BSOC-103 : Introduction to Sociology-II

Guess Paper-I

Q. What is the Scope of Religion Evolutionary Perspective?

Ans. Religion as a social force exerted influence in both the preliterate and literate societies. Its teachings and modes of worship got wide spread source of the early ways of remembering them consisted of hymns and poetic expressions that could be sung, at times in groups. These made religious performances attractive. A few story tellers could produce some dramatic effects in and through the Hari Katha. The devotional compositions of Nanak and Kabir were used to good effect. The ancient period had its Shruti and Smriti tradition. Life was nearer nature. Nature and its elemental forces become subject matter of these compositions, the Greeks and the Indian Thinkers even conferred divinity on nature. Groups of people began to identify themselves with the Sun, the Moon, and Fire as the Kshattriya lineages identified their ancestry. Among thetribals there were references to animals, like the Crow, the Eagle, the Kangaroo; in India, people used totemic connections with the Snake (Nag). Lion (Singh), deer (Hiran) etc. The totem represented the clan, or embodied its spirit. Water, air, earth, and fire were raised to that status, as also places like river, hills and mountains. So we have a Kailash Parvat, the sacred Ganga, and lakes with pious connections. In praise of these places, numerous songs and stories have come about. The great epics of India are described in various forms as the story of the Rama or Krishna; with ideas of good and evil, of gentleness and cruelty, of saints and devils expressed dramatically. Books embodying the quintessence of devotion - and glory of God are composed in great literary styles. Almost everything worth knowing, preserving and being passed on from generation to generation seems to carry a religious flavor. Even discussions among the best of minds revolve round the true meaning and import of the text. Not surprising therefore, the first formal schools took the form of mission schools, madarsas, or ashrams seminaries, and the intellectuals dealing with various forms of knowledge and its application come from such centres. Remembered knowledge, written and later published texts come into vogue. In and through these institutions developed grammar of various languages styles of expression, methods of reasoning and elements of scientific pursuits. In a sense for the early man both pre literate and literate, things worth knowing about man and nature and the supernatural all combined into the broad sphere of religious enterprise, if one may use that phrase. In this sense also got described various social strata of society, the sense of public duties, and time place and persons got those associations. Religion was all pervasive, may the soul of society as Durkheim put it. Participation in collective activities generated a sense of group solidarity and a force different from unconnected actions.

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

Q. Describe economy and its relation with religion.

Ans. Two views on the inter-relationship of economy and religion can be examined (i) that a concern with material welfare and this worldly development leads to a lack of interest or concern with other worldly matters that religion seems to promote. In this sense religion becomes gradually irrelevant to economic prosperity, or may even hinder the process of growth. Examples are given of the Asian religions, Hinduism, Islam and Confucianism where contentment with what one has got is emphasized and blessings sought for either a better life in the next world or birth, or the day of judgement when the Almighty will seek a balance of deeds good or bad. Islam promotes the idea of making gifts of a proportion of income as zakat, forbids taking interest on loans, but allows profit sharing. These ideas have been taken to be not conducive to the growth of capital and its results. The Hindu view on the concern of better life in the next birth or the attainment of the moksha is considered to promote tolerance with existing set of circumstances not to try harder to earn more and lead a better material life in this world. On the other hand, a second view on eligion holds that (2) the spirit of religion can encourage a man to work hard consider work as worship, earn more money, working for greater. length of time, 'time is money' and go in for greater savings, money saved is money earned, and then makeuse of these savings for earning more 'money, that is converting it into capital'. Over a long period of time, material benefits, comforts and luxuries flow and the pleasures so defined are obtained in this world and this life itself. 'The heaven is brought to the earth' in this fashion. Among the Christians such an attitude is fully expressed in the Protestant sects, whereas the Catholics appears to be similar to other regions. In terms of paths to development, the protestants were found in the 19th century Germany itself to be going in more for studies in technologies and sciences, whereas the Catholics found greater satisfaction in humanities and arts. Such an examination of facts and reflection on the people's attitudes towards material success paved the way of Max Weber (1864-1920) writing his famous treatise on the Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism. He had dealt with the role of civilization in the shaping of human conduct which 'in western Europe and Western Europe alone' provided the basis of rational organization of life in all walks of which capitalism was a part. The time period he had in mind was the 19th Century, and the phenomenon he was trying to explain was the rise of capitalism. The facts of its early growth first in England, then in Holland and in Germany next in contrast to the late growth confirm his views seem to in other catholic countries like Spain, France, and Italy.

Q. Explain the thesis of Neo-functionalism.

Ans. A revival of interest in Parsons's work, first in Germany and then, the United States of America, led to the emergence of neo-functionalism. The basic aim has been to merge certain aspects of functionalism, those which have withstood the test of time, with other paradigms that have developed better critical perspectives.

Those associated with neo-functionalism in Germany are Niklas Luhmann and Jürgen Habermas, who initially collaborated on a theory of social engineering in modern society,

but later worked separately. Parsons placed emphasis on value consensus, also believing that because the social system penetrates the personality system, the options available to the individual for social relationships and behavior are limited. But that is, Luhmann thinks, not simply correct. He moves the individual out of the social system into the 'society' — what may be termed the 'societal environment' — which is far more complex and less restrictive. It accords people more freedom, especially freedom for carrying out 'irrational and immoral behaviour'. Abrahamson says that if Luhmann moved from Parsons, and then discovered the problems with the concept of value consensus, Habermas moved toward Parsons. Habermas's early writings were strongly critical of Parsons, but later, he accorded a place to cultural, social, and personality systems in his theory. His conceptualization of the relationship between these systems was quite consistent with Parsons's views. He also gave place to Parsons's concept of 'self-regulating system', which comes into existence when societies become complex as a consequence of which structural systems are separated from 'lifeworld', i.e., the inter-subjective realm for experiencing and communicating about culture, society, and personality.

The main spokespersons of neofunctionalism in America are Jeffrey Alexander and Paul Colomy. In one of their joint publications of 1985, they define neofunctionalism as 'a self-critical strand of functional theory that seeks to broaden functionalism's intellectual scope while retaining its theoretical core'. Under the rubric of 'neo-functionalism', they have made an effort to extend structural functionalism by overcoming its difficulties. Alexander and Colomy think that the deficiencies of structural functionalism are not irreversible. Its synthetic orientation can be recaptured. The concepts of conflict and subjective meaning can be introduced. One can regard the integration of the system and the interpenetration of its various subsystems as a 'tendency' to be investigated rather than as a 'given' or 'assumed' fact.

Q. What is Marxist structuralism?

Ans. Structural Marxism emphasizes Marx's concern with structures that are themselves not visible but which organize reality and account for visible facts. Cultures, like organisms, are structures and have the built-in capacity to reproduce themselves. Unlike the structuralists, structural Marxists do not believe that the structure reproduces itself when internal contradictions between structures or within a structure cannot be overcome. It is rather contended that in such an eventuality the structure evolves or is transformed.

It is generally accepted that the structural analysis in the Marxist thought has its root in the works of French Marxist philosopher, Louis Althusser. According to him, Marx eliminated the human subject from social theory and constructed a 'new science' of the levels of human practice (economic, political, ideological and scientific) which are inscribed in the structure of a social reality. Hence, the Marxist theory is not 'humanist' or 'historical' but is concerned essentially with the structural analysis of social totalities (e.g. mode of production, social formation); and the object of such analysis is to disclose the 'deep structure' which underlies and produces the directly observable phenomena of social life. Maurice Godelier arguing

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

against empiricism and functionalism in anthropology says that for Lévi-Strauss, as for Marx, "structures are not directly visible or observable realities, but levels of reality which exist beyond man's visible relations and whose functioning constitutes the deeper logic of a social system." The idea of a real structure behind appearances also influenced Marxist political economy where Marx's analysis of commodity in Capital is seen as an exemplary instance of structural analysis.

Q. Write a note on the Interpretive Approach.

Ans. Born in San Francisco (California) on 23 August 1926, Geertz served in the navy from 1943 to 1945, and then studied at Antioch College, where he majored in English, and then studied philosophy. After receiving the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1950, Geertz studied anthropology at Harvard, from where he obtained his doctorate in Human Relations in 1956. From the Massachusetts, he moved to Stanford (1958-9), the University of California (Berkeley), the University of Chicago (1960-70), and then to the Institute of Advanced Study, where he has been ever since, with joint appointments at Oxford University (1978-9) and Princeton University (1975). An author of twelve books, and the editor and co-editor of numerous others, Geertz has conducted his fieldwork in Java, Bali, Celebes, and Sumatra in Indonesia, as well as in Morocco. In May 2000, he was honored at a conference held at Sefrou in Morocco, a country where he had done his fieldwork. Geertz found this gesture highly gratifying, for he thought that 'anthropologists are not always welcomed back to the site of their field studies'.

Geertz is known for his interpretive approach (or what some call 'symbolic anthropology'), according to which the major task of anthropology is to 'make sense' of cultural systems. He has applied this approach for understanding various aspects of social reality (such as kinship, ideology, modes of livelihood, social change, distribution of power), but he is best known for his focus on the meaning of religious symbols and for his extensive ethnographic studies of religion in complex societies. Among his most significant publications that deal with religion are The Religion of Java (1960), Islam Observed (1968), The Interpretation of Cultures (1973), and Local Knowledge (1983). One of his oft-consulted essays on religion is 'Religion as a Cultural System', which was originally published in 1966 in a volume titled Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion that Michael Banton had edited and was later included in his collection of essays, The Interpretation of Cultures.

Criticism of Approaches: Geertz opens his essay 'Religion as a Cultural System' with an observation that the 'anthropological study of religion is in fact in a state of general stagnation'. To explain this, he makes a distinction between the anthropological works on religion that were done before and after the First World War and those that were done after the Second World War. He finds that the former made significant advancement, but the latter were rather sterile. No major theoretical advance has been made in the work produced after the Second World War, except for a repetitious rendering of the ideas of the founders of anthropology and certain empirical enrichments supporting or disputing those ideas. Secondly, this work has always looked at the writings of the scholars from sociology,

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

anthropology, and psychology, particularly the works of Durkheim, Max Weber, Sigmund Freud, and Bronislaw Malinowski. None of them has considered the writings from other disciplines like philosophy, history, law, literature, or the so-called 'harder sciences. In fact, the founders of both sociology and anthropology had closely read these disciplines for ideas and inspiration.

The path Geertz chooses is to develop the cultural dimension of religious analysis. He thinks that the concept of culture has suffered a great deal because of the multiple meanings it has been given. When it becomes a 'put-it-in-all' concept, an 'umbrella concept', that is everything that human beings have made and thought is 'cultural', its analytical power is weakened. Thus, there is an urgent need to arrive at a definition of culture which is unambiguous and does not have multiple referents. In his essay titled 'Thick Description: Towards an Interpretive Theory of Culture', he espouses a view of culture for which he is indebted to Weber. For Weber, man is an animal who gives meaning to his actions. Man has spun around him the 'webs of significance', in which he is caught, which give him meaning. Culture, for Geertz, refers to these 'webs of significance'. The of quoted definition of culture that he has offered reads as follows:

[Culture] denotes an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life.

Our job as anthropologists is to discover the meaning of actions of people in different societies. Our approach, Geertz says, is not to discover laws as experimental scientists do, but to 'interpret' human actions, to understand their meaning. In other words, the concept of culture for Geertz is 'essentially semiotic.'

Q. Examine Control Theory.

Ans. Sociologist Walter Reckless developed the control theory to explain how some people resist the pressure to become deviants. According to Control Theory, people have two control systems that work against their desire to deviate. Each person has a set of inner controls and outer controls.

- Inner Controls are internalized thought processes such as a sense of morality, conscience, or religious beliefs. People may also refrain from doing acts of deviance because they fear punishment or couldn't live with the guilt that would come from acting outside of society's norms. Inner controls represent a sort of internalized morality.
- Outer Controls consist of the people in our lives who encourage us not to stray. They could be family members, police officers, clergy, or teachers. Whoever they are, they influence us to conform to society's expectations. A person who is tempted to engage in a deviant act can resist the temptation by imagining how others would react to his or her behavior.

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

Sociologist Travis Hirschi elaborated on the control theory. He identified four elements that would render an individual more or less likely to commit deviance: attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief.

- **Attachment:** People who feel a strong attachment to other people, such as family or close friends, are less likely to be deviant. If people have weak relationships, they feel less need to conform to the other person's or group's norms. They are more likely to commit a deviant act.
- **Commitment:** Individuals who have a sincere commitment to legitimate goals are more likely to conform to society's norms. Those goals could be a legitimate job, higher education, financial stability, or a long-term relationship. When people have little confidence in the future, they are more likely to engage in deviance.
- **Involvement:** The more involved people are with legitimate activities, the less likely they are to deviate from appropriate behavior. A person with a job, a family, and membership in several clubs or organizations is less likely to commit deviance. Not only does he not have time to waste in potentially harmful activities, but he has a lot to lose if he does.
- **Belief:** An individual who shares the same values as the dominant society, such as respect for authority, the importance of hard work, or the primacy of the family, is less likely to commit deviance. Individuals whose personal belief systems differ from those of the dominant society are more likely to commit deviance. A person raised to believe that it is acceptable to cheat, lie, and steal will probably not integrate into mainstream society as well as someone whose beliefs conform to the values of the larger society.

Join Telegram @Ignouresults
Www.Ignouresults.Com

BSOC-103 : Introduction to Sociology-II

Guess Paper-II

Q. Highlight Modernist vs. Postmodernist Feminist Theory.

Ans. Useful anthologies of the first stage of second wave socialist feminist writings which include discussions of women, class and work from psychological as well as sociological and economic perspectives are Eisenstein (1979), Hansen and Philipson (1990), Hennessy and Ingraham (1997), and Holmstrom (2002). Jaggar (1983) wrote perhaps the first philosophy text explaining the categories of liberal, radical, Marxist and socialist-feminist thought and defending a socialist-feminist theory of male domination based on the notion of women's alienated labor. Others such as Jaggar and Rothenberg (1978), Tuana and Tong (1995) and Herrmann and Stewart (1993) include classic socialist feminist analyses in their collections, inviting comparisons of the authors to others grouped under the categories of liberal, radical, psychoanalytic, Marxist, postmodern, postcolonial and multicultural feminisms.

Various post-modern critiques of these earlier feminist schools of thought such as post-colonialism as well as deconstruction and post-structuralism challenge the over-generalizations and economic reductionism of many of those constructing feminist theories that fall under the early categories of liberal, radical, Marxist or socialist feminism. Others argue that part of the problem is the master narratives of liberalism or Marxism, the first of which sees all domination relations due to traditional hierarchies and undermined by capitalism, thus ignoring the independent effectivity of racism (Josephs 1981); and the second of which ties all domination relations to the structure of contemporary capitalism and ignores the non-capitalist economics contexts in which many women work, even within so-called capitalist economies, such as housework and voluntary community work (Gibson-Graham 1996).

In spite of the "pomo" critiques, there are some powerful thinkers within this tendency who have not completely rejected a more general starting point of analysis based on women, class and work. For example, Spivak (1988), Mohanty (1997), Carby (1997), and Hennessy (1993, 2000) are creating and re-articulating forms of Marxist and socialist-feminism less susceptible to charges of over-generalization and reductionism, and more compatible with close contextual analysis of the power relations of gender and class as they relate to work. They can be grouped loosely with a tendency called materialist feminism that incorporates some of the methods of deconstruction and post-structuralism.

Q. What is a Dalit Movement?

Ans. Dalit movement raises issues of caste-based discrimination and economic inequality. It is a struggle for social justice. The issues on which dalit movement is launched are: self – respect, harassment of women, payment of wages, forced labour or begar, disputes over land, implementation of the reservation policy, promotion in the job, denial of democratic

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

rights like casting of votes, disrespect to Dr. B.R. Amebedkar/his statue, etc. Dalits protest and agitate on these issues in various ways which include mainly informal ways, at individual basis, through the organised ways, satyagraha and litigation, by getting these raised either in the parliament or in the legislative assemblies. Dalit movement/agitation is also expressed through collective action like demonstration, rallies, procession; through signature campaign, protest literature, etc. Some times their agitation result in the clashes between dalits, police and the those elements in the society who are inimical to the interests of dalits.

Q. Define the Term 'Dalit'.

Ans. In the annals of Indian history, dalits were referred to with different nomenclatures – like Chandalas, Avarnas, Achhuts, Namashudra, Parihas, Adi-Dravida, Ad-Dharmis, depressed classes, oppressed Hindus, Harijans, etc. – at different point of time. However, after the emergence of the Dalit Panther's movement in Maharashtra in the 1970s, they preferred to be called as dalits. The definition of dalits as propounded by the Dalit Panthers was a class definition and it included members of Scheduled Castes (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (STs), the landless and poor peasants, women, and all those who were exploited politically, economically and in the name of religion. It was the Panthers' political compulsion that made them propound such a definition of a category which never existed before, as they wanted to forge an alliance among these aforesaid groups.

However, sociologically, the term dalits has been strictly used for exuntouchables of Indian society who have faced the worst kind of social exclusion. The term 'social exclusion' has been defined as a multidimensional process in which various forms of exclusion are combined: participation in decision-making and political processes, access to employment and material resources, and integration into common cultural process. When combined, they create acute form of exclusion that finds a spatial manifestation in particular neighbourhoods. To this, we have to add the elements of religious justification of such exclusion of dalits based on dharma and karma. Based on the above elements of social exclusion, we can argue that dalits are different from Scheduled Tribes, women and poor persons among caste Hindus that were included in the Dalit Panthers' definition of dalits.

At the outset, economically, a poor person is different from a dalit. A poor person may be deprived in the economic sphere, especially of income necessary to participate in the economy. However, he/she may not be necessarily deprived in social and cultural spheres, that is, he/she may not face the same type of exclusion in the social and cultural life of his neighborhood as dalits face. For instance, a penury-stricken Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya or Shudra is never forced to live outside the boundaries of the village. They interact among themselves at least in secular realms on more or less equal terms. However, dalits were excluded from the main residential area of the village, and were kept outside the interaction pattern of its social life. Hence, we can argue that a poor person may be economically or politically deprived, but he/she is never excluded from the social and cultural spheres. An ex-untouchable is deprived in all the three – social, economic and political – realms. T.K.

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

Oommen, therefore, has rightly pointed out, 'If proletarian consciousness is essentially rooted in material deprivations…dalit consciousness is a complex and compound consciousness which encapsulates deprivations stemming from inhuman conditions of material existence, powerlessness and ideological hegemony'.

The social exclusion of an ex-untouchable is so overpowering that, even though he/she attains economic and political mobility through hard work, he/she is not accepted in totality by the castes located higher up in the hierarchy. Another aspect of social exclusion is that, because of their extreme form social exclusion, dalits could not accumulate social capital which could give them the potential to develop their consciousness. Moreover, because of lack of this consciousness, they could not revolt against the Hindu social order for so long. Their cultural co-option in the Hindu social order, even though they were not part of the varna hierarchy, was affected by the artificial consensus which was a part of Hindu hegemony legitimized by the doctrine of karma. Tribals are different from dalits because they were never treated as a part of the Hindu social order. As they had their own independent social system, tribals did not face social exclusion as dalits did. They also did not suffer the same type of atrocities as suffered by dalits. Apart from their geographical location in the hilly or forested terrain, tribals also differed from dalits in political, religious, economic and psychological aspects. These aspects have kept them away from the Hindu hegemony in terms of their status in the caste hierarchy, occupation, commensality, etc. Furthermore, this differentiation has resulted in a different type of construction of consciousness among tribals and, hence, they revolted a number of times in the past. That is why we have not included them in the present definition of Dalits.

Q. What are the Implications of Division of Labour in Manufacture?

Ans. Implications of Division of Labour in Manufacture are:

1) **Profits accrue to the capitalist:** Division of labour in manufacture help to generate more and more surplus value leading to capital accumulation. Marx tackles a crucial question, namely, who takes away the profits? Not the workers, says Marx, but the capitalists. Not those who actually produce, but those who own the means of production. According to him, division of labour and the existence of private property together consolidate the power of the capitalist. Since the capitalist owns the means of production, the production process is designed and operated in such a way that the capitalist benefits the most from it.
2) **Workers lose control over what they produce:** According to Marx with division of labour in manufacture workers tend to lose their status as the real creators of goods. Rather, they become mere links in a production chain designed and operated by the capitalists. Workers are separated from the products of their labour; in fact, they hardly ever see the end result of their work. They have no control over its sale and purchase. For example, does a worker in an assembly line in a factory producing washing-machines really get to see the finished product? He/she might see it in an advertisement or at a shop window. The

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

worker will not be able to sell it or afford to buy it, having been merely a small part of the production of that machine. The actual control over it is exercised by the capitalist. The worker as an independent producer no longer exists. The worker has become enslaved by the production process.

3) **Dehumanization of the Working Class:** The capitalist system characterized by division of labour is one where workers stop being independent producers of goods. They become suppliers of labour-power, which is needed for production. The worker's individual personality needs and desires mean nothing to the capitalist. It is only the worker's labour-power which is sold to the capitalist in exchange for wages that concerns the capitalist. The working class is thus stripped of its humanness and labour-power becomes a mere commodity purchased by the capitalist, in Marx's view.
4) **Alienation:** One of the important concepts developed by Marx in understanding the realities of the industrial world is that of alienation.

Q. State Durkheim's Views on Division of Labour.

Ans. Auguste Comte suggests that it is social and moral consensus that holds society together. Common ideas, values, norms and mores bind individuals and society together. Herbert Spencer puts across a different view. According to Spencer, it is an interplay of individual interests that holds society together. It serves the selfish interests of individuals to strive for integration. Thus, social life is possible.

Durkheim was at variance with these views. If, as Comte suggests, it is moral consensus that holds society together, then would not modern industrial society crumble? After all, modern society is characterized by heterogeneity, mobility, and diversity in activities and values. It is a society where individualism is valued. Spencer's suggestion that selfish interests hold society together was also found to be faulty by Durkheim. If indeed, individual interests hold sway, the resulting competition and antagonism would break the backbone of society. Each would struggle for his own profit even at the expense of the other. Conflict and tension would bring about social disintegration.

According to him, the basis or focus of social integration differs in preindustrial and post-industrial societies. He demonstrates how the process of occupational specialization or division of labour helps to integrate societies where heterogeneity, differentiation and complexity are to be found. In the following sub-sections, we will see how Durkheim studies division of labour in terms of

1) The function of division of labour
2) The causes underlying division of labour
3) Deviations from the normal type of division of labour, i.e. abnormal forms.

Functions of Division of Labour: As you have already studied, Durkheim classifies human societies into:

i) Those based on 'mechanical solidarity' and
ii) Those based on 'organic solidarity'.

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

i) **Mechanical Solidarity**: As you know, mechanical solidarity refers to a solidarity of resemblance or likeness. There exists a great deal of homogeneity and tightly-knit social bonds which serve to make the individual members one with their society. The collective conscience is extremely strong. By collective conscience we mean the system of beliefs and sentiments held in common by members of a society which defines what their mutual relations ought to be. The strength of the collective conscience integrates such societies, binding together individual members through strong beliefs and values. Violation of or deviation from these values is viewed very seriously. Harsh or repressive punishment is given to offenders. Once again, it must be pointed out that this is a solidarity or unity of likeness and homogeneity. Individual differences are extremely limited and division of labour is at a relatively simple level. Briefly, in such societies, individual conscience is merged with the collective conscience.

ii) **Organic Solidarity**: By organic solidarity, Durkheim means a solidarity based on difference and complementarity of differences. Take factory, for example. There is a great deal of difference in the work, social status, income, etc. of a worker and a manager. Yet, the two complement each other. Being a manager is meaningless without the cooperation of workers and workers need to be organized by managers. Thus they are vital for each other's survival.

Societies based on organic solidarity are touched and transformed by the growth of industrialization. Thus, division of labour is a very important aspect of such societies. A society based on organic solidarity is thus one where heterogeneity, differentiation and variety exist. The growing complexity of societies reflects in personality types, relationships and problems. In such societies, the strength of the collective conscience lessens, as individual conscience becomes more and more distinct, more easily distinguished from the collective conscience. Individualism becomes increasingly valued. The kind of grip that social norms have on individuals in mechanical solidarity loosens. Individual autonomy and personal freedom become as important in organic solidarity as social solidarity and integration in societies characterized by mechanical solidarity.

1. **Causes of Division of Labour**: What leads to the process, of division of labour or, what are the causal factors? Durkheim provides a sociological answer to this question. According to him, division of labour arises as a result of increased material and moral density in society. By material density Durkheim means the sheer increase in the number of individuals in a society, in other words, population growth. By moral density he means the increased interaction those results between individuals as a consequence of growth in numbers.

   The growth in material and moral density results in a struggle for existence. If, as in societies characterised by mechanical solidarity, individuals tend to be very similar, doing the same things, they would also struggle or compete for the same resources and rewards. Growth of population and shrinking of natural resources would make competition more bitter. But division of labour ensures that individuals specialise in

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

different fields and areas. Thus they can coexist and, in fact complement each other. But does this ideal state of affairs always prevail? Let us see what Durkheim says.

2. **Abnormal Forms of Division of Labour**: If division of labour helped societies achieve integration and a newer, higher form of solidarity, why was European society of that time in such a chaotic state? Was division of labour creating problems? What had gone wrong? According to Durkheim, the kind of division of labour that was taking place was not the 'normal'-type that he wrote about. Abnormal types or deviations from the normal were being observed in society. Briefly, these included.

a) **Anomie:** This term means a state of normlessness. Material life changes rapidly, but rules norms and values do not keep pace with it. There seems to be a total breakdown of rules and norms. In the work sphere, this reflects in conflicts between labour and management, degrading and meaningless work and growing class conflict. To put it simply, individuals are working and producing but fail to see any meaning in what they are doing. For instance, in a factory assembly-line worker have to spend the whole day doing boring, routine activities like fixing screws or nails to a piece of machinery. They fail to see any meaning in what they do. They are not made to feel that they are doing anything useful, they are not made to feel an important part of society. Norms and rules governing work in a factory have not changed to the extent that they can make the worker's activities more meaningful or show the workers that society needs and values them.

b)

c) **Inequality**: Division of labour based on inequality of opportunity, according to Durkheim, fails to produce long-lasting solidarity. Such an abnormal form results in individuals becoming frustrated and unhappy with their society. Thus tensions, rivalries and antagonism result. One may cite the Indian caste system as an example of division of labour based on inequality. People have to do certain kinds of work not because of their capacity but because of their birth. This can be very frustrating to those who want to do more satisfying or rewarding jobs, but cannot have access to proper opportunities.

d) **Inadequate organization:** In this abnormal form the very purpose of division of labour is destroyed. Work is not well organized and coordinated. Workers are often engaged in doing meaningless tasks. There is no unity of action. Thus solidarity breaks down and disorder results. You may have observed that in many offices, a lot of people are sitting around idly doing little or nothing. Many are unaware of their responsibilities. Collective action becomes difficult when most people are not very sure of what they have to do. Division of labour is supposed to increase productivity and integration. In the example discussed above, the opposite takes place.

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

Q. Highlight the Main Features of Capitalism.

Ans. Tom Bottomore (1973) in His Dictionary of Marxist Thought sets down some of the main features of capitalism. As a mode of production, capitalism is characterised by the following features.

1) **Production for sale rather than for self-use:** By this we mean a shift from a subsistence economy. In most precapitalist economies, production is undertaken for direct consumption. For instance, in agricultural economies, farmers grow crops for their own use, only a small surplus is available for sale. This is because technology is not so advanced and domestic or family labour is used for farming. Such is not the case in a capitalist economy. Here, a large number of workers gather together in a factory. With the help of machines and through division of labour, goods are produced on a mass scale. They are produced for sale in the market. For instance in a factory producing soap, the output is not for the self-use of the producers. It is for sale in the market.

2) **The existence of a market where labour-power is bought and sold:** According to Marx, workers are regarded only in terms of their labourpower. The capitalist or owner hires their labour-power by paying them wages. Workers can sell their labour power or withhold it because they are legally free. Unlike in the earlier stages of human history, workers are not forced to work like slaves or serfs. Sheer economic need forces them to work. They must either work or starve. So, although they are legally free to enter or not enter into contracts with the capitalist, they are not free from hunger, which forces them to sell their labour.

3) **Exchange takes place through money:** As we have seen in point (1) production is undertaken for sale, and sale is transacted through the use of money. Money is the social bond that ties together the various elements in the capitalist system. Hence the role of banks and financial institutions becomes important in the system.

4) **The capitalist controls the production process:** Not only does the capitalist control the hiring and firing of workers, but also decides how production is to be carried out. He decides what is to be produced, the composition of raw materials and machines, and the manner in which the output is to be marketed.

5) **The capitalist controls financial decisions:** This is related to the earlier point. Decisions regarding pricing of the product, wages of the workers, the amount of financial investment and so on are taken by the capitalist.

6) **Competition**: Since the whole idea of capitalism is production for sale, there is bound to be competition between capitalists. Whose products will sell the most in the market? Whose profits will be the maximum? This leads to a situation in which each tries to outdo the other. The consequences could be innovation or the use of the latest technology. Competition could also result in the formation of 'monopolies' or 'cartels', where a single producer or group of producers try to dominate the market by pushing or forcing out competitors.

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

BSOC-103 : Introduction to Sociology-II

Guess Paper-III

Q. Highlight the global sources of contemporary conflicts.

Ans. Since the end of Second World War, most of the interstate conflicts were caused by Cold War between two Super Powers – the United States and the USSR. With the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the Cold War came to an end. But this led to conflicts within the states. The former communist states of Soviet bloc experienced ethnic conflicts (Yugoslavia) and secession demands.

There are analyses of the systemic sources of conflicts themselves. Setting aside the 'clash of civilizations' hypothesis of Huntington which predicts future conflict across the fault lines b etween civilizations and, in particular, a geo-political struggle between 'the West and the rest', the main focus is on three interlinked trends: deep and enduring inequalities in the global distribution of wealth and economic power (as the rich developed countries, constituting 20 per cent of the world population, control and own 80 per cent of resources, whereas the 80 per cent poor from the developing world own and survive with 20 per cent of global wealth and resources); human-induced environmental constraints exacerbated by excessive energy consumption in the developed world and population growth in the underdeveloped world, making it difficult for human well-being to be improved by conventional economic growth; and continuous militarization of security relations, including the further proliferation of lethal weaponry (it may be noted that $176 billion-worth of weaponry was exported to the Third World between 1987 and 1991). As a result, 'the combination of wealth-poverty disparities and limits to growth is likely to lead to a crisis of unsatisfied expectations within an increasingly informed global majority of the disempowered'. The probable outcome of this, argues HomerDixon, will be three kinds of conflict: scarcity conflicts mainly at interstate level over oil, water, fish, land; group-identity conflict exacerbated by large-scale population movements; and relative deprivation conflicts mainly at domestic level as the gap between expectation and achievement widens. With the demise of the second world after the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the first and the third worlds are seen to be confronting each other all the more starkly.

Q. Examine Belief and Faith in Religious Symbols.

Ans. This leads us to a profound question: Why do people believe in religion? Geertz notes that this question is often avoided in anthropology, and is often relegated to a psychological enquiry. People come to believe in religion because of their socialization. Right from the beginning they are told of the moral worthiness and supremacy of certain beliefs, which solve their problems and lay to rest their doubts, and in course of time they are transmitted to the posterity. Underlying all this is the existence of some authority that defines what is 'worshipful' (worthy of faith and

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

worship), and why it should be worshiped. Beneath every system of religious symbolism there is a system of authority which legitimizes and protects it. For example, in tribal religions, authority lies in the traditional imagery; in the mystical ones in the force of the supernatural experience, the experience of one-ness; and in charismatic ones in the attractive hold of an extraordinary person. Even revelations have the immediate authority of the person through whom they are communicated, besides of course the final authority of the divinity which selects a person through whom the 'truth' is revealed. Irrespective of its nature, the authority gives its people what may be called the 'religious perspective'. In other words, one who comes to 'know' must first believe in what he comes to know. Religion is 'real for the believers'; for the non-believers (and the faithless), it may be nothing more than mumbo-jumbo, a congregation of irrationalities.

Defining the term 'perspective' as a 'mode of seeing', Geertz states that the 'religious perspective' is one of the several perspectives that human beings have to look at and analyze the world inside and around them. He distinguishes the 'religious perspective' from the common-sensical, the aesthetic, and the scientific perspectives. The religious perspective differs from common sense because it moves 'beyond the realities of everyday life to wider ones which correct and complete them'. Religion does not act upon the 'wider realities', but accepts them, and develops faith in them. With respect to the scientific, religious perspective relies upon commitment for wider realities, rather than subjecting them to a dispassionate analysis. And it differs from art because it does not disengage itself from the question of facts as art does, but considers the things – the wider reality – with which it is concerned as 'real', 'factual'.

An important component of religion through which it establishes relations with the wider realities is ritual, which Geertz defines as 'consecrated behavior'. Through ritual performance, the veracity, the truthfulness, of religious conceptions is reinforced. The idea that religious directions are sound is also generated through rituals. They also produce the moods and motivations to keep religion intact. Here, one may notice that for Geertz also, as it has been for other anthropologists and sociologists, religious symbols comprise the aspects of both beliefs and rituals.

Individuals believe in the existence of powers beyond them. They have myths, beliefs, stories, fictions about the origin of these powers. They also know that the powers will influence their lives when some form of communication (through rituals) is established with them. But, this does not imply that people live in the world of religious symbols they have created for all of the time. In fact, most men live in it only at moments. The everyday world of common-sense objects and practical acts is the reality of paramount importance for human beings. Against this background, what religious rituals do is to 'color the individual's conception of the established world of bare fact'. In other words, religion does not describe the world, and if at all it does, it does it obliquely and incompletely. What it actually does is: It shapes the world of human beings, giving it a new meaning.

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

One of the most common occurrences men face is their constant shift from their day-to-day life to the world of ritual performances. When men perform rituals, they are transported to a world that engulfs them almost totally. In this, their beliefs appear 'pale', a 'remembered reflection of that experience'. So, while speaking of beliefs and rituals, we must keep a distinction between them, for their respective individual impacts on people differ greatly. Failure to keep this distinction has led to confusion, leading some to argue about the presence of a 'primitive mentality' and some to say that what science does in some societies is what religion does in some others.
Actually, they are talking about different realms of religion, which though related have different implications for the experiences of people. For the disciplines of anthropology and sociology, religion is viewed as a system of ideas and practices that offers a particular conception of the world that people inhabit. Geertz writes:
Religious concepts spread beyond their specifically metaphysical contexts to provide a framework of general ideas in terms of which a wide range of experience – intellectual, emotional, moral – can be given meaningful form.

Q. Critically analyze Primary and Secondary Deviance.

Ans. Sociologist Edwin Lemert differentiated between primary deviance and secondary deviance. The difference between primary deviance and secondary deviance is in the reactions other people have to the original act of defiance.

Primary Deviance is a deviant act that provokes little reaction and has limited effect on a person's self-esteem. The deviant does not change his or her behavior as a result of this act.

Example: An adolescent who smokes cigarettes with other adolescents is not at risk of being labeled a deviant among her peers, since they all smoke. Even though adolescents who smoke cigarettes are considered deviant by the larger American society, that teenager's actions go relatively unnoticed, unpunished, and therefore unchanged. The primary deviance is of little consequence.

Secondary Deviance includes repeated deviant behavior that is brought on by other people's negative reactions to the original act of primary deviance.

Example: The same adolescent moves to a new school where his peers never smoke and where smoking is considered a deviant behavior. The students call him names and exclude him from all of their social activities. Because of their reactions to his smoking, he feels like an outcast and begins to smoke more, perhaps engaging in other deviant activities, such as alcohol or drugs.

According to Lemert, the reactions to the adolescent's primary deviance provoked a form of secondary deviance. Because his alleged friends reacted so negatively to his behavior, he began to engage in more of the deviant behavior. This repeated deviance results in the adolescent having a deviant identity. He now has a "reputation," and no one looks at him in quite the same way as before.

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

Q. Describe Dalit Movement in the post – colonial Period during phase III.

Ans. The 1990s have seen the proliferation of Dalit organizations in in different states of the country. The case of the BSP in Uttar Pradesh is most important. Though the RPI had been influential in Uttar Pradesh like Maharshtra since the 1950s, the rise of the BSP has been the most striking feature of dalit identity and politics in Indi. It has been able to lead the government in Uttar Pradesh thrice with a dalit woman Mayawati as the chief minister. The BSP was founded on April 14, 1984 by its president Kashi Ram. Before forming the BSP Kashi Ram mobilised dalits under the banner of two organizations, i.e., the BAMCEF (All India Backward and Minority Employees Federation) and DS4. These were social and cultural organizations with their focus on the mobilisation of the dalit middle classes. With the formation of the BSP, Kashi Ram changed the social and cultural organisations into a political party – the BSP. The BSP aimed to mobilise the majority other sections of the society, the Bahujan Samaj, consisting of the dalits, backward class and religious minorities which excluded the high castes like Brahmans, Rajputs, and Banias. The BSP believes that the minority high castes have been using the votes of the majority communities or the Bahujan Samaj. They did not let them become the leaders or the rulers. As in a democracy it is the majority who should rule, the Bahujan Samaj should become the ruling class. There was a need to reverse the pattern of power game in the country; the Bahujan Samaj should no longer allow the minority high castes to use them as the vote banks. Rather the Bahjan Samaj should be the rulers. With this perspective the BSP contested the assembly and parliamentary elections in several states in the country from 1985 onwards. The BSP made its present felt in North Indian states, especially Punjab, UP, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh.

The BSP has been able to consolidate its position among dalits mainly for its strategy of electoral alliances and the public policies. The most important case of the BSP's electoral alliance has been in the state of UP, though it has attempted electoral alliances in other states as well. From the 1993 assembly election of UP onwards, the BSP has entered into alliances with the major political formulations like Congress, the BJP and the Samajwadi Party in UP or the Akali Dal and Congress in Punjab, which could help it win the assembly and parliamentary elections or in the post-poll alliance which help it form the government. The first alliance which the BSP made was with the Mulayam Singh Yadav-led Samajwadi Party in UP in 1993 election. This alliance was considered as an example of the unity of the Bahujan Samaj – the BSP identified with the dalits and the Samajwadi Party with the backward classes and the minorities. This alliance, however, continued only till the BSP withdrew support from the Mulayam Singh Yadav-led SP-BSP government in 1995. The fall of Mulayam Singh led-government was followed by its alliance with the BJP, which enabled Mayawati to become the first dalit woman Chief Minister of any state. Immediately after becoming the Chief Minister, Mayawati declared that her party serve the serva samaj; it was shift from her earlier position where she vowed to fight for the Bahujan Samaj. It was beginning of the BSP's change in the electoral or alliance strategy. In the subsequent

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

elections, contrary to original principles, it gave tickets even to the high castes Brahmins, Rajputs, Banias and Kayasthas gave them representation as ministers in her government.

However, during her Chief Ministership, Mayawati introduced special policies for dalits. The most important of these included: – Ambedkar Village Programmes consisting of the special programmes for the welfare of the weaker sections in the villages identified as the Ambedakar Villages on the basis of the substantial dalit population in such villages, and naming of the public institutions after the low caste historical personalities. It also took prompt action against those who involved in the discriminatory activities against the dalits. The rise of the BSP has imparted a sense of pride and confidence among the dalits in the country. Especial focus of the BSP-led coalition governments in UP on the dalis in its policies has created caused resentment among the non-dalits both the high castes as well as the backward classes. The BSP has been able to counter this by change in its alliance strategy. Unlike its initial strategy, the has been giving tickets to high castes. In fact in the elections held in 2002 to the UP assembly election, the largest group of the MLAs in the UP legislative election belong to the high castes. The main criterion for forging alliance seems to be the ability of the candidates to win the election, which could made possible by an alliance of dalits and high castes candidates who are given tickets by the BSP.

Though the BSP contributed to the politicization of dalits to a large extent, it could not maintain the unity of the Bahujan Samaj. The main reason for its success lie in the electoral strategy of the BSP.

Q. Define Religion in terms of Beliefs and Rites.

Ans. To define religion, says Durkheim, we must first free the mind of all preconceived ideas of religion. Durkheim discards the notion that religion is concerned only with 'mysterious' or 'supernatural' phenomena, with gods, spirits and ghosts. He points out that religion is as concerned with the ordinary as the extraordinary aspects of life. The rising and setting of the sun, the regular patterns of the seasons, the growth of plants and crops, the birth of new life are as much as a part of religious ideas as miracles and spectacular happenings. To define religion, he says, the various religious systems of the world must be examined in order to derive those elements, or characteristics, which they have in common. As Durkheim puts it, "religion cannot be defined except by the characters which are found wherever religion itself is found".

According to Durkheim, all religions comprise two basic components, namely, beliefs and rites. Beliefs are the collective representations and rites are determined modes of action, which are influenced by beliefs. Religious beliefs as studied by Durkheim presuppose the classification of all things into 'sacred' and 'profane'. There is an opposition between these two spheres which has to be carefully regulated through rites and ceremonies. The sacred is that which is set apart, considered holy and venerated or dreaded and avoided. The sacred is usually in a higher position, valued more than profane things, and its identity and power are protected by social rules. The profane, on the other hand, refers to the mundane, ordinary aspects of day-to-day existence. The sacred and profane are kept apart, says

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

Durkheim, because they are heterogeneous (different), antagonistic (in conflict) and isolated (separated). Rites therefore exist to mediate between the two worlds. Let us take an example. Why are believers not allowed to wear their shoes inside a temple? Wearing shoes or chappals for walking is a routine, practical or profane act. The temple is considered a holy, pure place; it is sacred. The floor of the temple must therefore be protected from the polluting dirt of our shoes. The sacred and profane are kept apart.

Beliefs and rites, says Durkheim, unite to form religion. Beliefs are the moral ideas, the rules, the teachings and myths. They are the collective representations which exist outside of the individual, yet integrate the individual into the religious system. Through beliefs, human beings understand the sacred and their relationship to it. They can lead their lives accordingly. Rites are the rules of conduct that follow from beliefs, which prescribe how human beings must behave with regard to sacred things. They can be positive, where the sacred is sought to be brought closer to the world of men, for example, through 'havan' or sacrifice. Rites can be negative, which means the sacred and profane are sought to be kept apart, e.g. purification rites, fasts, penance or suffering. In Durkheim's view rites serve to sustain the intensity of religious-beliefs. They bring individuals together, strengthening their social natures. They are modes of expression of the collective conscience, which, as you have studied, refers to the commonly held values, beliefs and ideas of the community,

Defining religion in terms of beliefs and rites poses one problem. This definition would also include magic. Is there no difference between magic and religion? Following the ideas of the anthropologist Robertson-Smith, Durkheim holds that magic and religion are indeed different. Magic is a private, selfish practice, performed at the individual level. For example, if one wants to do better than one's neighbour, so one goes to the magician and by paying his/her fee, one asks him to cast a spell or perform 'jadootona' to kill your neighbour's cows or spoil his crops. Magic thus involves a bond only between the magician and his clients based on a selfish motive, in order to manipulate nature to suit individual purposes. Religion, on the other hand, is public and social. There are social bonds between followers, which unite them into a group leading a common life. Durkheim's definition of religion taking into account these factors is as follows.

"A religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden — beliefs and practices. which unite into one single moral community called a Church, all those who adhere to them."

Q. Compare Durkheim and Weber views on Religion briefly.

Ans. Looking at the different types of religious systems, located in very different social settings that they handle, i.e., their units of analysis.

1. **Units of Analysis**: Emile Durkheim studies religion in what he believes is its most elementary form. He focuses on tribal society where collective life is pervasive. Ideas are held in common by all individuals and there is an intensity of shared ideas and feelings. This is a society without written historical records. Religion and clan

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

organization overlap. Thus, Durkheim emphasizes the role of religion as a collective phenomenon which serves to strengthen social bonds.

Weber, on the other hand, studies the major features of the great world religions. He is interested in their historical roots and their capacity to guide and shape economic activity. These world religions are also seen as responses to the prevailing social situations. For instance, Buddhism and Jainism in India hit out against the caste system. Judaism was the religion of the oppressed Palestinian peasantry. Thus, Durkheim's emphasis on tribal religion visualizes the role of religion in maintaining social order, Weber's analysis looks at the creative role of religion in helping to shape new ways of thinking and acting.

2. **The Role of Religion**: Taking the above point further, we can see that Durkheim basically sees religion as an expression of the collective conscience. Worshipping the totem according to him is nothing but worshipping the clan itself. Ideas and beliefs cherished by the clan as a whole thus become part of the individual conscience. The separation between the sacred and the profane aspects of the world is mediated through certain rites. The participation of the whole clan in some important rites helps to bring about collective enthusiasm, linking individuals into social bonds and making them aware of the awesome power of society.

   Weber, in contrast, wishes to understand religion in relation to economic, political and historical factors. How does it interact with other institutions of society? How does society shape and is in turn shaped by religious beliefs? Weber is interested in the unique culture patterns to be found in each society. He sees religion as part and parcel of a larger historical trend, namely, the move towards capitalism, industrialisation and rationality. He is concerned with the role of religion in making the world-view of individuals in different societies favourably or unfavourably inclined towards capitalism and rationalisation

3. **Gods, Spirits and Prophets:** Durkheim denies that religion is concerned with the mysterious, with gods and spirits. He holds that the object of worship is society itself, transformed and represented through certain symbolic objects. Weber does not hesitate to use the idea of gods and spirits. Remember, Weber is dealing with religions, which are of relatively recent origin as compared to the tribal religions. These religions discussed by Weber express certain personal qualities and display a certain level of abstraction. When individuals abstract, they engage in symbolic activity. Let us look at totemism in this respect. Durkheim argues that the totem is the symbol of the clan. Weber takes the example of a totem, which while worshipped as a symbol, is an animal that is sacrificially killed and eaten. The spirits and gods of the tribe are called to take part in the feast. Whilst eating the animal, clan members believe themselves to be united because the spirit of the animal enters them. They are united not merely by the totem as an emblem or a symbol, but they are united by sharing the substance of the sacred animal which is not merely flesh, but spirit.

Www.Ignouresults.Com Join Telegram @Ignouresults

Weber, unlike Durkheim, attaches great importance to prophets in propagating religious beliefs. Religions like Judaism, Christianity and Islam are characterized by great ethical prophets who people revere as the representatives of god, or individuals who have directly spoken to god. They are the charismatic leaders like Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Mohammed who capture the imagination and fancy of the people. Briefly, Durkheim denies that religion is basically concerned with spirits and gods. He maintains that it is society itself, which is worshipped in order to strengthen social bonds and make individuals who are born and who die feel the power and eternity of society. Weber speaks of religion in terms of its creation of abstractions. Thus spirits and gods are reflections of symbolic thought. The role of charismatic, ethical prophets in redefining and remaking religious beliefs is also accounted for.

4. **Religion and Science:** You have seen how Durkheim views both religion and science as providing society with its collective representations. The classifications of science derive from those of religion. Thus there is no conflict or opposition between the two. Weber is not of this view. His comparative studies of world religion show how religious ethics in India and China prevented the growth of capitalism, which basically requires an ethic of mastery, of rational calculation. It is only the Protestant ethic, which provided the appropriate world-view for rational capitalism. Science, as Weber views it, is an expression of rationality and a challenge to the traditional and mystical claims of religion. Science provides empirical knowledge or verifiable factual information, which helps human beings to know and master the world. Thus science and religion, in Weber's view, exist in contrast to each other.

Join Telegram @Ignouresults
Www.Ignouresults.Com
Www.Ignouresults.Com
Join Telegram @Ignouresults