it is through state apparatus that societies resolve conflicts and achieve their stated and unstated social, economic and other objectives. It the necessary social machinery through which the society maintains public order and peace.

Marxist view of the role of the state differs from that of the Weberian perspective in that it contends the state represents and operates in the interest of the dominant classes in a given territory, the interest of those in power.

#### **The Government**

The term the government refers to a collection of people who occupy positions of authority within the framework of the state. It can also be used to refer to the regular implementation of the policies and decisions on the part of the officials in a political apparatus. These people in the government apparatus have formalized goals; backed by the army and they work in a defined territory.

Therefore, the state refers to the organized social institution; and the government refers to the collection or group of people who at a given point in time occupy a position of authority in the state. Whereas it is difficult (although not impossible) to revolution ally change the state system, which endures with slight adjustment in its evolution and adaptation to the prevailing situation, the government system, as the people occupying the statuses therein leave and got replaced by others, can change.

### **Power, Authority and Legitimacy**

#### **Power**

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

Although much is written on the subject there is no one generally agreed upon definition of power, so remaining to be an area of heated debate.

Some scholars defined power as an ability to do or act. Positions, valued by the society, enable individuals or groups to act on their will. Weber contends on power as if it is an aspect of most social relations.

Most writers (Marx, Weber, Parsons and Mills) who attempted to define power characterized it as a capacity or ability for certain units, of individuals, of groups, of organizations, of classes, etc., to make certain decisions for or impose their will over other social units.

Although power is exercised in every social relationship and in all locations, the context in which it takes place gives its unique structure and form. Based on this, therefore, we can have three different but interrelated forms of power: social, economic and political. *Social power* is power exercised in social and interpersonal relations. It is the ability to induce and influence decisions at group, community and society level. *Economic power* is power based on the possession of economic means of production-the wealthy people. *Political power* is power by virtue of political offices and positions in the government exercise this power.

All these forms of power involve a significant influence and control over other people's behavior and circumstances.

### **Authority and Legitimacy**

In all societies, some forms of power relations are institutionalized and become part of the social structure of the social organization. They are given the stamp of legitimacy, therefore considered right, fair and natural. When such legitimacy is involved, power changes its name and becomes authority.

### **Authority**

Authority is an institutionalized power, a power accepted as natural, fair, right by those who are subjected to its influence. It is a socialized form of power, and therefore, it belongs to the position not to the individual who occupies a position in the social, political, or economic structure of the society.

For Weber there are three different forms of authority or legitimate domination.

*Traditional authority* is an authority system based on the acceptance of the power of the ruler to dominate because the system has been exercised for long period of time. It is based on belief systems and customs and it is an inherited and ascribed status.

*Charismatic authority* is an authority system based on a person's exceptional and exemplary qualities.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

*Rational legal authority* is an authority system based on the rules and regulations. This rational legal authority is what we find in most governmental and other bureaucratic institutions in modern societies.

Some contemporary sociologists added a fourth type of authority: *professional authority*<sup>34</sup>, which is based on expertise (knowledge, profession, etc) e.g. medical doctors, architects, etc.

### **Power and Authority: Points of Intersection**

There are four possible points of intersection between power and authority.

- ✓ A government may have both power and authority and therefore can make laws and effectively enforce its policies. Democratic types of governments are examples.
- ✓ A government may have power, but no authority. These are governments that exist because they have the control over the army and the physical force. Their laws and policy decisions are accepted by the people, not as legitimate ones but by fear of punishment. The power of the government is not accepted as legitimate because those who are subjected to it do not accept it as natural and fair. Dictatorial governments are examples.
- ✓ A government may have the moral authority and the claim for mass support, but no power to exercise. There are governments that claim the sole legitimacy of ruling the mass, but without the necessary power for enforcing their policies. Governments in exile are examples.
- ✓ A government may have neither power nor authority. Such a government is very susceptible for attack both from the inside and/or outside.

### **Legitimacy**

Legitimation is a process through which the social system or some aspects of it comes to be accepted as appropriate and generally supported by those who partake in it. Although it has been originally referring to the existence of the king or the queen in their appropriate places, it nowadays refers to people's attitude about the government regulations as right or wrong.

Of course, any government depends on its effectiveness<sup>35</sup> and the legitimacy of their political systems for its stability and continual existence.

There are four possible ways how a government could achieve legitimacy:

- ✓ *By governing well*: that is what we call effectiveness: ensuring economic growth, providing defense against invaders, providing justice to all, improving the living standard of the people, etc. In general terms, governing well means prolonged effectiveness and constant

---

<sup>35</sup> Effectiveness refers to the social and economic growth and development that a government could bring about to its subjects.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

economic development. The survival of any government system is dependent up on its ability to meet the needs of the population for a prolonged period of time. Even for democratic form of governments, bringing economic development is important for the maintenance of their legitimacy.

- ✓ *By fair structuring of the government system:* if legislators are elected, if the people are fairly represented and have a say in all the activities that are going on in the country's affair, the subjects are more likely to submit to the government and provide it with legitimacy.
- ✓ *By governing for long period:* long established governments are generally well accepted by their citizens than newly established governments that have got a shaking legitimacy, as people would not trust whether they have to support or not. People tend to consider long established governments as natural and legitimate and they, therefore, would not think otherwise.
- ✓ *By manipulating national symbols:* by using all those things like the national flag, the history of the country and arousing the patriotic feeling of the people will facilitate the legitimacy move of the incumbent government. Manipulating national symbols, addressing some issues that touch the emotions of the citizens will most probably enable the government to command the acceptance of the people. Nonetheless, when the other elements of legitimacy are not present, symbols by themselves will never create legitimacy and the government will eventually collapse.

### **Types of Political Systems**

#### **Totalitarianism and Democracy**

Totalitarianism and democracy are the two extreme and ideal types in the classification of political systems. There are differences in societies regarding the amount of power that the ordinary people have to influence the decisions of the government. Most political systems fall in between these two extremes.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

### **Totalitarianism<sup>36</sup>:**

History is full of regimes in which power is concentrated in hands of individuals or small bands of individuals. These groups of people can use unrestrained power in every matter that goes in the society. There is no restriction in the power they exercise. If one refuses or compromises their power, he will be subjected to severe punishment. Aristotle and other philosophers, with some difference in the connotation of the term, called this type of government tyranny; and the period in their reign absolutism.

Totalitarianism is any political system in which a citizen is totally subject to state authority in all aspects of day-to-day life. It goes well beyond dictatorship or typical police state measures, and even beyond those measures required to sustain total war with other states. It involves constant brainwashing achieved by propaganda to erase any potential for dissent, by anyone, including most especially the state's agents.

Totalitarianism is defined as a system of government where societies controlled by small powerful groups (an elite) where ordinary citizens lack effective control over the government's decision-making process.

It is a system of government where one party controls all the economic, the judiciary, the military, political and etc power in the society. This party attempts to restructure the values of the society, even the private personal life of the citizens. The government strictly manages all the major social institutions in the society, directly or indirectly.

A scholar by the name Carl J. Friedrich gave us some description of totalitarian state systems.

- ✓ A totalized or all-embracing ideology

---

### <sup>36</sup> Authoritarianism

The term **authoritarianism** is used to describe an organization or a state which enforces strong and sometimes oppressive measures against the population. It is distinguished from totalitarianism both by degree and scope, authoritarian administration or governance being less intrusive and in the case of organizations not necessarily backed by the use of force. For example, the Roman Catholic Church can be accurately described as authoritarian; however, in modern times it lacks the means to use force to enforce its edicts and is not a totalitarian organization.

The distinction between authoritarianism and totalitarianism was a crucial part of the Kirkpatrick Doctrine, which asserted that the United States could cooperate with authoritarian nations with bad human rights records because they were more capable of fundamental reform and less dangerous than totalitarian nations.

In an authoritarian state citizens are subject to state authority in many aspects of their lives, including many that other political philosophies would see as matters of personal choice.

Typically, the leadership (government) of an authoritarian regime is ruled by an elite group that uses repressive means to stay in power. However, unlike totalitarian regimes, there is no desire or ideological justification for the state to control all aspects of a person's life, and the state will generally ignore the actions of an individual unless it is perceived to be directly challenging the state. Totalitarian governments tend to be revolutionary, intent on changing the basic structure of society, while authoritarian ones tend to be conservative.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

One finds only one ideology that totally embraces every other ideology in the society. One can't find other or different views of the world. That single ideology gives explanation for everything that goes on within the society. There is not alternative to that dominant ideology.

✓ A single party

The party is dedicated for the protection of all-embracing ideology.

✓ Police power based on terror

There is a wide spread informers network. The police divide and create an atmosphere of suspicion and fear among citizens. The government governs through the employment of physical force and coercion.

✓ A monopoly of communication medias

All forms of the media are controlled. Everything that will be displayed on public will strictly be censored in light of the interests of the incumbent government. The media's main objective is to teach good things about the government.

✓ The monopoly of the agency of the criminal justice system and the armed forces, including the police, the courts, and the prisons.

The entire law making and the law enforcement agencies are under the strict control and supervision of the government. These agents are the principal sources of power for the existence of the system.

✓ A centralized economy and the control of all organizations

In order to meet the policy objectives of the party, the economy is subjected to a single direction, a command economy. Government owns everything, private investment is not encouraged; and they are under government control, if there are any.

### **Democracy<sup>37</sup>:**

---

governing.  
However, the term is also sometimes used as a measurement of how much influence a people has over their government, as in how much democracy exists. The word democracy originates from the Greek "demos" meaning "the people" and "kratein" meaning "to rule" or "the people to rule" which meant literally: "Rule by the People."

A modern democracy implies certain rights for citizens:

- right to elect government through free and fair elections

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

Democracy is the most widely cited concept in philosophy, sociology, political science and in other social sciences disciplines. Governments of the modern era claim for democratic legitimacy and democratic form of government, for of the very favorable public attitude attached with democratic forms of government, states all over the world over advertise their democratic attributes.

The word democracy is made of two words: “demo” to the people and “crazy” to the government. Until recent times, the concept was not held in such good esteem. The discussion on democracy as a form of government could be traced back to the Greeks. Nonetheless, for Greek thinkers it was an inefficient form of government. It was equated with a mob rule.

A historical review of democracy reveals the fact that perspectives on democracy are not the same in the 5<sup>th</sup> century Athens and the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century modern states. The Athenian democracy was direct popular government; all citizens, excluding the slaves and the foreigners and women, used to participate in decision making. All freemen take a direct part in the decisions of public stake. However, such a democratic structuring is very difficult and extremely costly to implement and therefore, rare, in modern times. Therefore, now we are talking about a representative democracy.

Democracy in modern times could be defined as a system of government which basically involves the government of the people, by the people, for the people, where ordinary people have some control over government decision making.

Democracy in the modern complex societies provides constitutional opportunities for changing the governing officials. It is also a system of government, the largest possible part of the people influences government decisions through their representatives. Therefore, democracy today refers to the system of government acting under constitutionalism. Authority or legitimacy to rule is achieved through delegation and trusteeship.

Though, modern democracy is not just a rule by the majority, it demands the existence of the rights and opinions of the minority. Otherwise, it becomes the tyranny of the majority.

Therefore for a system of government to be fully democratic it has to fulfill the following criteria:

✓ Regular, free and fair election:

There should be a regular periodic election where everyone can stand as a candidate for an office and/or vote freely without intimidation.

✓ Effective participation in the government:

- 
- freedom of speech
  - the rule of law
  - human rights
  - freedom of assembly
  - freedom from discrimination

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

On certain vital national issues, citizens have to be given the opportunity to express their ideas and preference as to the final outcome. Referendum and direct popular participation should be carried out, if demanded by the situation.

✓ Competing political parties:

In order to insure a possible range of options for the voters to choose among, political parties with their own different ideologies and policies should be organized.

✓ The right to vote and voted; and vote must be allocated equally among the citizens.

✓ Freedom of expression and free and independent mass media.

✓ Freedom of association and belief:

The freedom of belonging to associations on social, political or cultural interests of people, and the freedom of individuals to believe should be respected.

✓ Civil rights such as the right to protest and demonstrate:

Citizens' rights not to be arrested and detained by the police without trial must be respected.

✓ An independent legal system:

The court system should be independent of the control of the dominant group or party. All citizens should be treated equal before the law.

### **Sample Ingredients of the Democratic System**

Democracy is not an easy system of governance to create and maintain. Several elements are demanded to maintain itself as a system. These elements (ingredients) are not the same in all societies.

*1. Substantial Middle Class*

People that are neither poor nor rich form a democratic foundation. If there are too many poor, it creates an inherently unfavorable environment for a democratic system. If there are more members of middle class, they develop an aim at reform, not on revolution and to stability of the democratic system.

*2. The Level of Education*

A country with many educated citizens has a much better chance for sustaining a democratic system of administration. Therefore, education is very important in order to maintain a democratic system.



## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

The higher one's education is, the more likely that person to believe in democratic values and support democratic principles. There is a strong correlation, but the characteristic of educational system should be taken in to consideration.

### 3. *Economic Development*

Democracy is very much related to the state of economic development. The more well to do the country is, the greater the chance that it will sustain democracy. From Aristotle to present thinkers argue are only in wealthy societies that the mass of the population intelligently participate in politics. It also appears that most of the countries that lack enduring democracy lie in the under developed section of the world. Weber has also written that modern democracy in its clearest form can occur under capitalist industrialization.

### **Political Culture**

Political culture is the accumulated store of the symbols<sup>38</sup>, belief<sup>39</sup>, values, attitudes, norms, and other cultural products that shape and govern political life in a society. It includes both the material and the non material aspects and it is passed form one generation to the next through the process of the so-called political socialization. Political socialization is the process by which individuals in a given society become acquainted with the political system and which to a significant degree determines their perceptions of politics and their relations to political phenomenon.

### **Political Participation**

Political participation is an instrument through which people can influence the selection of government leaders, their actions, policies and decisions. Depending on various factors, it ranges from non-involvement to the holding of political offices. There are a number of arguments regarding the different types of political participation. For example, Lester Wilberth in his classification of the American people holds that there are three major categories of political participation based on their level of participation in the political process: the gladiators (who are active in politics that comprise between 5 to 7 per cent of the total population), the spectators (who have a rudimentary or minimal involvement in politics, and it constitute about 60 per cent of the total population), and the apathetic (who do not involve themselves in any type of political participation, which represents about the 33 to 35 per cent of the total population).

A more elaborated classification of the American population on political participation is made by other political sociologists and it is made up of six categories.

Those who are totally passive  
(22%)

Those whose political activity is limited to the periodic voting

---

<sup>38</sup> Symbols refer to the statue of the heroic figures, the motto, national anthem, the monuments, etc.

<sup>39</sup> Belief refers to the national history, the attitude towards patriots, the politicians, and other leaders, etc.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

- (21%)  
The localists, those whose political activity are confined to political process and issues around their locality
- (20%)  
Parochials, those who would participate in politics as long as the situation affects their interest
- (4%)  
Campaigners, those who would involve themselves in politics only in relation to the political process or issue on which they are campaigning
- (15%)  
Those who are totally active those who are involved in all types of political processes and activities
- (18%)

A hierarchy of political participation (highest to lowest)<sup>40</sup>:

- Holding Political Offices*  
*Seeking Political Offices*  
*Active Membership in Political Organizations*  
*Active Membership in Quasi-Political Organization*  
*Participation in Public Meetings and Demonstration*  
*Passive Membership in Political Organizations*  
*Passive Membership in Quasi-Political Organizations*  
*Participation in Informal Political Discussions, (the family, work places, peer groups)<sup>41</sup>.*  
*Some Interest In Politics Maintained Through The Mass Media, Press, Etc.*  
*Voting<sup>42</sup>*  
*Non-Involvement in Politics<sup>43</sup>*

---

<sup>40</sup> The following hierarchical classification of political participation could be applicable in all societies; but the concentration (the percentage) of the people at each stage or level of the hierarchy differs from one society to the other.

<sup>41</sup> Such an intermittent type of political participation is more likely to be formed where there is a crisis situation or when there is an election for a political position.

<sup>42</sup> The act of voting is the minimum active form of political participation and it requires the least commitment and it is over when the election process is over.

<sup>43</sup> Here the situation is that the people, because of some personal (or by choice) or because of some reasons that are beyond their control, fail to participate in any type of political activity.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

However, based on their research findings many scholars in political sociology contended that political participation is essentially a minority activity, only few people participate in politics. They claim for ample correlation why political participation varies according to the socio-economic characteristics of individuals in a given society as it can be observed from the following comparative analyses:

<b>Socio-Economic Characteristics</b>	<b>High Level of Political Participation</b>	<b>Low Level of Political Participation</b>	<b>Influencing Government Policy in Democratic States</b>
Education	The Educated	The less educated	
Class	The Middle Class	The working / the lower class	
Gender	Men	Women	
Age	Middle Aged	The young and the old people	
Marital status	Married	Single	
Area of residence	Urban Residents	Rural residents	
Ethnicity	The Majority	The minorities	

What are the ways that people can use in influencing the decisions made by their representative democratic governments? Two major mechanisms are discussed in the following section.

### 1. Political Party Membership

Membership in political parties' enables individuals to take part in the formulation of party policies. If the party wins a government office, those policies could be the policies of the government. As political parties are interested in administering by holding political offices, membership in such parties gives an individual an opportunity to influence the trend of social, political and economic development of a country.

### 2. Pressure / Interest Group Membership

Pressure groups try to put pressure on the government and its legislators to formulate and implement policies that work in their members favor. They are the association of individuals concerned with influencing the government in a manner favorable to the group members' interest. They are important in democratic countries as they serve as a channel to represent the opinions and interests that may escape the due attention of the government and keep the government in touch with the public opinion.

### Pressure Groups and the Political Parties: Contrast

1. Whereas political parties seek to promote and/or defend a general cause, pressure groups usually promote and defend a limited and specific cause.

# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

2. Pressure groups advocate the interests and preferences of their members and, like the political parties; they employ different techniques to solicit the public interest. However, unlike political parties, pressure groups are not interested in holding governmental offices. They try to influence those in power towards certain policy directions. But there are instances where interest groups develop in to political parties, like the Labor Party in England.

## Types of Pressure or Interest Groups

### 1. Protective or Defensive Groups

A pressure group concerned with defending the shared sectoral interest of the members of the group is called protective or defensive group. The group strives to influence the government to formulate policies that would protect and/or defend the interests of its members (e.g. Trade Unions, Professional Associations, etc).

### 2. Promotional Groups

Pressure groups concerned with the promotion of a particular cause rather than protecting and defending the interests of a particular group are called promotional pressure group. Here the cause is broader than for protective pressure groups. These groups intend to promote the benefit the general public rather than the exclusive interests of the members (e.g.: Anti-Apartheid Movement, Green Peace, Anti-Smoking Movement, Anti-HIV Movement, etc.).

Strategies pressure groups employ in influencing political decision making includes one or a combination of Lobbying, Funds political parties that support a cause, Advertisement, Holding public meetings and demonstrations, Organizing petitions, Opinion polls, Strikes, etc.

## Theories of Political Process

Theories in political sociology try to explain how power is distributed, who rules given society, and what techniques and strategies that the rulers use in subordinating the ruled.

### The Elite Theory

A superior social group in a society in terms of ability, privileges, etc. is described as elite. Elitism is a doctrine that assumes some groups always get an upper hand and rule the mass.

The elitist perspective found an early expression in the works of 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century European sociologists as V. Pareto, G. Mosca, R. Michels, and C. Mills. They contended that the concentration of power in the hands of elite group is inevitable in modern societies. They portrayed all societies as dominated by the few who rule and many who are ruled. The masses can't and don't govern themselves.

At the core of the elite theory lays the conception that a society is divided in to two groups and there are minorities (the elite group) who rule the society and make decisions in a society.

# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

There are three different approaches under the elite theory

## Elite theorist

Vilfredo Pareto  
Gaetano Mosca  
Robert Michels  
Wright Mills

## Approach

Psychological Approach  
Organizational Approach  
Organizational Approach  
Institutional Approach

**V.  
Pareto  
(the  
Italian):**

## **Psychological Elitist**

Pareto suggested that any society is consisting of two classes: the higher stratum (the elite) and the lower stratum (the mass or the non-elite). Pareto believed that every society is ruled by a minority, a group that possesses those qualities that are necessary for political and social leadership. Those who get at the top are the best and they are called the elite, consisted of those successful individuals in education, economy, politics, etc. The elite group has got two sub-divisions, where we have the governing group and the non-governing group.

For Pareto, the governing elite is the ruling class which directly or indirectly influences the political decision making process. The non-governing elite is made up of those persons who hold a leadership positions in a society (such as the engineers, the lawyers, the physicians, the social scientists, etc.), but who are not directly involved in the political decision making process.

Pareto rejects the Marxist notion of Economic Determinism that people become leaders because of their economic resources. He argues that the elites are largely the products of their individual human attributes. The elite have got better and superior qualities. As he emphasized the individual unique qualities for leadership, his approach is referred to as psychological. He contended that the elite have got superior psychological abilities in order to get obedience from the mass.

Pareto views history as an endless alternation or circulation of power elite: new elite comes to replace the older. He argued that no matter what form of government, there is always a circulation of elites and it is always the privileged minorities (the elite) who run the show.

## **G. Mosca and R. Michels: Organizational Elitists**

Both personalities believed in the existence of the so-called the elite group and they contend that its domination of the society rests on its organizational abilities and position. For them, the organized minorities rule or manipulate those that are the less or unorganized mass.

## **G. Mosca (the Italian): Organizational Elitist**

He argued that in all societies two classes of people could be discerned, which he referred to as a class destined to rule and a class destined to be ruled. According to him, whatever the form of the government, power is always concentrated in the hands of few organized minorities that dominate the disorganized majority.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

The minority (the elite) dominates the majority (the mass) because of its highly organized system of communication involving superior individuals. These qualities of the minorities are results of their elite social background rather than their biologically inherited factors. For him the majority is usually disorganized. Individuals in the majority stand alone.

Mosca divided the elite into the upper stratum, a small group of political decision makers, and the lower (the sub-elite) stratum, the whole middle class in a society that performs in lesser leadership positions. The second group includes those individuals in the public institutions, managers, scholars, physicians, the technocrats, etc. and is so vital in any society. They serve as a channel or as a bridge of information between the minority and the majority and provide information for decision making. This group is also a source of recruitment for the upper elite group.

Mosca believes that the stability of any political organization or government depends on the level of morality and intelligence the second group attained and the *bustle* accomplished by the group. Mosca agrees with Pareto that there is always a circulation of elite, in an endless chain, and it is always the elite group that rules the society not the majority.

### **R. Michels (the German): Organizational Elitist**

Michels work on political theory was a reflection of his first hand knowledge of the German Socialist Party and the Labor Unions in the Soviet Union and other European countries.

For him, there is always a tendency for parties and labor unions, or other socialist parties to change themselves to an oligarchic rule. For him, this is an inherent tendency in all bureaucratic organizations. Thus, he coined his famous phrase "the Iron Law of Oligarchy".

The Iron Law of Oligarchy asserts that even ideal democratic organizations will eventually develop in to a bureaucratic (oligarchic) form of administration (a rule by the few or elite group). A group may be established to pursue the most ideal democratic principles, but there is a permanent tendency to be transformed in to an oligarchical rule.

### **Why Do Oligarchies Emerge?**

#### **1. Complexity of Modern Organizations**

In complex societies, it is practically impossible to directly engage all members of a society in all matters (considerations of time, space and energy). At the same time, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to reach at a consensus while involving too many people in the process. To the solution, the majority should select and appoint representatives to facilitate the decision making process.

However, these people who enjoy the privileges of the positions they are instated, would want and therefore use different techniques to monopolize and perpetuate themselves in power-and this results in an oligarchical system of rule. In other words, it can be said that the growth of complexity of the tasks and division of labor in the modern world leads to the rise of an oligarchical rule. An Iron Law

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

of Oligarchy dictates that complex societies always become oligarchic in which the power of the state is monopolized by the elite.

### 2. Apathy or Incompetence of the Mass

As the mass is usually apathetic, slavish, or indolent, it's permanently incapable of self-governing. Not only the mass, but also the rank and file members of a party or a movement look up to the leaders for direction, and they, therefore, enforce the process of the rule by the few (an oligarchical rule). For Michels, the leaders, therefore, would take the advantage of these qualities of the mass to perpetuate them in power and monopolize institutionalized power.

### 3. The Lure of Leadership Positions

Leadership positions in a society are attended with packages of privileges, which tempt the leaders to exploit all possible techniques to stay in power. Revolution usually takes place when power is monopolized by few individuals. Contrary to its aim, it overthrows one tyranny and replaces it with a new form of tyranny and oligarchy.

### C. W. Mills (the American): Institutional Elitist

In his book the "Power Elite," Mills argues that elite groups in America are part of the power structure of the society and therefore, their power is institutionalized. For him, the USA is dominated by three complexes of overlapping elite groups whose key members constitute what he calls "the power elite": the industrial, the military and the political. Key members of the group make decisions that have major national and international consequences.

According to C. W. Mills, the power structure of the America population could be depicted in terms of three classes: the power elite (the class of the corporate businessmen, leaders of the federal government, the rich people, the military leaders, the political leaders), the middle class (the class of the intellectuals, the scholars, the white collar workers, and the leader of interest groups), and the mass (the class of the exploited and disorganized mass).

For Mills, the power elite is a minority in size and that works as a cohesive unit. Members of this group are integrated on the bases of their social and psychological similarities and common interests. The power elite controls the major resources in American society and commands the major institutions such as the legal, executive, the legislative branches of the government to its own interest.

He commented that the power elite in the United States are usually made up of individuals with the following criteria: Male-White-Anglo-Saxon-Protestants. Much of the Americas national and international policies are initiated, designed, planned, and carried out by the members of this group.

The members of the middle class, on the other hand, serve the interests of the power elite by providing valuable information for the decisions that have to be made by the power elite. They yield up for the power elite.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

At the bottom of the hierarchy found the mass who expect the government to take care of their accustomed daily life activities. Politics for this group of people is something extra.

Mills summed up, power in American society is monopolized by the big businessmen, federal leaders, and military leaders; and the rest of the population has a secondary, irrelevant role in the decision making process.

### Concluding Remarks

- Elite theory tries to answer the question “Who is selected for a particular position in a society and how?” The theory proposed an answer to the question by investigating the socio-economic backgrounds of the rulers. According to the elitist theory the elites are usually drawn from the upper class of a given society in terms of their ethnic, educational, income, etc. backgrounds.
- Elite theory assumes that the relationship between the governor and the governed is manipulative and therefore depends not on pure force but in understanding of mass psychology. The theory assumes that the mass is responsive to symbols, sentiments, and ideologies. And these symbols and ideologies could serve to create an emotional tie or smooth relationship between the mass and the elite.
- Elite theory has a low view of the mass. It underestimates the human nature. According to the elitist theorist, the crowd is useless unless there is a head. It can be driven or manipulated by leaders easily.

### Pluralist Theory

The strongest opposition to the elitist theory of politics comes from the Pluralist School of Thought. The theory has developed, just like, Mills’ institutional theory of power, from the analyses of the American politics, but the conclusions are very different.

According to the pluralist model, power instead of being concentrated in the hands of a group or class, is treated as diffused among many interest groups competing against each other’s for the full possession of it. It doesn’t accept the existence of a single superior group, an elite group that monopolizes power in the society. In stead there are many functional social units that compete against each other’s. Therefore, no one group is strong enough to monopolize power.

According to the pluralists, government policies are compromise between the various interests groups within a society: business groups, religious groups, trade unions, ethnic groups, etc. A policy is an outcome of the participation of all these groups; and the government’s role is like a broker, a balancing agent among the competing interest groups and making sure that the various groups with their sectoral interests fit in to the rules of the game. The pluralists see power as politically fragmented or diffused among the different sectors of a society. Competition among the several groups prevents any group from monopolizing power and then becoming a dictator.



# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

Pluralists assume that politics works in what they call check and balance technique. (For example, in the United States, when the Democrats become or start to monopolize power the mass vote for the Republicans and vice-versa. So long as there is an open system election, peoples' ideas and interests are represented in the decisions made in a society).

A leading pluralist thinker in American Political Sociology, Robert Dahl suggested that policy decisions are outcomes of different and competing group interests. In his book "Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American Society" (1961), he argued that, there are plural interests and in response to the question "Who governs?" he answers "it depends on the issue". In one issue, one group may become decisively influential, while in another other groups. This pluralist system, for Dahl, is essentially democratic because individuals can influence decision making through popular participation. He described such a system as polyarchy-the rule of the leaders of several groups who have reached a stable understanding with each other or the rule of many in which the state and its political structures provide an arena or environment so that interests can bargain and compete over policy proposals.

## Elitism and Pluralism: A Comparison

	<b>Elitist theory</b>	<b>Pluralist theory</b>
<u>Society</u>	Society is dominated and led by organized minorities (the elite). The rest of the society is an unarticulated mass.	Society is an interaction network of individuals and groups reflecting diversity of interests and values in which no group is dominant.
<u>State</u>	State is an organ manipulated by organized minority who run it for its own interests.	State is one of the many political institutions regarded as democratic because it represents the interests of many interest groups.
<u>Social Order and Change</u>	This school of thought is afraid of social change; whenever social change occurs, it comes for the above; circulation of elites.	Change is regarded as a gradual process based on conflict between competing groups. The emphasis is on stability.
<u>Inequality and Stratification</u>	It is assumed to be inherent, inevitable and necessary between the elite and the mass.	It is present in a society, but the influence and the benefits are widely distributed.
<u>Politics</u>	It is the means by which the elites govern and manipulate the mass	It is a mechanism of mediating the various and conflicting interests.
<u>Political Participation</u>	It is mechanism through which the silent majority is manipulated by the elite minority.	It is mechanism through which special interest groups influence decision making process.
<u>Power</u>	It is centralized in the hands of those who occupy the highest positions.	It is diffused and distributed among the many groups.

## The Functionalist Theory<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Reading: J. V. Zanden, *The Social Experience: An Introduction to Sociology*: 1990; pp 472-73.

# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

Functionalists contend that there is a good reason why the state arose and why today it has assumed a dominant position in contemporary life. They say that society must maintain order and provide the common good.

Functionalists cited four major or primary functions of the state:

✓ Enforcement of Norms

Where people lack formal political institutions, they enforce their folkways and morés through the spontaneous and collective action of community members. In modern complex societies, however, characterized by a preponderance of secondary relationships, a special body or organization is required to assure law and order-the state.

✓ Planning and Direction

Rapid social change dictates that people can no longer rely on the gradual, more or less spontaneous evolution of folkways and morés to provide the guidelines for their daily lives. New norms become indispensable. In addition, the complexity and scope of many activities generate and require a specialized mechanism of coordination and integration. These and many other activities dictate central direction. These tasks should be performed by individuals or by group of individuals; and these individuals must have the power and authority to implement their plans.

✓ Arbitration of Conflicting Interests

Because such resources as privileges, prestige and power are scarce and divisible, people find themselves in conflict over them. The entire social fabric would be imperiled in conflict among different social strata, races, religions and special interest groups were to become deep and intense. Some agency must be capable of containing conflict within tolerable limits and that agency is the state.

✓ Protection Against Other Societies

If a society is to maximize its position against adversaries and to provide protection against the aggression of other groups for its people, it needs a state to centralize control and mobilize the population.

## **The Conflict Theory<sup>45</sup>**

The conflict perspective contends that the state is a vehicle by which one or more groups impose their values and structures of inequality on other groups. The state has its origin in the desire of ruling elites to give permanence to social arrangements that benefit themselves.

### **Structuralism and Conflict Theory: A Comparison:**

	<b>Functionalist Theory</b>	<b>Conflict Theory</b>
<u>Society</u>	It is a social system with shared values, needs and goals.	It is an arena of competing and conflicting interests.
<u>State</u>	It is a sub-system contributing to the	It is an instrument of coercion by

---

<sup>45</sup> Reading: J. V. Zanden, *The Social Experience: An Introduction to Sociology*: 1990; pp.473-75.

# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

<u>Social Order and Change</u>	maintenance, integration and goal attainment of a society. An emphasis is on integration, order and stability. Change is viewed as a social system adapting to its environment.	the ruling class in order to induce compliance. Society is in a constant state change and conflict, conflict, not consensus, is the dynamic force in society.
<u>Inequality and Stratification</u>	It serves as an integrative system maintaining stability and social order.	It hinders integration and is the chief source of conflict. It arises out of the unequal distribution of resources.
<u>Politics</u>	It is a mechanism for achievement of collective goals and plays a mediating role in the resolution of conflicts.	It helps one group to get what it wants at the expense of others.
<u>Political Participation</u>	It is a means through which citizens and special interest groups show their support to the polity. In an exchange for citizen participation and support the polity offers responsible leadership and fulfills broad societal demands to the people.	It is assumed that those who benefit the most tend to participate mostly. Polity is not equally responsive to the demands of all citizens and groups.
<u>Power</u>	It is a legitimate medium of exchange and mobilization of resources in the polity for the attainment of collective goals.	It is an illegitimate and self-serving mechanism for the benefit of few dominant groups at the expense of the powerless.

## Weber's Theory of Legitimate Domination<sup>46</sup>

Domination is defined by Weber as the probability that specific commands or all commands will be obeyed by a given group of persons.

He had tried to provide an answer to the question “Why people obey authorities?” He was particularly interested in the motives that underlie peoples’ choice to obey orders and authorities. These motives, for Weber range from habits (customs) or affective ties to rational calculation of advantages. They also show that the relationship between the ruled and the ruler is reciprocal.

Weber identified three ideal-types of legitimate domination: the Traditional Authority, the Charismatic Authority, and the Rational Legal Authority.

### 1. Traditional Authority:

This authority is obeyed based on the belief that that has been the way things have been done do far. People obey such an authority because it has existed for long period of time being transferred from one generation to the next. It is usually based on the ascriptive characteristics of the rulers-those people who rule inherit their power or the will to command through customary ways.

### 2. Charismatic Authority:

---

<sup>46</sup> Read on the following topics and personalities as their ideas are not included in the hand out: For Coercion theory refer to the ideas of T. Hobbes and J Locke and Marxist theory as a theory of political process.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

This authority is obeyed mainly because of affectional tie between the ruler and the ruled. The leaders may possess some exceptional, extra-ordinary and exemplary qualities (that could be real or imaginary) that the followers admire. Charismatic rulers govern the society, group or community because of their charisma and personal devotion. However, such an authority is fluid and ill-defined, no hierarchy of power exists, and there are no rules and laws to govern relationships. Charismatic authority is usually unstable because there are no rules in arranging smooth transfer of power.

### 3. **Rational Legal Authority:**

It is a system of authority, which is based on rational calculation of advantages; i.e., it is based on rationally produced laws, norms and leaders are appointed or elected by through legal procedures. Here people obey the laws, not the individuals implementing them. Weber says that this form of authority produces a particular type of organizational structure known as the bureaucracy<sup>47</sup>.

---

<sup>47</sup> The term the bureaucracy is misused in our daily life language; it is used as almost synonymous with re-tape, excessive use formalities, rules and regulations. However, bureaucracy is something, which in fact a modern society should use to organize work and the modern society can't effectively perform without it. It is the only efficient way to coordinate, organize and run organizations. It can also be defined as a hierarchical organization designed rationally to coordinate the work of many individuals in the pursuit of large scale administrative tasks and organizational goals.

## Sociology of Law

As sociology is the scientific and systematic study of social phenomenon, and as law is a crucial element of this social phenomenon, sociology, by extension, studies law. Sociology of law is the study of legal institutions of the society in light of sociological concepts, theories, and approaches. It can also be defined as the study of social control norms, which constitute the law as its important aspect, whose analyses is a long standing tradition of sociologists.

In the modern world, limited to our knowledge of societies, no one can find a society without some regressive principles, laws, norms and rules that govern the behavior of individual members. These principles, laws, and rules could either be written or oral, implicit or explicit; some form of law is inherent to all known cultures, whether they are simple or complex, industrialized or agrarian.

The search for the definition of the concept the law has lead to the development of different traditions. The first tradition defined the law as being naturally laid down by God above the rulers: the absolute laws. This approach to the law is the classical religious or theological approach.

The second approach, which excludes the law in primitive societies (societies without formal legal institutions because it maintains that the law is formulated by the legislators), is the legal secular tradition. The tradition defines the law as those norms issued from recognized legal institutions.

Roscoe Pound defined the law, emphasizing its existence in all societies, as a social control through the systematic application of the forces of a politically organized society. The law serves as a mechanism of social control that a society maintains conformity to the norms. People could either be punished or rewarded for their behavior based on their conformity or violation of sanctioned norms.

On the other hand, law can sociologically be defined as a system of standardized norms regulating the human conduct, deliberately established for the purpose of social control. Law refers to the norms, rules and regulations that are chiefly selected from the morés of a given society. This indicates that not all morés are laws. Some morés are maintained by society as conventions.

## Evolution of the Law

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

Three stages of the law:

1. The Primitive Law: this is the law of the primitive societies before the emergence of the feudal system. It is based on primitive cultural customs that are characterized by the lack of formal legal institutions or organization. It is the law of the pre-literate societies to resolve daily problems of members.
2. The Archaic Law: this law is better advanced than the primitive law as it follows some sort of court system and there exists legal institutions, although they're archaic (simple). This law characterizes the period of the Ancient Europe, Middle Ages in Africa, and the Roman Empire.
3. The Mature Law: this stage characterizes the professionalization of the law and the emergence of the analytical jurisprudence or the science of the law. Here the law is handled not by religious persons or traditional shamans, but by specialized staff who handled and administers the law-the lawyers, the jurists, the prosecutor, the police, the correctional facility officers, etc.

### **Background to the Sociology of the Law**

The roots of the sociology of the law lay rather mainly in the jurisprudence than in sociology. Its base is the school of law than in sociology; however, it's not just an outcome of an autonomous work of the jurists.

The first jurist to be mentioned for his contribution to the origin and development of the sociology of the law is R. V. Jhering. He considered the society as an arena of competing interests and argued the function of the law is to mediate such competing interests.

The other jurist, R. Pound, argued the function of the law is social engineering and in order to achieve such objective he urged sociological studies to be made.

E. Ehrlich pointed out that, within the same tradition of Jhering and Pound, lawyers and jurists must be aware of the existing social conditions and practices in order to bring formal law into harmony with the norms and traditions of the society.

### **Charles Louis de Montesquieu (1689-1755)**

Montesquieu's chief work, on which his reputation is founded, is his *Spirit of the Law (De l'Esprit Lois, 1748)*. From the traditional viewpoint, the basic principles of the law could be rationally ascertained, and law was characteristically the thought in universal terms. The tendency of the philosophy of natural law was to minimize actual legal differences, treat them as accidental, and as not pertaining to the essence of the law.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

Montesquieu confines the concept of the natural law to the state of nature, “before the establishment of society”. Once mankind sets up a society and government, there are three kinds of laws: first, the law of nations, which applies to their mutual intercourse; second, political law, which applies to the relations between the government and the governed (*constitutional, public, and administrative law*); third civil law, which regulates the relations of citizens among themselves (*private law, such as the law of contracts*). He says that the law in general is the human reason inasmuch as it governs all, the inhabitants of the earth.

Montesquieu argues that laws should be relative to the climate of each country, to the quality of the soil, to its situation and extent, to the principal occupation of the natives, whether husbandmen, huntsmen, or shepherds; they should have a relation to the degree of liberty which the constitution will bear; to the religion of the inhabitants, to their inclinations, riches, numbers, commerce, manners and customs. In such a way he indicates how the law should be made.

In addition, laws are not arbitrary products of a rational thinking, but are compromises with the existing social factors, processes and traditions of the society. He, therefore, says it is ill advisable for a country to adopt and apply laws from other cultures.

### **Auguste Comte (1798-1857)**

He did not have a firsthand interest in the law; he identified the Law of Three Stages in the evolution of man and society: the theological, the metaphysical and the positive or scientific. He had also identified what kind of law exists in association with the different stages regulating the different social, economic, etc. institutions and relationships.

### **Herbert Spencer (1820-1903)**

Spencer proposed that legal institutions evolve as other institutions in the society; and Law is not merely a body of formal rules possessing objective validity but is an institution that the development of which is an inseparable part of the social process.

### **Karl Marx (1818-83)**

Marx considered the law as an ideology of the ruling class that conceals the existing class division and inequality in the society and exploitation of the labor class. The legal system of a nation promotes the interests of the dominant class; it's an instrument or weapon of domination of the capitalist class.

### **H. S. Maine**

Maine is an evolutionary theorist who had made a distinction between the static and the progressive societies. He argues that the evolution of law in society is from the status legal relationship to a contractual relationship. In primitive societies, law is based on status, whereas in modern societies it is based upon contractual agreements.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

In primitive societies, decisions are made by senior members of a family, a community or the society at large. At this level, the individual is not able or allowed to act on his behalf without notifying the family or the community. He is part and parcel of the community. Later on, people moved to the contractual relationship based on the agreement of individuals which can be terminated when it becomes unnecessary.

### **Emilé Durkheim (1858-1917)**

In his book *'The Division of Labor in the Society,'* he gave us an account of legal development or evolution. He argued that the development of the law is from repressive or punitive or penal to restitutive or cooperative law.

Durkheim discusses the law in relation to social integration. Division of labor is a basic feature of social organization, not only just an economic phenomenon, with significance for the nature of the social bond and for the autonomy of the individual and groups.

In his attempt to understand the modern society better by comparing it with an early stage of social evolution, he distinguished between two types of social solidarity, mechanical and organic, the latter representing a later stage of development. Durkheim suggested that each of these stages were associated with, and indicated by, a distinctive kind of law.

Mechanical solidarity is based on likeness and sense of common identity. People are bound together by the fact that they have been brought up to act and think alike, follow similar life routines, and share a common conscience. The main source of cohesion is symbolic experience. This solidarity is mechanical: the cohesion that unites the elements of an inanimate body. All members of a group are subject to strict social supervision; the individual is scarcely distinguished from the group to which he belongs. In the stage of mechanical solidarity, social control through the law is largely a matter of upholding the symbolic order. Group identity is reaffirmed when punishment is meted out to deviants who violate what is sacred to the group. To enforce and reassert the common conscience, the community resorts to punitive law and repressive sanctions, as the violation of norms threaten the very basis of the society.

Organic solidarity, on the other hand, is based on functional differentiation, analogous to a complex living body with specialized organs, each dependent on the others, and the whole dependent on the functional integration of the parts. Similarly, differentiation makes people and groups interdependent, and the outcome is organic solidarity.

With the development of organic solidarity based on the division of labor, another type of law becomes predominant. This is restitutive law, which is the law of cooperation. Its purpose is to restore social equilibrium by *'making a man whole'*; i.e., to compensate him for losses incurred when someone fails to discharge his lawful obligation. The classic branch of restitutive law is the law of contracts. In this law people deal with their interests through contractual agreements. Therefore, legal sanctions are mostly civil whose main purpose is deterrence.

### **Leonard T. Hobhouse**



## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

In his book *“The Material Culture and Social Culture in Simple People,”* Hobhouse claimed that there is a general trend to all societies to control their environment and develop political, judiciary, religious and other institutions. He systematically developed an evolutionary theory of law: from primitive redress or blood feud to civilized justice. Individuals in primitive redress take the law in their own hands; they rely on their own capacity to rectify the breach of social norms than on the court or justice system, where the guilty party gets a formal sanction or punishment.

### **Max Weber:**

Weber argues that the evolution of the law is from the formal and substantive irrational to rationality or logically coherent system of principles and rules. He vied that an early law is largely irrational and partial.

### **Sociology and the Law**

Contributions of sociologists to the development of the theory of law:

1. Sociologists independently of jurists have developed their own theories of the nature of the law.
2. Jurists have found the sociological approach very useful in making the law and legal analyses.
3. The sociological analyses of socio-legal institutions constitute the great bulk of materials to which jurists can use, particularly in the field of legislation.
4. Sociologists have advanced a theory of social change which may be of great help to jurist in determining the lag between the law and culture and in adjusting the law to the changing culture.

### **Major Area Concerns of the Sociology of the Law**

1. Sociology of law is primarily concerned with the way in which the formal norms of society (legal practices) and enforcing agents act towards each other and towards deviants and criminals.
2. Analyses of the social role of the criminal, lawyer, judge, etc and how they relate to the general structure of the society.
3. Sociology of law studies the laws governing the development of human society and the effects of legal provisions.
4. Sociology of law shares with political sociology a concern for the nature of legitimate authority and social control, the social basis of the constitution, the evolution of civil rights, and etc.

In general, the sociology of law studies the relationship between the legal institutions and law enforcement state machineries on the one hand, and other wide ranging social processes going on in the realm of the family, education, polity, religion, and economy, on the other.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

### **Rules of the Law and Rules of Conventional Morality**

Whether its character is modern or traditional, law shares some common elements with religion and morality. In many instances, the Holy Books are the major or primary sources of the law.

Although they are very much interrelated, there are differences between these issues: morality and the law. For example, in the case of the law, obedience is obligatory with different levels of punishment on its violation. But for morality obedience is not obligatory, but for personal and group satisfaction. In addition, legal principles are usually precisely codified, written, and formulated than conventional moral issues; and in violation a person faces formal legal punishment. But in violation of conventional morality the same person may face only the informal negative and unfavorable reactions from other group members.

The strong relationship between the law and morality could be illustrated by the belief that when laws express the moral attitudes and principles of a group, they will be obeyed and accepted by the citizens and effective legal enforcement is relatively trouble-free. On the other hand, when laws lack a firm moral basis and the support of the people, effective enforcement is less likely. Maintenance of legal regulations depends on the attitude of the people towards laws and a moral climate of a given country. That is why some argue 'when morés are adequate then laws are unnecessary; when morés are inadequate then laws are ineffective'.

There are arguments and counter-arguments on whether a society should maintain morality through legal sanctions. Some social scientists argue that controlling behavior, for example, sex and alcoholism, through legal actions is an invasion of privacy of individuals by the state. People should be given the ultimate right to decide on their behavior as things like sex are something natural and private. They contend that we should not equate sin with crime; sin is something different which could be attended by the church, but crime is something else.

Some other group of social scientists wants to argue morality should be enforced through legal sanctions. Their argument is that crimes involve victim or victims who affect the state: there is always a victim for every crime. Public morality is the cement of society and it must be maintained by legal sanctions to prevent social disintegration.

### **Natural Law and the Modern Law**

#### **The Natural Law**

The law derived from nature and binds society together in the absence or in addition to the positive law. It is a collection term referring to those norms that develop with the creation of man.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

For Plato, natural law is a law that governs the universe. The medieval Christian thinkers, St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas, argued that God imposes natural law and it was expounded by the head of the Catholic Church. Human beings are bounded by certain rules of conduct which binds them together; these rules are not established by themselves but have been given to them together with their human nature.

Different personalities in the Renaissance period have played a significant role in the development of the concept of natural law. They argued man possessed certain fundamental rights in the state of nature. People are endowed, by their very human nature, with the rights to live, to possess property, to pursue happiness and to enjoy liberty. These rights are natural to a human being, they are not privileges. We cannot exist as humans, without the natural rights.

The UN human rights declaration document, which was endorsed in 1948 was essentially a natural law document based on these natural rights: it has clearly stated the fundamental rights of people; it is strongly associated with democracy, liberty and freedom.

Human rights document, the first several articles deal with the basic human civil, political, cultural and economic rights, which are considered as inherent to our human nature.

Such natural law thinking was reinforced by a number of different developments:

- ✓ The incorporation of human rights into the written constitution of many countries.
- ✓ The rise of Nazism and Fascism dictatorships.
- ✓ The spread of Totalitarianism form of government in Asia and Africa.
- ✓ The emergence of Communist societies that deliberately refuse to all the norms of morality and culture.

### **Features of the Modern Law:**

- ✓ Modern legal norms are uniform and one doesn't find variation in their application.
- ✓ The legal system is hierarchical and bureaucratic that it has a regular chain of command.
- ✓ Professionals ran the law: priests, notable persons are replaced by trained agents, lawyers and jurists.
- ✓ The system is amendable: it can be changed or modified.
- ✓ The modern law is political; i.e., it is connected with the state which monopolizes the hold of the law.
- ✓ The legislative<sup>48</sup>, the judiciary<sup>49</sup> and the executive<sup>50</sup> functions are separate and distinct in modern law.

---

<sup>48</sup> The legislature is that organ of the government which initiate law in relation to the norms and values of the society.

<sup>49</sup> The judiciary interprets the law and imposes sanctions on those who transgress the laws set forth by the legislature.

<sup>50</sup> The executive is that section of the government concerned with the enforcement of the rules and sanctions laid by the judiciary.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

### **Functions of the Law:**

The major functions of the law include:

1. Maintaining and looking after the values that society feels to be right.
2. Social control: the law essentially enforces the rules of the right conduct as a primary means of social control. The law makes sure that wrong doers didn't go unpunished.
3. Settlement of disputes: conflict over advantages may arise in any society; and one of the basic functions of the law is to offer some means as to how people resolve conflict and settle disputes.
4. It serves as an instrument of social change.
5. The law directs and guides economic conduct in market economies by coordinating the activities of those parties confronting against each other's.

# SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

## **Economic Sociology**

Economic institutions determine and coordinate the process of production, distribution, exchange and consumption of goods and services in a society. They are usually the study area of economists. Yet, sociologists also study them, for economic institutions affect all other aspects of society and vice versa. There is a mutual interdependence between the economy and the socio-cultural aspects of society. Sociologists, therefore, can't ignore the study of economic institutions; and do that through their economic sociology subfield.

Economic sociology is the application of the general frame of reference, variables explanatory models of sociology to those complex activities concerned with production, distribution, exchange and consumption of goods and services.

## **Subject Matter of Economic Sociology**

1. It focuses on the economic activities and how they are structured into organizations, how they are organized according to statuses, values and norms that usually regulate economic activities (contract laws) and sanctions (rewards and punishments).
2. It focuses on the relationship between sociological variables as they manifest themselves in economic and non-economic contexts. This relationship can be viewed from two aspects: intra-unit and inter-unit focus. In the intra-unit focus, sociologists take a given concrete economic unit, for example a factory, and they study power and authority relations, groups that exist in the unit, employee-employer relationships, employee-employee relationships, etc. The broader, inter-unit focus, studies relationships between economic units and their social environment: factors at societal level as they affect economic process, labor management, public policy, etc.
3. It studies the distinctive sociological aspects of the central economic variables (money, saving and investment).

## **Economic Sociology and Economics**

Economics and economic sociology study the same complex economic activities. But there are differences between these fields of study as each field operates with different class of dependent and independent variables and explanatory models. For instance, economics deals with purely economic variables: relations of price and supply, supply and demand, monetary flow, cost-benefit analyses, input-output ratio, savings and investment, labor, capital, commodities, etc. Sociology, on the other hand, deals with both formal and informal organizations; with the roles, statuses, values and norms that exist in the economic institutions; with strains that result from economic shortage or poverty, crime, alcoholism, suicide, mental disorder as manifestations to economic poverty.

In addition to these sociologists study a number of social factors that influence economic institutions: the contribution of education to the productivity of labor, the impact of incentives in production, employer-employee relationships on production, the impact of values and preferences on price of goods, etc. In other words, they study enterprises as social organizations, not just as

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

economic ones. In addition to the economic benefit analyses, social benefits are emphasized that can't be calculated in terms of money.

Another difference between economic sociology and economics is the methodology they employ in the investigation of the phenomenon under consideration, in this case the economic process. Sociologists use comparative method (Weber's study of *the Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* is a typical example), whereas economists depend more on mathematical and statistical methods and models. In addition, the survey method is widely used in economics to collect facts about households and firms, assets and plan of expenditure. In sociology, however, the survey method is widely used, but they are conducted to assess attitudes and opinions towards economic issues; towards expenditure, investment, etc.

### **Background to the Economic Sociology**

#### **Herbert Spencer**

For Spencer the evolution of the society is from militant to industrial and to ethical (perfect) form. In arguing this, he tried to describe the economic activities that characterize each of these forms of societies. He suggested that, cooperation in the production, distribution, exchange and consumption of goods and services is compulsory in militant society. Whereas, in industrial society, cooperation is voluntary and it is regulated by the means of the market forces.

In industrial societies, economic activities flourish independent of the direct control of the government based on competition and market based economy. He was an advocator of the laissez faire economic policy – where unrestrained free-trade and competition would promote economic development and stability. He believed a government should promote competition and free-trade economy; it should not control or regulate economic activities. The government should leave the business sector to individuals and should not involve in the economic activities.

He defined the state, accordingly, as a limited company formed by individuals to protect their mutual liberty. The proper duty of the government is to maintain equal justice and protect order. This is the opposite of a command (centralized) economy where the government makes every decision about the production, distribution, exchange and consumption of goods and services.

#### **Emile Durkheim**

In The Division of Labor in the Society, Durkheim talked about the different forms of specialization of social functions and he argued that division of labor is intrinsically connected with the type of social order or social solidarity. Societies characterized by mechanical solidarity, there we find division of labor based on sex, age and other natural characteristics. He pointed out that, cooperation in such society is compulsory that people should cooperate whether they like it or not. In complex societies, where division of labor is based on specialized role structure, there is freedom from any domination. Cooperation is voluntary and such societies are integrated by organic solidarity. He says that the state of anomy occurs when the division of labor fails.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

### Max Weber

In his book Capital, Karl Marx had contributed a great deal to economics and economic sociology. According to him, whatever its stage of development, any society is based on its economic foundation. He believed in economic determinism: everything is a manifestation of the economy. The economic structure of the society influences (or to a greater extent shapes) the other aspect of the society. Changes in the economic system will be mirrored by changes in the legal and idea system and other aspects of the society.

For many, the works of Weber were thought to be oppositions to the works and ideas of Marx. Others think that the ideas of Weber are extensions of the ideas of Marx. And still others allege much of the works of Weber were an attempt to clarify and modify the ideas and works of Marx. Despite all this, the famous philosopher Leo Strauss once wrote, “Whatever may have been errors, Max Weber was the greatest social scientist of the century”.

In contrast to the proposition of Marx, Weber argues that ideology can play a key role in influencing and changing the economy of a society. Unlike Marx, did not see the idea system of religion as opium of a society.

Weber’s analysis contrasts Marx’s: Marx considers religion to be a dependant variable and the economy an independent variable, whereas Weber argues that religion could be an independent variable that could cause changes in other social structures, including the economy.

#### *Weber: the Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*

In one of his major works in sociology, Max Weber tried to trace the impact of protestant religion on the spirit of capitalism. He says the major explanatory variable for the emergence of capitalism in the West was the set of religious ideas created by the religious revolutions of the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

As he was a pragmatic sociologist, he conducted a study in societies with mixed religious systems in order to provide evidence for his contention that religious ideas and values could influence the economy. He alleges that he found out those who are technical and commercial owners, and the leaders of the economic system are overwhelmingly Protestants. Their religion was the main motivational factor for these people to choose those occupations, but other religious systems fail to produce ideas systems that encourage people to those occupations.

He discussed the spirit of capitalism in relation to Calvinism. Calvinism is idea system that only a small number of people are chosen salivation, and in addition, it alleges that people are predetermined to be among the saved or the damned. This idea of predestination leaves people in the state of uncertainty. To reduce the anxiety of living the state of uncertainty, Calvinists developed some signs of salivation-economic success. Such a religious attitude, therefore, advocated and encouraged hard working, accumulation of capital (saving), and investment as virtues of a moral man. In such way, Calvinism had contributed for the emergence and development of capitalism.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

He then, came up with certain values that are associated with protestant religion and that are so important to capitalistic economic development:

### *1. Acquisition Rationality*

Calvinists are supposed to avoid worldly pleasure, be thrifty, and despise waste; they couldn't use wealth in traditional ways. They could use their capital to expand, their business activities. In general, Calvinism advocated the accumulation of capital, saving and investment rather than conspicuous consumption and extravagancy.

### *2. Financial Rationality*

Calvinists are not expected to save what they have acquired, but they are also expected to invest in much industrious ventures for further economic prosperity and for increased interest.

### *3. Work Rationality*

Calvinists believed that work is intrinsically good and at that time is acquired a religious importance or significance. The Greeks, for example, despised work, but Calvinists regarded work as a personal calling or mission. Calvinists advocated hard working, diligence; and these and other values of the protestant religion have helped the transformation of North Europe from Feudal-Agrarian to Industrial-Capitalist society.

### *4. Individualism and Competition*

Calvinists believed that man is alone before his maker, that he should not trust the friendship of man that only God should be his confidant. Each individual could seek success as the sign of grace, and this striving was consistent with economic competition.

According to Max Weber, Protestant religion did not hold ground in all Europe. He mentioned of Italy and Spain as lagging behind in economic development as they were predominantly Catholic. He argued that, Protestantism provided a good ground for capitalistic economic development. For him, on the other hand, the great classical oriental religions, did not offer supportive cultural framework for the rational pursuit of economic games.

## **Work**

Sociologist and other scholars in other fields of study have been interested in the question "Why people work?" They identified self-interest (in its broadest sense includes the interest of the family and friends), as a major motivation to work in all societies. In addition, work is a major social mechanism for placing people in the larger social structure and for providing them with identities. People work to gain a contributing and rewarding position in the society. Other diverse factors identified include: a sense of duty, to escape from boredom, to derive a sense of accomplishment, a desire for approval, a wish to conform to customs and traditions, a feeling of emulation, a pleasure in craftsmanship, etc.



### **Alienation at Work**

Alienation is a Latin word that has diverse meanings depending on the area of application:

- A legal definition: it refers to the transfer or sell of goods or rights.
- A psychological definition: it refers to the state of insanity.
- A sociological definition: it refers to the dissolution of the link between the individual and the group.
- A religious definition: it refers to the dissolution of the link between the individual and God or gods.

All the pioneers in sociology are concerned with the changes in the workplace that come with the industrial revolution. Regarding the higher degree of division of labor that characterizes capitalism, Durkheim says 'as labor becomes more and more differentiated, individuals experience anomie'. In his analyses of organizations in capitalist system, Weber argues that one result of impersonal bureaucratic organizations is the creation of cold, calculating and uncaring individuals. He says alienation is common among employees of bureaucratic organizations (they feel hostility to the work they undertake).

Karl Marx offered the most penetrating analyses of alienation or the dehumanizing aspects of capitalism. The word alienation is used by Marx to describe the sense of disconnectedness that is supposed to be present among the workers in capitalist societies that results from feelings of powerlessness as a result of the division of labor. It also refers to a pervasive sense of powerlessness, normlessness, social isolation and self-estrangement.

The argument is that, what singles out man from other animals is that he has the capacity to control nature by creative activity. He can plan, design and execute. Therefore, for Marx, work is an expression of human intellect and human creative capacity. But in capitalist society, workers are alienated; and work is not an expression of human intellect for many reasons:

- a. Workers are concerned with survival; workers work to gain wages (for living), not for satisfaction. Under capitalist system, workers are forced to sell their ability to work to the employer as a market commodity. Therefore human creativity is turned in to a commodity bought in the cheapest of prices.
- b. Work is alienated because of the high degree of division of labor. Workers are forced to do monotonous, meaningless and repetitive tasks; only part of the large process.
- c. Workers are also powerless because they have no control over their occupational duties, the product of their labor and the distribution of profits. The products of labor is owned and sold by the capitalists.

## SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS I & II

---

Marx said that alienation reached at its worst form in industrialization process, because workers are tied with machinery. Marx pictures workers under capitalism as alienated from productive activity, the products of their own labor, their co-workers, and their own human potential. Man in capitalist society is not a total man; the capitalists mutilate him off his nature. Man in capitalist countries is a specialized man. And he says specialized activities assume the unused abilities and capabilities in work. Man is alienated, and this has a number of impacts on productivity, employee-employer relations and generally on the industrial relations.

He suggested a polytechnic training in which individuals will be free not to do the same job from morning to night.

### **Alienation and its Expressions: Marx**

In Marx view, factory technology, the increasing rate of division of labor, and capitalist property institutions brought about the estrangement of the industrial worker from his work. Highly mechanized systems replaced craft methods of production in which the artisan had been master of his tools and materials. In the new factories, the intelligence and skill previously expressed by the craftsmen were 'built into' the machines. Workers were left with routine and monotonous jobs. The machine system governed the pace of the work and restricted the employee's free movement. This loss of freedom, this subordination to the machine, turned the worker into a mere instrument and made him feel powerless.

The increasing division of labor within the factory made jobs similar and each employee's area of responsibilities diminished. The highly specialized operation might be very efficient, but it separated the worker from the total process. The fragmented relation of the individual to his work robbed him of a sense of purpose. This meaninglessness is another aspect of alienation.

According to Marx, the property relations of capitalist society alienated the employee. The factory belongs to the entrepreneur who has the power to hire labor, sell the products of the enterprise on the market and take the profit for himself. The worker does not own what he produces. He has nothing to sell but his power. Thus, the property institutions of capitalism produce a third form of alienation, the employee's sense of isolation from the system of organized production and its goals.

### **Durkheim and Anomie**

Marx viewed alienation as the outcome of social forces that emanate in capitalist arrangements, and separate human beings from meaningful, creative and self-realizing work. In contrast, Durkheim depicted alienation as arising from the breakdown of the cohesive ties that bind individuals to a society. For Durkheim, the central question was whether or not people are immersed in a structure of group experiences and memberships that provide a meaningful and valued context for their behavior. Otherwise, people may experience anomie.