Remarks:

- You need to work on flow of the answer, i.e. order.
- Avoid abrupt change of course.
Karl Marx argues that capitalism represents highest form of alienation. Alienation is a condition in which objects of human creation appear as aliens to him.

Productive power represents ability of humans to express their creativity and show their humanity. Work is an end in itself, but when work becomes a means to an end; men is no longer able to express his humanity and creativity. Process of production becomes a meaningless and purposeless activity. Then he loses his subjective character and performs his work mechanically. Dead labour (Capital) replaces live labour.
This loss of subjectivity takes place in 3 ways:

1) Alienation of Output of Production

In capitalistic system, object of labour's creation does not belong to him but rather to capitalist. So, labour is alienated from object of his creation.

2) Alienation of Act of Production

It is the capitalist who decides what to produce, how to produce not the worker. He believes impersonal forces of demand and supply influence the production and these are outside his control. So, worker gets alienated from the act of production.

3) Alienation from Humanity

An object is representation of worker's humanity. The more he produces, the more his humanity gets objectified. Objectification of labour. He gets alienated from humanity.
This way, capitalism robs workers of their subjective character and he is reduced to an animal existence.

C. Marx argues that alienation is reflected in five dimensions:

- **Alienation**
- Meaninglessness
- Amonie
- Ineffectiveness
- Self-Estrangement

In capitalism, these factors grow and cause loss of subjective character of workers.

Thus, capitalism robs workers of their subjective character.
Marxism became influential in 1970s, but after fall of communism in Eastern Europe and then in USSR, Marxism declined in popularity.

It is argued that Marxism has lost its relevance in 21st century. One reason is that many of the assumptions that Marx made regarding future of capitalism have not materialised. Marx argued that polarisation will take place between bourgeoisie and proletariat. But against this, middle class has expanded.

He argued that homogenisation of workers will take place but there has been increasing differentiation within workers; there are differences of status between skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers.
Marxism sees an increase in the relative deprivation of workers and sees them developing as a class for itself, but this has not taken place in capitalist countries.

Marxism as an ideology of protest has declined too.

However, there are other developments too which prove the other side. John Cassidy argues that Marxism is as relevant as ever today. Marx argued that with rise of capitalism, bourgeoisie will expand their markets to new locations in pursuit of unprecedented profits. Globalisation is a proof of this trend.

Marx said that capitalism is inherently unstable and will witness booms and slumps. Global financial crisis of 2008 is a testimony to this.
Capitalism has led to increasing inequalities. Oxfam Report: ‘An economy for the 99%’ says that the 1% people of world own as much as rest 99%. Even in developed countries, inequality is growing.

Today, some of the MNCs are richer than some countries. Thus, concentration of wealth is taking place as suggested by Marxism.

Thus, there are some trends which support Marxism although many of the things regarding class and class struggle have been disproved by history.
Karl Marx sees contradictions in the social structure as the cause for social change. He argues that the forces of production (FOP) change, they bring about a change in relations of production (ROP). When a conflict occurs between FOP and ROP, this becomes the source of change in the society. His view of change is termed as dialectical materialism. It emphasizes on material factors (economic factors) as the basis for change. The contradictions between FOP and ROP are resolved by the social change.

In feudal society, capitalism started emerging, and for its development, it required wage-labour kind of relations of production as against feudal lord-vassal kind of relationship. Thus, there emerged a conflict of contradictions between new force of
production (Industrial Capitalism) and old Rop (hard - vassal).

When the capitalist class turned from a class - in - itself to a class - for itself; it brought down the old feudal system and led to capitalist society.

Thus, changes in Rop have brought about changes in social structure throughout the history:

- Primitive Communism
- Ancient Society
- Feudal Society
- Capitalist Society
- Socialism
- Communism
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Maxx argues that "communism" will be the end of history as no contradictions will be left in society.

Q5)

"Capitalism" is characterised by unprecedented pursuit of wealth.

Karl Maxx sees "capitalism" as an oppressive system. In this, one class (bourgeoisie) gains at the expense of other class (proletariat).

The proletariat has no control over the output of production or the act of production. Everything is decided by the capitalist.

He argues that capitalism is inherently unstable. He says that as capitalism grows, the homogenisation of workers will take place as machines will do major
Job and workers would need to operate machines only.

He also argues that growth of capitalism will lead to pauperisation (progressive impoverishment) and immiseration of classes.

He sees capitalism as contributing to polarisation of classes and then worker class turning from class-in-itself to a class-for-itself to bring an end to capitalism.

As against above view of capitalism by Marx, Weber sees capitalism as a reflection of rationality.

Factory system of production is a rational system as it involves greater efficiency, predictability, calculability and control.
He does not see polarisation of classes taking place in capitalism, rather a proliferation of classes. Weber talked about 4 classes in industrial society as against Marx's two class model.

1) Propertied Upper class
2) White collar Middle class
3) Petty Bourgeoisie
4) Manual Workers.

Weber argues against homogenisation of classes proposed by Marx, rather he sees increasing differentiation among classes. Like workers will be further differentiated into skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled.

He sees middle class expanding in capitalism as against Marx's view of middle class merging into proletariat.

While Marx sees capitalism as contributing to worker's alienation, Weber sees class of substantive rationality (as reflected in values of
justification, equality, happiness) as the cause for alienation.

Thus, above points reflect the differences of views between Marx and Weber's capitalism.

(Q3.1) Religion is generally thought of as a special relationship between man and extra-mundane entity generally called God.

Above common sensical view of God was completely revamped by Emile Durkheim's work on religion.

Prior to Durkheim, E. B. Tylor viewed religion as 'belief in supernatural beings'. Max Haurlele saw religion in worship of forces of nature which he termed 'Naturism'. Durkheim completely demystified
Religion. His definition of religion shows this. He says-
"Religion is the set of beliefs and ideas with respect to sacred i.e. things that are set apart and forbidden."

Thus, he views religion in terms of dichotomy between sacred and profane. Since this sacredness is imposed by society, religion as per Durkheim represents "worship of society."

In worshipping the Totem, the Austra tribes were worshipping the society only; this is because they depended on society for all their needs.

He argues that with industrialization, religion will decline and it will be replaced by some other factor such as nationalism. Because essence of religion is providing...
solidarity to society. In future, this function will be performed by some other ideology that brings cohesion and unity.

Durkheim's Religion Types

Traditional Religion
Modern Religion
Religion (Nativism)

Above view thus proves that God is not necessary for existence of religion. Besides, we have known of religions that do not believe in the idea of a personal God such as Jainism and Buddhism.

Therefore, although majority of religions are based on the idea of God; it can be argued basis above arguments that Existence of God is not necessary for existence of religion.
Durkheim provided functionalist view of religion i.e he studied religion in terms of the contributions of religion towards maintenance and survival of society.

He argued that religion is a source of solidarity. It  strengthens the value consensus in society and reinforces the conscience collectif.

This is an integrative and harmonious view of society.

Above view cannot explain communalism in India. This is one of the criticisms directed against Antheimian theory of religion.

Communalism is the feeling of antagonism between members of
different faiths, it represents conflict and opposition, something that is not explained by a functionalist theory that focuses on stability and harmony.

Durkheim's theory would only explain solidarity among members of one religion but not their opposition to members of other faiths.

Thus, Durkheim's theory is singularistic and not applicable to mono-religious societies and not to multi-religious societies. Here, Merton's theory can be helpful in explaining communism in India. Merton corrected the functionalist view by proposing the concept of dysfunction. He argues that religion is a source of unity in a mono-religious society but source of conflict in multi-religious society.
Q3(c) Emile Durkheim gave the concept of Normal and Pathological social phenomena.

A social fact is normal when

1. It is present in the average members of society.
2. And it is functional for the society, i.e., it contributes to survival and stability of society.

He distinguished between Normal and Pathological division of labour. He argued that high division of labour in modern industrial societies became pathological because it led to anomie and forced division of labour.

Though high division of labour should result in organic solidarity, but when division of labour was not as per merit in society, it led to forced division.
of labour. It becomes pathological.

He also suggested ways to turn it into normal division of labour through active government intervention.

Durkheim also talked about deviant behaviour. He argued that deviant behaviour is good for society as long as it is a normal social fact (i.e., present in small quantity) as it would reinforce the collective conscience of society.
Q8(a) 'Capitalism' is an unprecedented pursuit of accumulation of wealth. It is reflected in free market dynamics.

'Socialism' represents abolition of private property and state control over factors of production instead of individuals earning it.

Above two phenomena are contradictory. While capitalism emphasises on equality of opportunity, socialism emphasises on equality of outcomes.

Capitalism advocates free market economy, free trade and absence of state control or control - only to the extent of providing law and order in society.

Socialism, on the other hand, advocates government role in ensuring a just and egalitarian society.

However, though appearing contradictory,
the true are complementary and necessary for establishing a democratic society.

Democracy represents a form of Government in which there is rule of people either directly or indirectly through their elected representatives.

Democracy espouses principles such as equality of laws, participation of all in the democratic process.

In a society marked by poverty and illiteracy, above conditions cannot be fulfilled. People cannot participate effectively in the political process or make rational choices if they are illiterate.

In a society marked with high inequality, the equal application of laws does not take place, as argued by Marxists. State becomes a tool in the hands of capitalists.
even if they appear virtually apart.

This is one of the reasons for the rise of Naxalism - sheer inequality and absence of opportunities to people.

In this scenario, Government is required to play an active role in ensuring equality of opportunity to all. Indeed, today, there is a trend towards welfare states, i.e., states taking active measures to promote welfare of disadvantaged sections of society.

India, at the time of independence, chose a mixed state model, i.e., a mix of capitalism and socialism. Here, the state provides opportunities to weaker sections by providing requisite infrastructure and/or other affirmative actions.

At the same time, people are free to engage in setting businesses.
and generating profits.

Thus, socialism and capitalism though contradictory but are complementary for a democratic society.

Q8 (b)

Division of Labour (D&L)

Karl Marx

- perspective → Marxist
- studied division of labour from conflict perspective
- cause of D&L

Marx see D&L as an instrument to perpetuate ruling class ideology. It is an instrument using which capitalists are able to exploit the workers.

Emile Durkheim

- Durkheim studied D&L from a functionalist perspective.
- Durkheim sees D&L as a result of increase in material density (population density) and moral density (intensity of interaction).
Consequence of "DoL"

Marx sees "DoL" as resulting in alienation and thus alienation for the worker. He argues that in a capitalist society, "DoL" results in the fragmentation of work and that making people aware of the importance of the division of labor (DoL).

Durkheim sees development of "DoL" as a tool to ensure stability and harmony in society. When population increase exerts pressure on existing structure in the wake of limited resource availability.

Durkheim sees "DoL" as contributing to solidarity and harmony in society.

Marx sees "Communism" as the solution to bring an end to alienation rising from "DoL".
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| their work towards harmony development in society will make them adhere to God and end their alienation. |

| While Durkheim conducted a detailed work on God, Marx thought did not conduct a study into God. Durkheim saw an increase in God from low to high, saw as an evolution of society from simple to industrial societies. He saw this transition leading to organic solidarity. |

| But Marx saw God as an instrument of oppression and a reflection of ruling class ideology. |

(17/20)
Internal Contradictions

An phenomenon in which steps taken to pursue a particular goal lead to the opposite effect in the long run, thus undermining the very goal is called internal contradictions.

British rulers in India introduced modern secular scientific education to create a supply of cheap labour for the British administration. But, in the long run, this educated class led and contributed to the growth of nationalist sentiment. This is an example of internal contradictions.

Karl Marx talks about internal contradictions when he says that every society has seeds of its destruction in its womb. In a capitalist system, there are inherent contradictions which will lead to its demise. For instance, unprecedented
Pursuit of wealth will lead to consolidation of capitalists. More efficient capitalists will drive out the less efficient ones, leading to monopolist tendencies. This will undermine the very basis of capitalism, free market economy as there will be no competition in future.

Sorokin also talks about internal contradiction between spiritualism and materialism. He argues that the essence of a society keeps fluctuating between ideological and material, when society becomes too spiritual, production and distribution (i.e., materialistic aspects) are severely undermined, which necessitates a return to material aspects so that society can survive. This is yet
another example of internal contradiction.

(ii) Emile Durkheim belonged to the functional and positivist school of sociology. He emphasised on external factors as responsible for social behaviour. His perspective was based on social realism, i.e., he gives primacy to social reality over individual factors.

He does not consider meanings and motives as important to understand social reality. He studies social reality in its patterned form.

He argued that social facts should be treated as things, i.e., like material objects to be studied from outside.
In his study of suicide, he treats suicide as a social fact. He argues that individual factors are responsible only to the extent that they determine who would commit suicide and social facts would determine why they commit suicide (social determinism).

He was criticized for excessive social acquisitiveness. Douglas (an interpretative sociologist) questioned the validity of his findings and criticized him for neglecting meanings attached to acts of suicide by the actors.

Similarly, his study on religion was criticized for neglecting its impact on the individual and overly emphasizing on its significance to society only. This is one of the reasons he is not able to account for religious revivalism taking place today.
Thus, Durkheimian approach, though contributing a lot to positivist and functionalist tradition, proved partial and incomplete.

On the other hand, Weber argued that only positivist method would not be sufficient for study of social phenomenon. He regards sociology as interpretative study of social action.

He argues that it is important to study the meanings and motives behind the social acts. He gave the concept of *Verstehen*, which means empathetic understanding with the social actor whose behaviour one wants to study. By imaginatively placing oneself in the position of social actor, one should understand the cause of course and consequences of social behaviour.
His fundamental assumption is—

"People are cultural beings who have the capacity and the will to understand the social world and assign it meanings."

Thus, he emphasizes cultural norms (external factors' influence) as well as individual factors' importance.

In a microscopic study, focus should be on individual meanings and in a macroscopic study, focus should be on shared meanings.

This way, Weber's approach is superior to that of Durkheim and hence more fruitful to development of sociology as science.
Throughout his life, Max Weber was a constant commentator and critic of Karl Marx. It can be seen from below explanations:

Max studied the relationship between religion and capitalism. He argued that economic forces formed the base or infrastructure and shaped the superstructure (political, religious, legal aspects).

Max Weber accepted that economic factors influenced religion but argued that at times, religion can become a cause for change in the economic sphere.

Through his study, "Protestant Ethics and Spirit of Capitalism," he argued that Calvinist protestant ethics was an important factor in the growth of modern industrial capitalism in Western religions.
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Europe.

Secondly, Karl Marx extensively studied Capitalism. He saw Capitalism as an embodiment of exploitation and oppression. He argued that the growth of Capitalism would cause increase in alienation among workers.

Weber, studied and commented on Capitalism as proposed by Marx. Weber proposed "Capitalism" as rationalisation of society. He also argued that it was not the increase in rationality that caused alienation but the loss of substantive rationality that caused alienation.

Thirdly, Marx studied class and class conflict. He argued that history of mankind was a history of class struggle.

Weber argued that class emerged in modern capitalist economy. Prior to that, there were only status.
differences. He defined class as a group of people having similar market situation.

While Marx talked about homogenisation and polarisation of classes, Weber talked about increasing differentiation and proletification of classes.

Thus, from above analysis, it can be argued that Weber constantly studied, commented, and criticised on Marx's works. It establishes that throughout life, Weber talked to the ghost of Marx.
Karl Marx in his book *Capital* talks about two types of division of labour (Dol):

- Social Dol
- Economic Dol (in production process)

Social Dol — Karl Marx said that social Dol is the Dol that results from differences in resources, skills, and capabilities. This is a natural phenomenon and is found in societies across the world. For eg: Some produce food, some make artifacts, and so on. It gives rise to trade.

He argues that social Dol got monetised in capitalist society.
Economic code → Marx talks about the code that is found in a factory system of production. This is imposed upon the proletariat by the bourgeoisie. The latter has no control over the object of his production or the act of production.

Economic code results in fragmentation of code; it robs the production of any meaning and gives rise to alienation. The worker gets alienated from the object of his production and from the act of production, and also from humanity.

Marx argued that this alienating division of labour would come to an end in a communist society, and will lead man to live a wholesome and meaningful life.