CHAPTER III

THE STUDY OF VALUES IN SOCIOLOGY: MAJOR THEORETICAL APPROACHES
3. Value as a “Standard for Desirability” is one of the widely accepted definitions in the discipline of Social Sciences (International Encyclopedia of Social Science: 1968:254). Sociological study, being a scientific study of society, is as old as the human thought itself. Initially the study of value was not studied very specifically but the values have been understood and expressed through various social institutions like Family, Marriage, Kinship, Groups, Property, State, Education, Cultural Traditions and Religion etc. Even before the existence of Sociology as a separate discipline, man tried to understand their origins, social structures, functions and growth. Perhaps the human intervention to explore the knowledge in the areas of philosophy, polity, history, religion, economy, etc. played an important role in the identifications of social values. Which is later on in the beginning of 20th century occupied a subject of studies in the discipline of social sciences. It is earlier mentioned previous chapter that, the study of values made a pioneering effort in the subject of sociology by Thomas and Znanicki in the year 1918 on their work The Polish Peasant in Europe and America (1918) (International Encyclopedia of Social Science: 1968:285). The existence of value is tied with the various theoretical orientations that have been propounded by the prophet, philosopher, intellectuals and some others.

Beginning with the study of The Polish Peasant in Europe and America in the year 1918, the concept of values perhaps found increasing use in full influence on the subject of social sciences. However, the considerable part of values in the discipline of sociology has come from the western sociological tradition. For the better understanding of values in the present context of sociological discourse it is perhaps most essential to remember the classical works of pioneers of sociology like Auguste Comte, Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx, Max Weber and some others (For more details see Ratna Dutta: 1971:1:5 & 38:60). The study of social values could be possible through different approaches. Broadly speaking, the social values have two aspects one is the positive and another is negative. Keeping in view with these two aspects, in this study the social values has been studied and explored through the following major approaches.

1. Firstly, in Western Sociological Tradition, i. structural functional approaches, ii. conflict approaches. iii. critical theories
2. In Indian Sociological Tradition, i. structural functional approaches, ii. conflict approaches, and iii. integrative approaches

These approaches have been employed in this study to understand values through the theoretical perception/orientation with reference to both Western as well as Indian sociological traditions.

3.1. The Study of Values in the Western Sociological Tradition

Sociology emerged as a distinct science in the 19th century Europe. By the time the entire Europe is passing through a period of many changes that had set in after the French Revolution (F.R.) and the Industrial Revolutions (I.R). The social conditions with new outlook and the values of rational principles set a background to the emergence of sociology. According to T. B. Bottomore, the intellectual conditions of the eighteenth century contributed to the rise of sociology.

The social structure of Europe was traditional and land holding was central to its economic system. The society was arranged with the hierarchy of landowners, the feudal lords and the peasants who generally work on the lands. Religion has occupied a central place in the society. The family and kinship was important organ of the society. Monarchy was prevailed in the society and king was believed to be divinely origin to rule over his subjects. However, after the F.R. and I.R. the new Europe emerged with a new set of social values. Old classes like land lords, feudal lords were overthrown and new classes were reorganized. Religion has lost its traditional stronghold over the society and subsequently monarchy was overthrown. The central concept of society, namely, religion, community, power, wealth, prestige status etc. were all taking on new bearings and new implications. These have been dealt by pioneers of sociology with a theoretical framework in relation with individual and society. Some of their works in the context of value relations and value preferences is discussed in this chapter in a theoretic form.

3.1.1. The Study of Values in the Structural Functional Approaches in Western Sociological Traditions

The first Sociological theoretic perspective, i.e. the functionalism, has emerged as a reaction against the utilitarianism as it is a classical economic idea that dominated by
the values of open competition in free markets. Many people still view social life as a kind of market place where people buy and sell their qualities in hopes of making a psychic profit. But in today's society, social life is a competitive game of people rationally pursuing their interest, with social order some how emerging out of these classes of self interest. In the 19th century Europe study of the value in sociology was dominated by the utilitarian ideas but the first generation of French sociologist had ceased to accept this idea. The biological discoveries of 19th century were significantly altering the social and intellectual climate of the times as the many of the mysteries of the human body were discovered. It was in this social and intellectual milieu the study of sociology as a self-conscious discipline was born and the value of social order and social function were influenced by biological science. Beginning with the work of pioneer sociologists and how the study of values has gradually developed within the branches of sociology. (For more details on the functions of values and interests on the theoretical problem see sister Marie Augusta Neal: 1965: 1-18) Some of them are discussed below.

3.1.1.a. Auguste Comte (1798-1857)

Auguste Comte, a well known French thinker credited as being the founder of sociology, advocated science of society and coined the term sociology. Comte felt that human evolution in the 19th century had reached the positive stage in which empirical knowledge could be used to understand the social world and to create a better society. Comte became an advocate of the application of the scientific method to the study of society. He termed this scientific method as positivism. Throughout his life Comte has attempted to legitimate sociology as a study of separate discipline. “Comte saw the affinity between sociology and biology to reside in their common concern with organic bodies. This affinity led him to divide sociology into social “statics” or morphology, and “dynamics” or social growth and progress.” (Jonahhan H. Turner: 1997: 39)

Comte’s work has been heavily borrowed the idea from the biological science. He reintroduced the organic analogies into sociological inquiry and visualizes sociology as closely allied with the biological science. Comte saw that the F.R. was a crucial turning point in the entire human history. The reconstruction of the post-revolutionary disintegrated French society was a biggest challenge before Comte. Society was unable to cope with the new developments in scientific knowledge and
industrial progress that has taken place after the F.R. and the I.R. The new order of social institutions in keeping with the pace of changes had not taken firm hold. The cultural goals of people lacked coherence, confidence and worthwhile objectives. New social values were yet to shape up with the changing social structure and its functioning. Comte’s new science was basically aimed at social reconstruction. He believed that trained sociologists would reconstruct society on the basis of the values of family, morality and religion. In between the year 1851-1854, Comte wrote a treatise entitled *System of Positive Politics*. And there applied the findings of theoretical sociology towards solving the social problems of French history. According to Comte, sociology is the abstract theoretical science of social phenomena. He had initially called it social physics but was compelled to use the word sociology as the word “Social Physics” as it was already used by Belgian scientist Adolphe Quetelet to describe the simple statistics.

Comte has given evolutionary view of the human thought and developed *The Law of Three Stages*. In the theological stage, the mind explains phenomenon by ascribing them to beings or forces comparable to human beings. Human mind at this level supposes that all phenomena are produced by the immediate action supernatural beings. In other words this stage is dominated by the divine or religious values. In the metaphysical stage, the mind explains phenomenon by invoking abstract entities like ‘nature’. This stage is only a modification of theological stage. This stage is dominated by the modified divine values or religious values. In this stage human beings pursue meaning and explanation of the world in terms of ‘essences’, ‘ideals’, ‘forms’ or in other words it functions in a conception of some ultimate reality such as existence of god. The final stage is that of science or the positive stage. At this stage human beings cease to look for original sources or final causes because these could be neither checked against facts nor utilized to serve our needs. In this stage the human mind abandons the vain search after absolute notions, the origin and destination of the universe and the cause of phenomena. Hence, this stage is governed by the principles of rational values.

3.1.1.b. Herbert Spencer (1820-1903)

Herbert Spencer, an England born engineer contributed to various fields of knowledge like Philosophy, Biology, Psychology, Anthropology and Sociology. Like the other contemporary functionalist, Spencer saw the universe as divided into realms of the
inorganic (physical, chemical) the organic (biological and psychological) and super organic (sociological). (Ibid: 42) However, he borrowed these principles from the physics of his time and not like Comte who borrowed from the biology. Spencer continued to analogize the points of similarity between organicism and societies and began to develop functional requisite for organic and super organic bodies. According to him, the organic and super organic bodies reveal certain universal requisite that must be fulfilled in order to adapt an environment. He again says these same requisites exist for all organic and super-organic system. The above discussed ideas from August Comte and Herbert Spencer clearly reflects on how the biological science influences upon sociological values and understandings.

The focal point of Herbert Spencer’s sociological work such as, *Social Statics*, *The Study of Sociology*, *Principles of Sociology*, are dominated by the idea or values of evolutionary thought. According to Spencer throughout the progress of human society there has been social evolution from a simple, uniform or homogenous structure to a complex multiform or heterogeneous one. He was concerned with the evolutionary changes in social structure and social institution rather than with the attendant mental states. Most of his work emphasizes that changes in structure cannot occur without changes in functions and that increases in size of social units necessarily bringing in their wake progressive differentiation in social activities. “Indeed, much of Spencer’s discussion of social institutions and their changes are expressed in functional terms. Spencer’s point of departure is always the search for the functions sub served by a particular item under analysis.” (Coser: 1996:97)

3.1.1.c. Emile Durkheim (1858-1917)

Emile Durkheim, a French sociologist and a follower of Comteian tradition influenced by the 19th century preoccupation with biology. His early works were heavily infused with organismic terminology. In his major work *The Division of Labour in the society* (1960) Durkheim was sharply critical on Herbert Spencer. He attempted to establish sociology as an independent and distinct discipline of studies. His value orientation and value preferences with reference to social changes reflect in his work *The Division of Labour in the Society* (1960) and *The Elementary Form of Religious Life* (1968). The book maker’s statements at the beginning of the book *The Division of Labour in the
Society are pre-eminently an attempt to treat the facts of the moral life according to the methods of the positive science. (Emile Durkheim: 1960: 32)

Durkheim’s commitment to the belief clearly shows that it is possible to analyze moral facts in terms of the objective and value free methods of science. In his book, he wants to explain the effect of the division of labour of men on the basis of moral values. He also focuses with the increasing density of the population how the basic structure of the division of labour in the mechanical type of solidarity transfer into the organic type of solidarity. “A society with primitive technology and low degree of division of labour is characterized by the mechanical solidarity and a legal system based on repressive laws. With the increasing division of labour, organic solidarity emerges in the legal, which becomes more restitutive.” (Emile Durkheim: 1934: 319-28)

The theory of division of labour formulated by Durkheim is important for us to understand the differentiation of institution and increasing moral autonomy of the individual in the society. With a reference to Durkheim’s work, the values of society could be understood through mechanical and organic solidarity. Where he mentions how the division of labour leads at first to the separation of the industrial and commercial from agricultural labour, and hence to the separation of town and country and a clash of interest between them. Its development leads to the separation of commercial from industrial labour. At the same time there develops various divisions among the individuals cooperating in definite kinds of labour. Regarding the various stages of development in the division of labour in relation to individual and their ownership is stated by Durkheim as, “a contract which is fully consented to only if the services exchanged have an equivalent social value. Under these conditions each receives in effect the thing he desires and delivers what he gives in return so that each has a value for the other. To be sure, we sometimes desire more for our product than it is worth; our ambitions are limitless and consequently, are moderated only because they are restrained by those of the others.” (Emile Durkheim: 1960: 383)

Durkheim’s another work The Elementary Forms of Religious Life (1968) also shows the various functions performed in society through the values of religious cults, rites and beliefs. Here Durkheim is concerned with elucidating the particular functions of religion, how religious rituals prepare men for social life by imposing self, discipline and a certain measure of ascetism. Durkheim found the religious ceremonies bring
people together and thus serve to reaffirm their common bonds and to reinforce social solidarity. Religious observance maintains and revitalizes the social heritage of the group and helps transmit its enduring values to future generations.

3.1.1.d. Max Weber (1864-1920)

Max Weber is a German sociologist who developed a particular approach for sociological analysis of a wide range of areas such as economics, sociology, stratification, complex organizations, sociology of religion, authority and social change which are still significant in sociological research. In the development of theoretical orientations, however, Weber's influence has been less direct and particularly his influence on functionalism is less evident. But he has significantly contributed to the study of values in the discipline sociology.

Weber's impact on the emergence of functionalism generally could be understood through two aspects of Weber's work i.e. (1) Weber's substantive vision of social action and (2) his strategy for analyzing social structure. Weber argued that sociology must understand social phenomena on two levels, at the level of collective action among groupings of actors. "Weber's subjective view of the world and his strategy for analyzing its features were thus influenced by these dual concerns. In many ways, Weber viewed two realities that of the substantive meanings of actions and that of the emergent regularities of social institutions." (Jonathan H. Turner: 1997:53)

According to Weber, values are precisely the subject-matter and make possible a truly scientific study of human actions. He is a leading spokesman for what is usually labeled the value-free approach in sociology. There is no paradox or irony in Weber's dual contention that "values" make human behavior meaningful and value perspectives are necessarily forbidden to the scientist. For Weber values express means, which make behaviour rational with this believe. Weber worked out profoundly insightful methodology in terms of scientific method and value judgment. The scientific treatment of value judgment understands and empathetically analyzes the desire ends and ideals which underlie them and judge them also critically. Weber believes the philosophical tradition of Kantian idealism along with the positivists wished to ignore the value base of all human decisions.
Weber wished to establish the relationship between values and science as a creative and self-conscious balance vis-a-vis-antagonism (idealists) and alienation (positivist). Scientist cannot choose whether or not to make value judgments for as Rossider points out “values are what prompt science.” Rather, realizing that science itself is a value of western culture, scientist must either be self-consciously aware of their own value-commitments and judgments or else they are not. (F. Abraham and J.H. Morgan: 2004: 167)

Weber's sociology keeps values apart from social facts regarding the value freedom. In Weber's words, value is that which is set down as somehow desirable or worthy of being followed irrespective of whether we go after it or not. Values are based upon beliefs, not rationality so values attached beliefs regarding truth, wealth, beauty, honour and prestige. Clashes for choosing between different values, to prove what is valuable and what is not, go on from time to time in societies and in the minds of individuals for choice between alternatives. Values are what people acknowledge as precious. (Jaspal Singh: 1996: 29-30)

According to Weber's understandings, "values may be based on non-rational beliefs. He clearly saw values as separate from scientific facts. His doctrines of value-freedom do not mean that a scientific research may give up values from his own conduct. On the contrary, be stressed that values are windows of understanding society and culture." (Ibid: 30) Referring the value neutrality in social science research Weber says, while doing research, a researcher has to be impartial in his thought and writings during data interpretation. Weber also explains on value-rationality, "which means, one chooses appropriate means for reaching the desired objects. One accepts something as true, beautiful, ideal, and correct. He sets about to achieve it together with others like himself. The values are chosen without taking their consequences into consideration. He may not hesitate to even lay down his life for a cause. Such an action is value-rational, and ethical standards are also value rational." (Ibid: 32)

Weber argued that neither scientific nor philosophical analyses could solve the disputes arising out of ethical and cultural values. He believes that empirical scientific investigation could lead to the discovery of the ultimate motive of human behaviours. Moreover, his protestant ethic thesis demonstrated most brilliantly the causal connection between a particular value system and the birth of the capitalist order. From
Weber, we can learn the analysis of the psychological functions of different value system. His explanation focuses that values can be used as rationalizations for action chosen for interest reasons. In *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* Weber demonstrated the relationship between the values derived from the protestant ethic and the rise of capitalism. The unit of sociological analysis by Weber is social action where values occupy a key place. He formally defined social action as the subjectively meaningful behaviour and concerned with the analysis and understanding of values, as these are the important elements of any society and this is the foundation of Weber’s notion of value free sociology. “Weber’s concern with the empirical fact that with the modernization comes rationalization of values led him to identify the bureaucracy as one of the most important social organizations.” (Ratna Dutta: 1971: 58)

According to Weber’s theory, the common stimulus of industrialism would still result in different patterns of social institutions. Since each culture would adapt to this common stimulus unique and creative style. He states that the contemporary world is characterized by rationality and in his believes, the key to understand modern society is to be found in its rational features and rationalizing forces. Weber identifies two distinct types of rationality i.e. ‘Zweckrationalist’ or goal oriented ends based rationality and ‘Wetrationalitat’ or value based rationality. The former is characteristic of modern capitalist society and flows from goal oriented social action, and the latter one on the contrary is characteristic of social formations. It is involved with morality and touches upon emotions, sentiments and beliefs. Briefly saying Zweckrationalitat refers to rationalization of means and goals/ends. Reason and logical thinking are recommended in order to obtain ones desires where as Wetrationalitat, Weber believes that traditional societies did have rational elements in their social organization but these were defined in terms of values or norms. His concept of rationality as a modern value refers to those ideas and behaviours which are logically coherent and consistent and amenable to empirical knowledge. Rationalization refers to the process whereby, rationality is applied to various aspects and activities of life. Weber has applied the concept of rationality in sociological investigation with special reference to his plea for a value-free sociology. Weber believed that rationalization is the product of scientific specialization and technological differentiation of western culture and the key to understand modern society is to found in its rational features and rationalizing forces.
Weber views rationality as a process of rationalization of social system, and the sphere of rationalization is extended to economy, polity, religion, social organizations etc. As a part of rationalization Weber argued for a value free social science, a debate that continues even today in different terms. The important points of Weber’s value-free sociology are, firstly, the sociologist in their study of society is mainly concerned with the analysis and understanding of values, as these are the crucial elements of any society. Weber’s concern was that, the sociologist must not let their own values come in the way of a clear understanding of the subject matter. This is the basic foundation of a value free sociology. Secondly, the sociologist, as a human being is fundamentally involved in evaluating or passing certain value-judgments. Weber personally involved and he himself can hardly avoid having or living by values. According to Weber the values by which knowledge and science develops as the commitment to dispassionate inquiry. In this enquiry, the sociologists own experience of valuing or disvaluing is itself a data, giving insight into the meaning and relevance of that which he explores. Thirdly, the development of a value-free social science in this sense is necessary for creating a body of reliable and assured knowledge. And this knowledge can guide action only when the discipline of sociology itself becomes reliable.

Weber employed the term value orientation to pinpoint one of the differences between the subject matter of the social sciences and the subject matter of natural sciences. Weber believed that the major of the social sciences apart from the natural sciences was that human social action reflects an orientation to values. Human beings, according to this view, always act in relation to ends which they value, where as objects of the natural sciences act only in reference to the laws of nature. Examples of these values are to be found in laws, customs, language, economy, polity and religion. From this standpoint there emerged a fundamental distinction between the sciences of value and the sciences of fact. In sciences of fact values are irrelevant because they do not enter into the laws of nature, whereas in social sciences such as history and sociology, values are central because they concern themselves with human individuals whose actions reflect the judgments and evaluations of a surrounding social world.

He used the term value neutrality in his methodological study to indicate the necessary objectivity required by researchers in solving problems in the social sciences and the caution that investigators should exercise against making ‘value judgments’
which coincide with the particular orientation or motives of the researcher. Whereas the term value relevance was used by Weber to refer to the means by which specific aspects of reality are bought to the attention of scientific observers and isolated as a matter of investigative interest.

3.1.1.e. Talcott Parsons (1902-1979)

Talcott Parsons an American sociologist was probably the most dominant theorist of his time. Between the year 1950 and the late 1970s, Parsonian functionalism was clearly the focal point around which theoretical controversies were raged. Even now several years after his death, Parsons functional approach could not be neglected in the study of sociology. Talcot Parsons and his associates have formulated following kinds of significance regarding the values. These are mentioned below:

i. Values as points of reference in legitimizing the expression of dissatisfaction, which is one of the processes of differentiation.

ii. Values as point of reference in legitimizing the introduction of new ideas and experiments later in the process of differentiation. In these two roles values are conceived as central in the monitoring of process of social change.

iii. The generalization of values in the process of differentiation - that is their loss of situational specificity - so that more complicated structural arrangements in the process of differentiation that is the reinterpretation of their meaning in terms of new structural arrangements. (For more details see Ratna Dutta: 1971:52)

In his book The Structure of Social Action (1961), Parsons pointed out that any complete social action requires to fulfill four conditions i.e. goal orientation, it occurs in a particular situation, it is regulated by norms and values existing in the society and finally motivation or effort. When behaviour is seen in this analytical context, it can be defined as completed social action. Thus, Parsons orientation of action can be divided into two major components. One is the motivational orientation, refers to a situation in which action takes place taking into account needs, external appearance and plans. Second is value orientation that is based on considerations of standards of values, aesthetics, and morality and of thinking. Parsons also describes about the personality system, the cultural system and the social system. The personality system refers to
those aspects of the human personality which affect the individual's social functioning. The cultural system refers to the actual beliefs, concrete system of values and symbolic means of communication. The social system also refers to the forms and modes of interaction between individuals and organization. In a social system roles are institutionalized. Institutionalization means that expectations from a specific role, its values and motivational orientations are integrated within the culture of a society. Society sets common standards for role expectations from its members and imposes sanctions in terms of rewards for positive values and punishments for negative values (the values that violate social standards). In the context of Parsonian functionalism, it is necessary to distinguish between the instances where the pattern variables are used as indicators of norms. Parsons has conceptualized the pattern variables as values, and states, we feel that it is fruitful to treat the system function (pattern variable) scheme as the main frame of reference for analyzing the structural differentiation of the large scale society.

For Parsons, values and norms are considered as conceptions of the desirable behaviour. He has developed a classification of value patterns, which define role orientation in specific situations. Five pairs of action orientation were conceptualized. Two of those pairs (specificity/diffuseness and affectivity/affective-neutrality) are rooted in "need disposition" of the inter-acting personality (and achievement/ascription) are rooted in culturally shared standards of expected behaviour and the fifth pair (collectivity/self orientation) was "as it were between them". (Ratna Dutta: 1971: 58)

According Parsons, a value is a normative pattern, which defines desirable behaviour for a system in relation to his environment, without differentiation in terms of the functions of units or of their particular situations. A norm on the other hand is a pattern defining desirable behaviour for a unit or class of units it respects specific to it and differentiated from the obligation of other classes. Persons has usually described values as broad cultural meaning patterns rooted in traditions, has also assumed values in that sense remain stable, even where changes in all other segments of society takes place.
R. K. Merton an American sociologist becomes the serious rival of Talcot Parsons as a central figure in the theoretical developments in American sociology. He was influenced by Parsons and Sorokin. In his work *Social Theory and Social Structure* (1968) Merton tried to add value to the functional theoretical orientation in sociology. In other words he tried to re-evaluate the existing functional theory. Merton argued that in view of the general status of sociological knowledge and theory Parsons enterprise was over ambitious. Unlike other sociologist, R. K. Merton has very systematically codified and analyzed functionalism in sociological theory.

Merton’s first seminal work in the form of a theoretical frame was on *Social Structure and Anomie* (1968) that deals with explanation for deviant behaviour. And this explanation of deviance is centered first of all at the social level. Merton argues that, the traditional functionalism holds whatever exists in a structural or cultural level that serves a positive function, a social necessary purpose, or else it would not exist. His concern with values could be understood and explained in his work on theoretical contribution in the field of deviance, functions, middle range theory, reference group, role set and status set, etc. "Values provide an anchorage or a constant point of reference to an action system. whether at the level of an individual or a society and it does not mean that there is one value that dominates all actions of an individual or all sub-system of a society. Behaviour is typically oriented towards the basic values of the society that we may speak of a human aggregate as comprising of a society. Unless there is a deposit of values showed by interacting individuals. there exits social relations, if the disorderly interactions may be so called, but no society.” (R.K. Merton: 1968: 195) He argued that the existing social practices are not uniform for society. Thus practices might be positive, negative, or irrelevant for the social order. The differences in such practices are perhaps due to value preferences.

In Merton’s view, theories of the middle range offer more theoretical promise than Parsons grand theory. In his seminal work *Social Theory and Social Structure* (1968) Merton stated that, “middle range theory is principally cased in sociology to guide empirical inquiry. It is intermediate to general theories of social systems which are too remote from particular classes of social behaviour, organization and change to account for what is observed and to those detailed orderly descriptions of particulars
that are not generalized at all. Middle range theory involves, abstractions, of course but they are close enough to be incorporated in propositions that permit empirical testing. Middle range theory deal with delimited aspects of social phenomena, as is indicated by their labels. One speaks of a theory of reference groups, of social mobility, or role-conflict and of the formation of social norms just as one speaks of a theory of prices, a germ theory of disease, or a kinetic theory of gasses.” (Ibid: 39: 40)

In his functionalist analysis Merton pointed out three related assumptions. The first, he assumes the ‘postulate of functional unity’ of society which refers that any part of the social system is functional for the entire system. He argues that such functional unity is not uniform for the whole society. For instance in complex and highly differentiated societies the functional unity is doubtful. Referring religious pluralism Merton says, in a society with a variety of faiths, religion may tend to divide rather than unite. Thus value consensus integrates the various parts of society. Similarly common values produce common goals and different values produce different goals.

The second assumption ‘postulate of universal functionalism’ states that all standardized social or cultural forms have positive functions. Merton argues that, every aspect of social system performs a positive function is not valid one. He says that any part of society may be functional, dysfunctional or non-functional. For example poverty may be seen as dysfunctional for the poor but functional for the non poor and for society as a whole. Similarly social values may be functional, dysfunctional or non functional for society as value are not uniform and it differs from individual and society. “The concept of dysfunction, which implies the concept of strain, strain and tension on the structural level, provides an analytical approach to the study of dynamics and change. (Ibid: 107)

His third assumption directed towards the ‘postulate of indispensability’ which refers, if a social pattern is well established, it must be meeting some basic needs of the system, and hence it must be indispensable. Changing the part does not presage the collapse of the whole, and certain parts of a social system can be eliminated or modified. To replace the idea of indispensability, Merton suggests the concept of functional equivalents, “functional alternatives and functional substitute”. In functional analysis Merton used the concept like latent and manifest functions. The manifest functions are those objective consequences contributing to the adjustment or adaptation
of the system which are intended and recognized by participants in the system. And the latent functions are those which are neither intended nor recognized. Drawing the idea of functions, dysfunctions latent and manifest functions one can apply it in the context of social values. For instance the values of child marriage have all the character of functional, dysfunctional as well as latent and manifest functions. Because child marriage is acceptable to some society and not acceptable to some others if the child marriage is directed to perform social obligation which is a manifest function but simultaneously it has latent function that is, the early marriage may causes physical problem as well as increases population growth.

Defining social structure and anomie Merton argues that anomie/deviance results from the culture and structure of society itself. Drawing idea from the functionalist position of value consensus he says that all members of society are placed in different positions in the social structure and they do not have the same opportunity of realizing the shared values. This situation can generate deviance. In Merton’s views the social and cultural structure generates pressure for socially deviant behaviour upon people variously located in that structure.

3.1.2. The Study of Values in the Conflict Approaches in Western Sociological Tradition

The conflict theory is originated in the academic debate as a critic to the functionalists for their positivistic approaches to understand the social phenomena. During the 1950s the essential of the Parsonian functionalism were unfolding and a body of criticism was taking place. Simultaneously the functional theory in sociology especially the Parsonian variety was seen as under emphasizing the conflict nature of social reality. David Lockwood maintained that Parsonian systems in equilibrium maintain social order but it also produces systematical disorder and change. Lockwood argued there are mechanisms in society that make conflict inevitable and inexorable. There are two distinct traditions of conflict theory in the classical works. Firstly, the power relations tradition of political philosophy in which Machiavelli, Bodin, Hobbes and Mosca have analyzed conflicts in the polity in terms of power relationships and have treated the state as the central object of analysis. Secondly, the tradition of competitive struggle in classical economics where the scholars like Adam Smith, Robert Malthus and
The sociological theory is largely a synthesis of these two traditions with primary focus on the unequal distribution of rewards in society. Karl Marx is known as its leading architect. Some other sociologists like Pareto, C. Wright Mills, Ralf Dahrendorf, Lewis Coser, George Simmel, Veblen, Gramsci, etc, are well known for their conflict theoretical approach in contemporary sociology. (For more details see Sister Marie Augusta Neal: 1965: 1-6) however, some of them are discussed in this chapter.

The conflict theories tend to be very specific and restricted to the interrelationship between two more units within society. Racial tension, ideological differences, class war, religious conflicts, strikes protests, students' movements, revolutions, environmental movements and pleasant uprisings etc often become subjects of analysis. But in the context of India caste conflict is one of the central issues of conflict.

3.1.2.a. Karl Marx (1818-1883)

Karl Marx a German philosopher and social thinker, considered as the master theoretician of conflict sociology. He says the existence of different social classes is the continuous source of inevitable conflict and changes in the social structure which occur through violent upheavals affecting class composition. Class struggle constitutes the central theme of Marx's theoretical framework. For Marx, the history of all existing society is the history of class struggle. "Marx’s perception regarding value is based on economic relationship among the individual in the society. Karl Marx asserted that value formation and social change is initiated by conflict of interest group. He claims that current power elite resist changes in value change in value terms. People accept responsibility to initiate change when they become aware that their special interests are in fact exploited by the very structure of the social system. The values institutionalized are in all cases the values of the ruling class. (Ratna Dutta: 1971: 22)

The ruling classes shape social values according to their favour, protect their vested interests and compel other lower class or suppressed people to follow those values. Those social values are not shared values, hence these inequalities among the
people leading to social conflict. What is good for society is not necessarily good for the individual, for often there is a basic conflict between the interests of the two. The ideas of the ruling class are in every age, the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the dominant material force in society is at the same time its dominant intellectual force. (F. Abraham: 1994: 114) Men create his own surroundings according to his consciousness, that allows values preferences and adapt its life style as per the relations of productions. For Marx, man creates both himself and his idols through his labour in manipulating and acting as he goes about making a living; man changes not only his environment but his own nature- psychologically indeed physically. (Ratna Dutta: 1971: 46)

For Marx, history is a succession of discovering new techniques of production involving new modes of production, resulting in differing social organization of man. The social institutions adapt to particular technological periods through adaptive process and which further stimulate the growth of the scientific and technological genius of the period. Because of the advance of science and technology, there evolves again a new mode of organization of production, this gives rise to the necessity for breaking down the sanctity of the social institutions of the preceding technological period. However, for Marx the reformation movement or in his terms, the revolutionary conflicts become necessary to overthrow the old order, because there are entrenched vested interests in the established system of production and social relationships. His book *Capital, Critique of Political Economy* (1909) shows how commercial capital in England was transformed into commercial capital in Europe. How an economy primarily based on trade and consumption was transformed into one primarily based on capital accumulation and "round about methods of production". Fundamental changes had taken place in the cultural climate and social structure of that period. Perhaps the most far reaching change was the reformulation of the social values that describe the ultimate meanings about life and death.

According to Marx, the most distinguishing characteristic of any society is its form of property, and the crucial determinant of an individual’s behaviour is his relation to property. The classes are determined on the basis of individual’s relation to the means of production. Moreover, Marx says the economic conditions of the particular historic era determined the social, political and legal arrangements and set in
motion the processes of evolution and social transformation. The economic power of
the rich is transformed into political power, and the entire political processes and
institutions including the courts, the police and the military and the rating elites become
subservient to the interest of the capitalist. Marx used the term like ‘use values’ and
exchange values of a commodity in economic terms. In his theory of surplus value
Marx exclusively explained how the capitalists accumulate profit through the
exploitation of labour. Marx used the term ‘surplus value’ to refer to the quantity of
value produced by the worker beyond the necessary labour time.

Marx saw humans as being unique by virtue of their conscious awareness are
capable of self-reflection and can assess their situation. They can also use their
capacities for thought and reflection to construct new material conditions and
corresponding social relations. For Marx, Morality, religion metaphysics, all the rest of
ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness, no longer retain their
semblance of independence. They have no history, no development but men,
developing their material production and their material intercourse, alter along with this
their real existence, their thinking and products of their thinking. Life is not determined
by consciousness, but consciousness by life. (Karl Marx and F. Engels: 1974: 15)

From the philosophy and literature on socio-economic issues of Marx, one can
put the whole weight of the explanation of values and ideologies in structural factors
such as the level of technological development, type of social class relations between
groups of people co-operating to produce economic goods, and the type of political
economy necessitated by all this. And how the new value formulation take place after
the revolution.

3.1.2.b. Georg Simmel (1858-1918)

Georg Simmel, a German philosopher and thinker well known in sociology for his
immediate and profound effect on the development of American sociological theory.
Much like Marx, Simmel viewed conflict as ubiquitous and inevitable in society.
Unlike Marx, Simmel did not viewed social structure as a domination and subjugation
but he says as inseparable mingling associative and dissociative processes, which are
separable only in analysis. Simmel’s ‘organismic’ view of the social world led him to
seek out the consequence of conflict for social continuity rather than change. According
to Simmel, “conflict is thus designed to resolve dualisms; it is a way of achieving some kind of unity, even if it be through the annihilation of one of the conflicting parties. This is roughly parallel to the fact that it is the most violent symptom of a disease which represents the effort of the organism to free itself of disturbances and damages caused by them.” (Jonathan H. Turner: 1995: 139) From this statement it could be analyzed that, Simmel rather speaking subjugation and domination of values, speaks about the continuity of the conflicting values. This continuity is a way of achieving some kind of unity. He viewed conflict as a reflection of conflicting interest and hostile instincts that lie in the innate biological makeup of human actors. Simmel tried to maintain and analyze the positive consequences of conflict for the maintenance of social wholes and their subunits. His analysis of conflict is loaded in the direction of how conflict promotes solidarity and unification. In another sense Simmel took conflict as positive values. Simmel belongs to formal school of sociology. To Simmel, the forms found in social reality are never pure: every social phenomenon contains a multiplicity of formal elements. “Co-operation and conflict, subordination and super ordination, intimacy and distance all may be operative in a marital relationship or in a bureaucratic structure. In concrete phenomena, moreover, the presence of a multiplicity of forms leads to their interference with one another, so that none of them can ever be realized in purity. There is no “pure” conflict in social life, just as there is no “pure” cooperation. “Pure” forms are constructs, that is, typical relationships never to be completely realized. Simmel’s forms are not generalizations about aspects of reality, but they tend to heighten or to exaggerate “so as to bring out configurations and relations which underlie reality but are not factually actualized in it.” (Lewis Coser: 1996: 181)

Simmel Views conflict as a variable that manifests different states of intensity or violence. The greater is the degree of emotional involvement of parties to a conflict the more likely is the conflict to be violent. From the Simmel’s views on conflict one can understand and explain the emotional values that has attached with the social reality. He also says the less intense attachment (of emotional values) and violent conflicts that promoted the solidarity, integration, and orderly change of the system. (Ibid: 140)
In the sociological work of George Simmel it reflects how he examines the forms of group process and structural arrangement derives from the value of sheer quantitative relationship. Simmel talked about monad, dyad and tried type of groups in terms of relationship. A dyadic relationship differs qualitatively from all other types of groups in that each of the two participants. "Because this type of group depends only on two participants, the withdrawal of one would destroy the whole: for its life it needs both, but for its death, only one." (Ibid: 186) He further explains that, "when a third member enters a dyadic group, various processes become possible where previously they could not take place. When a dyad is transformed into a triad, the apparently insignificant fact that one member has been added actually brings about a major qualitative change. The triad is the simplest structure in which the group as a whole can achieve domination over its component members: It provides a social framework that allows the constraining of individual participants for collective purposes. (Ibid: 187)

To sum up Simmel's views on conflicts with referring social values, he saw how the intensity of emotional arousal maintains some kind of social solidarity. Simmel also took conflict as positive function that shapes the social order.

3.1.2.c. C. Wright Mills (1916-1962)

C. Wright Mills is an America born Sociologist, elaborated a radical perspective borrowing from Marxian thought and systematically developed one version of conflict theory in his book Power Elite (1969). In this book he criticized the military elites and their interest in the fallen world of corporate America in terms of an idea of participatory democracy existed in America. According to mills, "any macro sociological analysis worth its salt had to be grounded in concern with the struggle for power between conflicting classes, between rulers and ruled, between the high and mighty and the common man." (Ibid: 580) In the Power Elite (1969), he concentrates on the power as the base of social change and conflict. The conflicting values in American society could be understood from Mills theory in relation to that of economic, social and political power in American society. How it is manipulated by the three interlocking hierarchies such as the military, the industrial and the political elites. He explained the hierarchical order of the American society keeping top the economy (among the corporate rich, are the chief executives) at the top of the political order, the members of the political directorate and at the top of the military establishment are the
elite of soldier-states men clustered in and around the joint chiefs of staff and the upper echelon.

However, Mills theory describes how the military-industrial complex that expounds the principle of a monolithic power structure in American society reflects the American values. The economic, political and military elites hail from the same kinds of families, having superior education of prestigious institutes and enjoy important connections ultimately paves the way for direct access to strategic power centre. In other sense how the values of American social set up serve the purpose of these elites who have similar educations, careers, and life styles.

Members of the power elite, in Mills arguments are different from the ordinary people in their societies. They hold positions in society in which they make decisions with major consequence in their favour on a historical scale. Simultaneously, they transcend the every day environments of ordinary people by having the quality of mind necessary to control events. However, Mills describe elites in contrast to ordinary people. The ordinary people who are bounded by the commitments and concerns of every day life such as work, family and neighborhood - within these boundaries, they make decisions, but these decisions of any ordinary person are constrained by the imposition of poorly understood forces and do not ordinarily influence the lives of many others. Mills further argued that, the elite form a cohesive social and psychological entity, that they are "self conscious members of a social class" and possess a similar world view. They are frequently perceived as they perceive themselves: as born to command, as higher types of individuals, as possessors of superior energy and morality. They are unified and, in many respects, interchangeable. (William D. Perdue: 1986: 346)

Mills in his work *White Collar: The American Middle Class* (1951), stated that, "the competition was the process by which men rose and fell and by which the economy as a whole was harmonized. But for men in the era of classic liberalism, competition was never merely an impersonal mechanism regulating the economy of capitalism, or only a guarantee of political freedom. He also stated that, the competitive spirit, especially when embodied in an ethic which is conceived to be the source of all virtue, abounds only where there is consciousness of unlimited opportunity, whenever
there is consciousness of scarcity, of a limited, contracting world, then competition becomes a sin against one's fellows.” (C. Wright Mills: 1951: 38)

Discussing social hierarchy and power structure Mills says how American are concern for their class. “Class consciousness is not equally characteristic of all levels of American society: it is most apparent in the upper class. Among the underlying population every where in America there is much confusion and blurring of the lines of demarcation, of the status, value of clothing and housing, of the ways of money -making and of money spending. The people of the lower and middle classes are of course difference by the values, things, and experience to which differing amounts of income lead, but often they are aware neither of their values nor of their class bases.” (Ibid: 30-31)

In other words power, wealth and prestige influences American values. In the context of rural urban pattern of social arrangement in American society and how their values differ, Mills says, “all truly old ways in America are, of course rural. Yet the value of rural origin and of rural residences is sometimes ambiguous on the one hand. there is the tradition of the town hick and in many smaller cities, some prestige is achieved by those who, unlike the lower working classes, have in the city for all of one generation. On the other hand, men who have achieved eminence often boast of the solidarity of their rural origin; which may be due to the Jeffersonian ethos which holds rural virtues to be higher than the ways of the city, or to the desire to show how very far one has come.” (Ibid: 39)

The theme of American hierarchical power structure that shapes the American social values Mills stated that, apart from the top order power groups in economy, political directorate and military warlords, there has developed on the middle values of power, a semi organized statement, and that on the bottom level there has come into being a mass like society, which voluntary associations and classic publics hold the keys to power. The top of the American system of power is much more unified and much more powerful, the bottom is much more fragmented and is truth, impotent, than is generally supposed by those who are distracted by the middling units of power which neither express such will as exists of the bottom nor determine the decisions of the top.
Lewis Coser (1913-2003)

Lewis Coser, a German-born sociologist settled in America. His theoretical propositions are solely drawn from George Simmel's classic work on 'conflict'; in the functions of social conflict Coser formalized, clarified, and expanded his ideas in sociology. He has written extensively on the positive functions of the conflict. "He began by nothing that conflict serves certain "binding" or integrative functions. Specifically, it sharpens the boundary lines that provide groups members with a distinctive identity." (William D. Perdue: 1986: 22) For Coser conflict allows expression of hostility and the mending of strained relationships. However, "Coser addressed conflict as a regular feature of social life and attempted to specify its functions with respect to both change and stability. He also states, Conflict of interests and values, and contradictions among alternatives existing within a culture, are recognized to be ubiquitous and to be expressed in the history of the society in a variety of ways." (William D. Perdue: 1993: 75)

In the social conflict and theory of social change, he argues that, conflict within and between groups in a society can prevent accommodations and habitual relations from progressively impoverishing creativity. "The clash of values and interests, the tension between what is and what some groups feel ought to be, the conflict between vested interests and new strata and groups demanding their share of power, wealth and status, have been productive of vitality; note for example the contrast between the 'frozen world' of the middle ages and the burst of creativity that accompanied the thaw that set in with Renaissance civilization." (F. Abraham: 1994: 136) He also says that conflicts of interest and values or conflict between interest groups prevent stagnation and preserve vitality. They prevent accommodations and habitual arrangements from stifling creativity. While dealing positive aspects of conflict, Coser says, social conflicts not only generate new norms and institutions but also bring about technological improvements, revitalize the economy, and lubricate the social system that facilitate the release of tension and frustration and enable the social system to adjust itself.

Coser speaks about the causes of conflict, the violence of conflict, the duration of conflict and the functions of social conflict. The withdrawal of legitimacy from an existing system of inequality is the causes of conflict. The withdrawal of legitimacy will be likely when little mobility is allowed. However, the withdrawal of legitimacy is likely to result in conflict when people must first become emotionally aroused. In an
explanation to the violence of conflict, Coser pointed out the level of violence that indicates and depends on how the groups engage in conflict over realistic issues. Coser also says about the conflict over non-realistic issues' such as ultimate values, beliefs, ideology and vaguely defined class interests are emotionally mobilize participants, then the conflict will become violent. And in a system where there are high degrees of functional interdependence among the actors, then conflict is less likely to be violent. But the decrease in functional interdependence will tend to be nonrealistic and violent. Coser argues that although violence is destructive in the short run but it may have long term favourable consequences for the system in which it occurs. Coser views time factor in terms of the duration of the conflict. Conflict could be terminated after attaining the goal. Absolute conflict is terminated only when at least one of the antagonists is completely destroyed. However, victory and defeat are recognized by both sides and conflict is terminated. In his propositions on conflict Coser says, the more leaders of conflicting parties can perceive that complete attainment of goals is possible at only very high costs, the less prolong is the conflict. (Jonathan H. Turner: 1995: 172)

According to Coser the functions of social conflict which is mentioned earlier, that, conflict promotes integration based on solidarity, clear authority, functional interdependence and normative control over society and it is adaptive. However, he further says about the functions of conflict for the respective parties and the functions of conflict for the society as a whole.

3.1.2.e. Ralf Dahrendorf (b. 1929)

Ralf Dahrendorf a German sociologist describes in his work on authority as a form of 'conflict' as opposed to 'order' sociology. He advances a pluralist theory of social conflict based on shifting interest groups. His theory of conflict is an explicitly middle-range theory of conflict and social change. For Dahrendorf, the process of institutionalization of social conflict involves due to the creation of "imperatively coordinated association" (ICAs) that in term of criteria not specified; represent a distinguishable organization of roles. This organization is power relationships, with some clusters of roles having power to extract conformity from others. These power relations in ICAs tend to become legitimated and can therefore be viewed as authority relations in which some positions have the "accepted" or "normative right" to dominate.
of command. The intensity of the conflict varies directly with the amount of structural change it will generate. The violence of conflict varies directly with the speed of structural change. For Dahrendorf class conflict is only one form of a more general social conflict. For example, societies routinely feature bipolar clashes between races, age groups, rich and poor, men and women etc. Throughout human history, ideology, values, lifestyles, customs and belief systems have provided ammunition for social unrest. Dahrendorf is the major exponent of the position that society has two faces (conflict and consensus) and that the sociological theory therefore should be divided into two parts, conflict theory and consensus theory. Consensus theorists should examine value integration in society, and conflict theorists should examine conflicts at interest and the coercion that holds society together in the face of these stresses. (George Ritzer: 1988: 107) It is clear from Dahrendorfs dialectical conflict theory that, the conflict theorists like the functionalist have studied social structures and institutions. However, the orientations of conflict theorists are often the direct opposites of functionalist positions. For the functionalists society is static or in a state of moving equilibrium, but for Dahrendorf and other conflict theorists every society at any point of time tends to conflict and change.

Functionalist views that society held together informally by norms, values, and common morality. Where as conflict theorists believe whatever order there is in society as stemming from the coercion of some members who are at the top ladder of the society. Where functionalist focus on shared social values, there conflict theorists emphasize the role of power and authority in maintaining order in society. The elements of the social system are functionally inter-related and the functional approaches to sociology are basically an attempt to understand social phenomena in terms of their relation to some system. Whereas conflict theorists say, conflict is inherent in the social structure, it is not always violent or manifest. Social conflict can be latent, regulated or momentarily constrained.

3.1.2.f. Vilfredo Federico Damaso Pareto (1848-1923)

Vilfredo Federico Damaso Pareto popularly known as Vilfredo Pareto is by profession an Italian engineer, political economist and sociologist. His views on society as a system in equilibrium have been greatly influential in the study of sociology. Pareto in his scientific approach to understand individual and society, had discover a means of
rationality explaining the pervasiveness of irrationality and non-rationality in human behavior. In his study Pareto was interested to construct a system of sociological theory and method along the line of physiology and chemistry.

In order to understand Pareto’s conflict approach in his sociological writings, the following abstracts has been quoted in the English translated work of Derick Mirfin, *Vilfredo Pareto, Sociological Writings*, (1966) selected and introduced by S.E. Finer. Following are some of the important concepts and terminologies explained by Pareto and translated by Derick Mirfin. The following works has been abstracted from this book.

**Equilibrium:** society is to be regarded as a number of interdependent forces together constituting a system in moving equilibrium.

**External Forces:** Some of these forces are external to the individual, e.g; soil, climate, race and external pressures both in space and time. Since all affect and enter into the next set of factors, they may be temporarily disregarded.

**Internal Forces:** These other forces are the internal drives of human beings, notably their inclinations, aptitude and interests as manifested in their beliefs and theories.

**Social Heterogeneity:** By virtue of their psychic make-up, human beings are heterogeneous and unequal, and fall into different social strata and selfish.

**Elite Rule:** The most important societal distinction is between the governing elite (a minority) and the governed (majority). Irrespective of the form of the regime, all societies are governed by minority elites.

**Circulation of Elites:** Individuals move in and out of these categories. In certain cases, one elite displaces another en bloc. Such movements constitute the circulation of elite.

**Logical and Non-logcal Behavior:** Some human actions are logical (rational); other actions are non-logical (non-rational). This fact is concealed by the human tendency to “logically” non logical activity and makes it seem logical.

**Social Utility:** A belief or theory may be useful to society however non-logical it may be, and vice versa. Its utility is not correlated with its scientific truth or falsity.

**Residue and Derivation:** Non-logical theories contain a constant element and a variable element. The constant element is called a residue, which (it is assumed)
manifests human sentiments or states of mind. It lies at the root of otherwise very
dissimilar theories, being tricked out and masked by a logical or pedagogical element
called a derivation. The residue is non-logical and manifests some basic human impulse
or attitude; as the unvarying element in multitudinous theories of activities, it is the true
object of sociological enquiry, the derivations being more masks or veils. There are six
main classes of residues. The most important, socially, are the first two: class I, which
is the instinct of combining; and class II which represents the propensity to conserve
elements already combined and is styled the persistence of aggregates. The first class is
essentially innovatory, the second conservative.

Residue Distribution: Though the residue of one society usually differ from those of
another, in any given society they change little for society as a whole; but their
destruction between the social strata of that society changes markedly.

Alternatives of Elites: The relationship between the governing elite and the governed
is determined by the way in which class I and class II residues are distributed
between them. Governing groups with a preponderance of class I residues preponderate
tend to be bureaucratic, idealistic, conservative; they rule by force. The proportion of
class I to class II residues in the governing elite alternates through time. As the class I
residues preponderate in the rulers, so the class II residues build up among the ruled;
the governing elite in this way comes to lose the propensity to use force, while the
tendency to employ it builds up among the governed. So, ultimately either by
infiltration or revolution from below, the governing elite is displaced by new elite
drawn from the ranks of the former governed section of society. This process continues,
the new governing elite in time being overthrown, for the same reason.

Economic-Cultural Cycle: Other social phenomena economic, intellectual and
cultural—also alternate, their alternatives being interdependent with the political cycle,
as above.

Interdependent Factors: As a first approximation to the form taken by the social
equilibrium, the following factors should be isolated, and it is their interdependence,
which must be traced: a. Interests; b. Residues; c. Derivations; d. Social Heterogeneity
and Circulation.
According to Pareto, the form of society is determined by all the elements acting upon it, and in turn, it reacts upon them. Action and reaction follow one another indefinitely as in a circle. The movements and counter movements adjust themselves to another to produce a state of equilibrium. Accidental movements arising in a society are neutralized by the counteracting movements they provoke and ultimately, they die away and society reverts to its previous state. A society where this occurs can therefore be considered as being in a state of equilibrium. Real societies are in continual motion and their condition is one of dynamic equilibrium. Pareto says that "society in its entirely being borne along by a general movement which slowly modifies it. In the science of mechanics, the observer can apply the concept of dynamic equilibrium. The social scientist cannot; instead, he has to consider society as moving from one static equilibrium to another static equilibrium, in a continual series. Imagine, says pare to, two men descending a mountain side. One slides down from rock to rock. The first illustrates dynamic equilibrium, the second the series of static equilibrium which is appropriate to social enquiries". (Ibid: 32)

According to Pareto Individuals are not intellectually, morally or physically equal, and society is not homogeneous on the contrary, it is composed of vastly numerous social groups, mixing in innumerable ways. In any particular grouping, some people are more capable than the others. Those who are most capable in their peculiar branch of activity, whether this be playing chess or playing the prostitute, thieving or defining thieves in the law courts, writing poetry or governing the country, are the select persons of their particular grouping to the elite and the non-elite shade into one another by imperceptible degrees; but that is no reason why, as a first approximation, one cannot recognize able it by some arbitrary line- that some of the population are elite in their various branches of activity and others are non-elite. So we can, crudely divide society into a. the lower stratum and b. the superior stratum. This later in turn can be divided in to two groups: those who directly or indirectly play some considerable part in governing (and who are referred to as the governing elite and later- and more frequently as the governing class or the governing classes), and the rest of the elite, not in government i.e. 'the non-governing elite'. "In so far as members of the non-elite part of the population accede to the governing elite, and members of the governing
elite sink into the mass of the non-elite, we have a so called "circulation of the elites". (Ibid: 55)

In his explanation on social conflicts, by giving examples Pareto states that, "let us suppose there is a society in which a dominant section A, and a subject. Section B, are hostile to one another. Both could appear as they really are. But more often than not it will be the case that the dominant group want to appear to be acting for the common grad, hoping thus to reduce the opposition of the subject group. This latter, advantage it is seeking." (Ibid: 155) According to Pareto, "in such a society, there emerges between the two hostile sections, A and B a third section, C, which has links with both and may be found some times on are side and sometimes on the other. Eventually A splits into two groups: one group – which we call A1-has still enough strength to defend its portion of authority; the other group-A2 consists of degenerate individuals, weak in intelligence and will, in our day they are called humanitarians. Similarly, section B1 constitutes the new nascent aristocracy; it receives elements from A who, out of greed and ambition, betray their own class and put themselves at the head of its adversaries. The other groups B-B2- comprise s the common mass which forms the largest section in human society. (Ibid: 156)

It may be concluded Pareto's conflict approach to understand social reality by referring to continuity of social movements. According to Pareto, "the social order is never at perfect rest; it is a perpetual state of becoming; but the speed of the movement varies. In antiquity the movement is detectable as much at sport as at Athens; in our own day it is at work in societies as diverse as China and England. (Ibid: 299) Like the social continuation of social movements, how there is the circulation of elites takes place and one category of elite subsequently replace the other category of elite in the sphere of politics.

3.1.2.g. Thorstein Bunde Veblen (1857-1929)

Veblen, a leading American Sociologist was an inspiring figure of scholars like John Kenneth Galbraith and C. Wright Mills. He held several university posts and "during his thirty-year academic career he attacked every major institutions and practice in American life that had been or were regarded as sacrosanct; these included emulatory consumption and waste, institutional religion, absentee ownership, sports and games,
the subjugation of women, and aspects of academic life, including the entrepreneurial role of administrator.” (Rick Tilman: 1993: ix) If we analyse Veblen’s sociological works locating it in conflict approach in the study of values in sociology, “Veblen’s theory is powerfully dualistic, and in his interlocking dualisms his own values are vitally important. One conflict in his work is the struggle between the animistic and the matter-of-fact, between superstition and science, between that which is magical and that which is empirically demonstrable. A second dualism manifest throughout his work is that which pits technology, that is, the machine process and the industrial arts, against stagnant, change-resistant institutions that impede technology’s progress. A variation on this is the conflict between business and industry, that is, the cleavage between pecuniary and industrial employments, between those who make money, and those who produce socially useful goods and services. A conflict thus exists between those who perform what Veblen sees as socially wasteful roles and those who have useful social functions.” (Rick Tilman: 1993: xvii)

Rejecting the utopian character of the Marxism Veblen pinned his political hopes on a version of technism. However, “Veblen’s theory of evolutionary stages may well be relegated to the museum of antiquities, but his more general theory of technological determination, though often blended with one or other form of Marxism, has continued to exert influence among contemporary social scientists. (Lewis A. Coser: 1996: 266) His theory of social change is essentially a technological theory of history. According to him, the technology available to a society, determines the character of its culture. He believes that a new technology does not automatically bring forth new systems of laws, new moral attitudes, or new types of education. Rather, it challenges old institutions and evokes their resistance. His famous book *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899), deals with Veblen’s theory of status emulation where he argued that social classes competitively emulate the social strata next above them. “This is one wittingly or not in order to increase their own social status and thus their sense of self-worth and esteem. But emulatory consumption itself is not value-neutral type of behaviour rather, it is an often intense form of competitive rivalry aimed at status enhancement and, perhaps, also at power aggrandizement. In any case, Veblen believed that those classes most able to conspicuously consume, waste, and avoid useful labor are most likely to command social honor and deference from other
classes." (Rick Tilman: 1993: xix-xx) Veblen preferred consumption that was functional and instrumental in enhancing the life process of the community. Such consumption aimed at the satisfaction of biological rather than status needs, at human serviceability.

"The institution of a leisure class is found in its best development at the higher stages of the barbarian culture; for instance, in feudal Europe or feudal Japan. In such communities the distinction between classes is very rigorously observed; and the feature of most striking economic significance in these class differences is the distinction maintained between the employments proper to the several classes. The upper classes are by custom exempt or excluded from industrial occupations, and are reserved for certain employments to which a degree of honour attaches." (Thorstein Bunde Veblen: 1899: 01) It is the main purpose of Veblen's enquiry to discuss the place and value of the leisure class as an economic factor in modern life.

"The leisure class as a whole comprises the noble and the priestly classes, together with much of their retinue. The occupations of the class are correspondingly diversified; but they have the common economic characteristic of being non-industrial. These non-industrial upper class occupations may be roughly comprised under government, warfare, religious observance, and sports." (Ibid: 02) According to Veblen, division of labour considers with the distinction between the working and the leisure class as it appears in the higher barbarian culture. As the diversification and specialization of employments proceed, the line of demarcation so drawn comes to divide the industrial from the non-industrial developments." (Ibid: 04) Veblen points out that the distinction between exploit and drudgery is an individual distinction between employments. Veblen has suggested that wherever the institution of private property is found even in a slightly developed form, the economic process bears the character of a struggle between men for the possession of goods. (Ibid: 24)

Giving statement on values and valuer Veblen has stated that, "the connection which is here insisted on between the reputability and the apprehended beauty of objects lies through the effect which the fact of reputability has upon the valuer's habits of thought. He is in the habit of forming judgments of value of various kinds-economic, moral, aesthetic, or reputable concerning the objects with which he has to do, and his attitude of commendation towards a given object on any other ground will affect the
degree of his appreciation of the object when he comes to value it for the aesthetic purpose. This is more particularly true as regards valuation on grounds so closely related to the aesthetic ground as that of reputability. The valuations for the aesthetic purpose and for the purpose of repute are not held apart as distinctly as might be. Confusion is especially apt to arise between these two kinds of valuation, because the value of objects for repute is not habitually distinguished in speech by the use of a special descriptive term.” (Ibid: 149-150) Veblen argues that, the ground on which discrimination between facts is habitually made changes as the interest from which the facts are habitually viewed changes. “Those facts at hand are silent and substantial upon which the dominant interest of the time throws its light. Any given ground of distinction will seem substantial to anyone who habitually apprehends the facts in question for a different purpose. The habit of distinguishing and classifying the various purposes and directions of activity prevails of necessity always and everywhere; for it is indispensable in reaching a working theory or scheme of life. The particular point of view or the particular characteristic that is pitched up on as definitive in the classification of the facts of life depends upon the interests from which a discrimination of the facts is sought. (Ibid: 9)

It is clearly understood from the Veblen's work that how values differs among the working and the leisure class and arises conflict between them. If we analyse Veblen's Work we can find that, the grounds of discrimination, and the norm of procedure in classifying the facts, therefore, progressively change as the growth of culture proceeds; for the end for which the facts of life are apprehended changes, and the point of view consequently changes also. So that what are recognized as the silent and decisive features of class of activities or of a social class at one stage of culture will not retain the same relative importance for the purposes of classification of at any subsequent stage.

3.1.2.h. Antonio Gramsci (1891 – 1937)

Gramsci is an Italian Marxist revolutionary theorist and a noted critic of economic determinism, well known for his popular concept of hegemony. He was a journalist, prominent political activist, parliamentarian and a leader of the Italian Communist Party. Towards the last stage of his career he became a political prisoner of Musolini. From the year 1947 onwards Gramsci's importance was progressively growing inside
and outside of Italy. That is why perhaps it is rightly stated that “if the history of Marxist theory during the 1960s can be characterized by the reign of ‘althusserianism’, then now we have, without a doubt, entered a new phase: i.e. ‘gramscism’. For some years now we have been witnessing an unprecedented development of interest in the work of Antinio Gramsci and the influence of his thought. Some of his writings now known as *The Prison Notebooks* (1929-35) which was also edited and translated into English in the year 1971 covers wider range of topics are intellectuals, education, Italian history, political parties, fascism, hegemony and fordism. The ideas and concepts contributed by Gramsci became a pivotal debate and developed as conflict approach within the Marxian tradition reflecting the associated values in the areas of political sociology. It was generally accepted that at the heart of Gramsci’s thought there is an elaboration of a series of concepts crucial to a theory of politics. The realization of this forms the main axis of the most recent work on Gramsci. “Gramsci’s political theory therefore, becomes a theory of the struggle of the masses in the network of the state where the social reproduction of the whole system is affected.” (Raymond Boudon, Mohamed Cherkaoui & Jeffrey Alexzander: 1997: 293)

During his years of revolutionary activity in the PCI he read the work of Lenin and the work of other luminaries of the Russian Revolution. Two months after the death of Lenin Gramsci began with the assertion that while there were states there would be dictatorship and that meant the dictatorship of leader. He went arguing that, “the essential problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not the physical personification of the function of the command. The essential problem lies in the nature of the relations that the leader or leaders have with the party of the working class, and in the relations, which exist between this parties of the working class: are they purely hierarchical, of the military sort, or are they purely organic and historic in character. Are the leader and the party working-class elements, are they a part of the working-class, do they represent its most vital and deepest interests and aspirations, or are they an excrescence, merely a violent superimposition? How was this party formed, how did it develop, according to what processes were its leaders selected? Why did it become the party of the working class? Why it is through chance? The problems becomes that of the historical development of the working class, which slowly constitutes itself in the struggle with the bourgeoisie, wins some victories and is defeated many times. It is
not only a problem of the proletariat in one country alone, but of the whole world working-class with its superficial and yet so important differences taken at particular moments and yet its substantial unity and homogeneity.” (Alaster Davidson: 1977: 233) He further elucidates that, “the international proletariat had and still has a living example of a revolutionary party which exercises a class dictatorship; it had, but unluckily no longer has, a living example, who best characterizes and expresses what it is to be a revolutionary leader, comrade Lenin. (Ibid: 234)

Gramsci has recognized the historical regularities in economic determinism but rejected the idea of automatic or inevitable historical developments. According to him the masses had to act in order to bring about a social revolution. He understands the importance of structural factors especially the economy, but he did not believe that these structural factors led the masses to revolt. “Gramsci operated with a rather elitist conception in which ideas were generated by intellectuals and then extended to the masses and put into practice by them. The masses could not generate such ideas, and they could only experience them, once existence, on faith. The masses could not become self-conscious on their own; they needed the help of social elites.” (George Ritzer: 1988: 128) According to him once the masses had been influenced by these ideas, they would take the actions that lead to the social revolution. His central concept is “hegemony”. The word hegemony is defined by him as cultural leadership exercised by the ruling class. “But if hegemony is related to the state then this is only in so far as the latter is defined as ‘the entire complex of practical and theoretical activities with which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its dominance but manages to win the active consensus of those over whom it rules, which clearly indicates that it is always the fundamental class that hegemony has its primary points of reference.’” (Raymond Boudon, Mohamed Cherkaoui & Jeffrey Alexzander: 1997: 298)

By civil society Gramsci indicates something much broader than what Hegel or Marx meant by it – namely, the entire complex of social, cultural, and political organizations and institutions in a particular society – everything in other words, that is nor strictly part of the state. “Hegemony, the Gramscian concept par excellence and the very fulcrum of his thought, is pictured as an equilibrium between “leadership” or “direction” (direzione) based on consent, and “domination” (dominazione) based on coercion in the broader sense. A “historical block” – another key concept – is formed
only when this sense equilibrium exists, that is to say, when a given class succeeds in maintaining hegemony over society through both direction and domination, persuasion and force. Whenever direction lags and the ideological grasp on the masses lessen, the state enters into a state of crisis, allowing other classes to penetrate the spaces it has failed to occupy, and to advance toward a hegemonic position.” (Antonio Gramsci: 1973: 42)

“Gramsci literally rotted away in prison, writing while his teeth fall out, his stomach was destroyed, and his nerves collapsed. But the most important fact was what Gramsci signified in the perspective of revolutionary action and thought in the twentieth century.” (Antonio Gramsci: 1973: 05) “He was suffering from Potts’ disease, tubercular lesions of the upper lobe of the right lung, which have caused two hemorrhages, arterio-sclerosis with hardening of the arteries. He has had fainting fits with loss of consciousness and paraphasia lasting several days.” (For more details see Alaster Davidson: 1977: 264) Despite this, it is his great strength of will and courage that he did not give up his revolutionary thought and spirit. The physical and spiritual life of Antonio Gramsci had lasted only forty-six years. Like the lives of all men it had been multifaceted, with a concrete personal content to each phase of suffering and thought.

Locating his ideas in a value framework it may be concluded that, Gramsci’s concept of hegemony is very much relevant to understand cultural, political, economic or ideological complexity of present elite or upper class how they impose their supremacy over the suppressed and take the dominant role in all spheres of social life.

3.1.3. The Study of Values in Critical Theories in Western Sociological Tradition
Like the structural functional approach and conflict approach in the study of values in sociology, the Frankfurt school of thought or critical theory has also emerged as a major critic in the field of literature, society and culture. As per the Britannica Concise Encyclopaedia, critical theory a school of thought derived in part from disenchantment with classical Marxism and the development of Western Marxism within what became known as the ‘Frankfurt School’. Associated with Adorno, Habermas, and Marcuse amongst others, critical theorists aim to uncover the inner workings of a society which they suggest lie concealed from view by a veneer of ideology. In the humanities and
social sciences, critical theory has two quite different meanings with different origins and histories, one originating in social theory and the other in literary criticism. However, until recently these two meanings had little to do with each other, since the 1970s there has been some overlap between these disciplines. This has led to "critical theory" becoming an umbrella term for an array of theories in English speaking academia.

If we locate in a value framework, the movement that inspired by Marxist scholars in social and political philosophy is originally associated with the work of the Frankfurt School. Drawing particularly on the thought of Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud, critical theorists maintain that a primary goal of philosophy is to understand and to help to overcome the social structures through which people generally dominated and suppressed. Believing that science, like other forms of knowledge, has been used as an instrument of oppression, they caution against a blind faith in scientific progress, arguing that scientific knowledge must not be pursued as an end in itself without reference to the goal of human emancipation. Since the 1970s, critical theory has been immensely influential in the study of history, law, literature, and the social sciences.

Upholding the values the first meaning of the term critical theory was that defined by Max Horkheimer of the Frankfurt School of social science in his essay *Traditional and Critical Theory: Critical Theory* (1937) is social theory oriented toward critiquing and changing society as a whole, in contrast to traditional theory oriented only to understanding or explaining it. Horkheimer wanted to distinguish critical theory as a radical, emancipatory form of Marxian theory both from the model of science put forward by logical positivism and from what he and his colleagues perceived as the covert positivism and authoritarianism of orthodox Marxism and communism. It is also central to this notion that critical social theory be directed at the totality of society in its historical specificity, i.e. in the way it had come to be configured at a specific point in time, and that it integrates all of the major social science theories that will help grasp the major dimensions of society, including especially economics, sociology, history, political science, anthropology, and psychology. Although this conception of critical theory originated with the Frankfurt School, it also prevails among some other recent social scientists, such as Pierre.
Bourdieu, Louis Althus and arguably Michel Foucault and Bryan Reynolds, as well as certain feminist theorists and social scientists.

However, in this part the works of scholars and critic like Walter Benjamin, Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno, and Jurgen Habermas has been discussed in a value framework. The critical school of thought is not necessarily oriented towards radical social change or even towards the analysis of society, but focused primarily on the analysis of texts and text-like phenomena. It originated among literary scholars and in the discipline of literature in the 1960s and 1970s and really came into broad use only since the 1980s, especially as theory used in literary studies became increasingly influenced by Continental philosophy and social theory and thereby became more "theoretical". The meaning of "critical theory" originated entirely within the humanities. However, there are works of literary critical theory that show no awareness of the sociological version of critical theory.

In the late 1960s Jurgan Habermas redefined critical theory in a way that freed it from a direct tie to Marxism or the prior work of the Frankfurt School. In Habermas's epistemology, critical knowledge conceptualized as knowledge that enabled human beings to emancipate themselves from forms of domination through self-reflection and took psychoanalysis as the paradigm of critical knowledge. This expanded considerably the scope of what counted as critical theory within the social sciences, which would include such approaches as world systems theory, feminist theory, postcolonial theory, critical race theory, performance studies, transversal poetics, queer theory, social ecology, the theory of communicative action (Jurgan Habermas), Structuration Theory, and Neo-Marxian theory.

In the early 1960s, literary scholars started reacting against the New Criticism of the previous decades, which tried to analyze literary texts purely internally. They began to incorporate into their analyses and interpretations of literary works initially semiotic, linguistic, and interpretive theory, then structuralism, Lacanian psychoanalysis, post-structuralism, and destruction as well as Continental Philosophy, especially phenomenology and hermeneutics, and critical social theory and various other forms of neo-Marxian theory. Thus, literary criticism became highly theoretical and some of those practicing it began referring to the theoretical dimension of their work as "critical theory", i.e. philosophically inspired theory of literary criticism. And
thus incidentally critical theory in the sociological sense also became, especially among literary scholars of left-wing sympathies, one of a number of influences upon and streams within critical theory in the literary sense.

Furthermore, along with the expansion of the mass media and mass/popular culture in the 1960s and 1970s and the blending of social and cultural criticism and literary criticism, the methods of both kinds of critical theory sometimes intertwined in the analysis of phenomena of popular culture, as in the emerging field of cultural studies, in which concepts deriving from Marxian theory, post-structuralism, semiology, psychoanalysis and feminist theory would be found in the same interpretive work. Both strands were often present in the various modalities of postmodern theory.

In the 1970s and 1980s, Habermas redefined critical social theory as a theory of communication, i.e. communicative competence and communicative rationality on the one hand, distorted communication on the other, the two versions of critical theory began to overlap or intertwine to a much greater degree than before. Both literary and philosophical versions of critical theory have focused on the processes of synthesis, production, or construction by which the phenomena and objects of human communication, culture, and consciousness come about. Whether it is through the transformational rules by which the deep structure of language becomes its surface structure (Chomsky), the universal pragmatic principles through which mutual understanding is generated (Habermas), the semiotic rules by which objects of daily usage or of fashion obtain their meanings (Barthes), the psychological processes by which the phenomena of everyday consciousness are generated (psychoanalytic thinkers), the episteme that underlies our cognitive formations (Foucault), and so on, there is a common interest in the processes (often of a linguistic or symbolic kind) that give rise to observable phenomena. Here there is significant mutual influence among aspects of the different versions of critical theory. Ultimately this emphasis on production and construction goes back to the revolution wrought by Kant in philosophy, namely his focus in the Critique of Pure Reason on synthesis according to rules as the fundamental activity of the mind that creates the order of our experience.
3.1.3.a. Walter Benjamin (1892-1940)

Walter Benjamin was born into an affluent Jewish family in Berlin, Germany on July 15, 1892, the son of an art dealer. He studying philosophy at universities in Berlin, Freiburg, and Munich, Germany. Benjamin graduated from the University of Bern, in Switzerland, earning a Ph.D. in 1919. He was a German Marxist literary critic, essayist, translator, and philosopher. The value framework of Benjamin reflects from his widely published topics as technology, language, literature, the arts, and society. Besides the complete works, he left a large body of unfinished work and that has been slowly published in his native country. Since the 1980s, this fragmented work has elicited much commentary, including several thousand studies. His main areas of interests are includes Literary theory, Aesthetics, Technology, Epistemology, Philosophy of language and Philosophy of history. He has been influenced by Bertolt Brecht, Hannah Arendt, Karl Marx, Theodor Adorno, Gershom Scholem and influenced Hannah Arendt, Theodor Adorno, Giorgio Agamben.

Benjamin was very much influenced by the writings of French poet and essayist, Paul Valery’s work *Pieces Sur L’Art*, i.e. “We must expect great innovations to transform the entire technique of the arts, thereby affecting artistic invention itself and perhaps even bringing about an amazing change in our very notion of art. Benjamin used that thought as the basis for what became one of his most famous essays, *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. It served as a foundation for the evolution of thought that emerged from the Postmodern school philosophy. In 1920, Benjamin began his work as a literary critic and translator in Berlin. He had considered for an academic career, but that pursuit become cut short when the University of Frankfurt rejected his doctoral thesis, *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*, in the year 1928. *The rise of Hitler* (1933), caused Benjamin to leave Germany permanently and settle in Paris, where he wrote radio scripts, as well as essays and criticism for literary journals. He married at this time and had a son. The marriage was not successful, however, and the couple eventually divorced. By 1930, however, his attempts to immerse himself in the study of historical materialism as a basis for his literary work, kept him from doing so. Still, his love of books, particularly children’s books, occupied much of his attention. Benjamin felt that it was the French
novelist, Marcel Proust, whose work most exemplified the point at which the child and the adult came together.

Benjamin is best known in the United States for his literary and cultural criticism, though his political, philosophical, and religious essays have been studied in greater detail by European commentators. The English translated some of his works are, One-Way Street, and Other Writings, (1928); A Short History of Photography, (1931); Theses on the Philosophy of History, (1942); Illuminations, (1961); Understanding Brecht, (1966); Moscow Diary, (1968). His works that have not yet been translated into English are, Goethes "Wahiverwandtschaften", (1924-25) (title translated as "Goethe's Elective Affinities); Berliner Kindheit un Neunzehnhundert, (memoirs) (1950); and Derr Beegriff der Kunstkritik in der deutschen Romaantik, (criticisms) (1973). In fact, the full scope of his works are not realized even after 67 years of his death, perhaps due to the slowness in publishing.

Benjamin's brilliant academic career was cut short by the rejection of his qualifying thesis (Habilitationsschrift) by Frankfurt University in the year 1925 but however, it was published in 1928. After the cut off from the academic advancement, he worked as a writer and critic. He became increasingly interested in Marxism, visited Russia.

As a critic Benjamin abandoned the German tradition of Hegelianism and set out to interpret poetic work on its own terms. Some of his writings of translated version in English are Goethe's Elective Affinities, (1922); Origin of German Tragic Drama (Mourning Play, (1928); One Way Street (1928); The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction, (1936); Berlin Childhood around 1900, published posthumously in the year 1950; On the Concept of History/Theses on the Philosophy of History, published posthumously in the year 1939, The Paris of the Second Empire in Baudelaire, (1938).

Benjamin, is known for his synthesis of eccentric Marxist theory and Jewish messianism. In particular, his essays on Charles Baudelaire and Franz Kafka as well as his speculation on symbolism, allegory, and the function of art in a mechanical age have profoundly affected contemporary criticism. Benjamin was influenced by his close friendship with the historian of Jewish mysticism Gershom Gerhard Scholem. In
1933, he moved to France because of the rise of the Nazis. When the Nazis invaded France, he fled to Spain, was denied entry, and committed suicide.

As a sociological and cultural critic, Benjamin combined ideas of historical materialism, German idealism, and Jewish mysticism in a body of work which was an entirely novel contribution to western philosophy, Marxism, and aesthetic theory. As a literary scholar, he translated essays written by Charles Baudelaire and Marcel Proust's famous novel, In Search of Lost Time. His work is widely cited in academic and literary studies, in particular his essays The Task of the Translator and The Work of Art in the Age of its Technical Reproducibility.

3.1.3.b. Max Horkheimer (1895 – 1973)

Max Horkheimer was a Jewish-German philosopher and sociologist, a founder and guiding thinker of the Frankfurt School/Critical Theory. Due to parental pressure, he did not initially pursue an academic career, leaving secondary school at the age of sixteen to work in his father's factory. However, after the World War I, he enrolled at Munich University, where he studied philosophy and psychology. He subsequently moved to Frankfurt am Main, where he studied under Hans Cornelius. There he met Theodor Adorno, with whom he had a lasting friendship and a fruitful collaborative relationship. His main areas of interest include Social Theory, Counter-Enlightenment and notable ideas include Critical Theory, the Culture Industry, the Authoritarian Personality, Eclipse of Reason. He was influenced by Kant, Hegel, Marx, Weber, Freud, Pollock, Adorno. He also influences Adorno, Marcuse, Habermas, and Honneth. He received his Ph.D. in philosophy at the University of Frankfurt in 1922. When Max Horkheimer was director of the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt, he played an important role in the development of critical theory and Western Marxism. Under his leadership, the institute attracted an extraordinarily talented array of philosophers and social scientists, including Theodor Adorno, Erich From, and Herbert Marcuse; collectively (with Horkheimer) they came to be known as the Frankfurt school. When the Nazis came to power in 1933, Horkheimer moved the institute to New York City, where he directed it until 1941; he re-established it in Frankfurt in 1950. The values associated with the critical theory reflected in his essay Traditional and Critical Theory (1937) which contrasted what he considered the socially conformist orientation of traditional political philosophy and social science to the brand of critical Marxism.
favoured by the institute, an approach known as critical theory. His collaboration with Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1947), is a pessimistic work that traces the origins of fascism and other forms of totalitarianism to the Enlightenment concept of "instrumental" reason.

In *Eclipse of Reason* (1947) and *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1947, written with Theodor Adorno), he developed a critique of scientific positivism, whose "instrumental rationality"—had become a form of domination in both capitalist and socialist countries. Against an older, deterministic Marxism, he argued that culture and consciousness are partly independent of economics. His ideas about liberation and consumer society could provide considerable influence in the work of the contemporary empirical sociologists.

Horkheimer's book, *Eclipse of Reason* (1947) deals with the concept of "reason" within the history of Western philosophy. Horkheimer defines true reason as rationality. He details the difference between objective and subjective reason and states that we have moved from objective to subjective. Objective reason deals with universal truths that dictate that an action is either right or wrong. Subjective reason takes into account the situation and social norms. Actions that produce the best situation for the individual are "reasonable" according to subjective reason. The movement from one type of reason to the other occurred when thought could no longer accommodate these objective truths or when it judged them to be delusions. Under subjective reason, concepts lose their meaning. All concepts must be strictly functional to be reasonable. Because subjective reason rules, the ideals of a society, for example democratic ideals become dependent on the "interests" of the people instead of being dependent on objective truths. Some of his major works are, *Authority and the Family* (1936), *Traditional and Critical Theory* (1937), *Critique of Instrumental Reason* (1967), *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1947) - with Theodor Adorno, *Eclipse of Reason* (1947). He also wrote *Egoism and the Freedom Movement*, *The Authoritarian State*, *The Longing for the, Totally Other*.

Writing in 1946, Horkheimer was strongly influenced by the Nazi legacy in Germany. He outlined how the Nazis had been able to make their agenda appear "reasonable", but also issued a warning about the possibility of this happening again. Horkheimer believed that the ills of modern society are caused by understanding of
reason: if people use true reason to critique their societies, they will be able to identify and solve their problems.

3.1.3.c. Herbert Marcuse (1898-1979)

Herbert Marcuse was a prominent German-U.S. Political Philosopher and Sociologist of Jewish descent associated with the Frankfurt School. He was born in Berlin on July 19, 1898. Marcuse studied Philosophy in Berlin and Freiburg, however, Martin Heidegger sponsored his doctoral dissertation entitled *Hegel's Ontology and the Theory of Historicity* (1987). In the year 1922 he received his doctorate of philosophy from the universities of Berlin and Freiburg. His main areas of interests are social theory, and Marxism and his notable ideas is “The Totally Administered Society”. He was a leading 20th-century New Left Philosopher in the United States and a follower of Karl Marx. He influenced by Kant, Hegel, Marx, Nietzsche, Freud, Husserl, and Luckas. He has influenced Angela Davis, Abbie Hoffman, Jurgen Habermas and William Leiss.

His writings reflected a discontent with modern society and technology and their “destructive” influences, as well as the necessity of revolution. His application of the theories of Sigmund Freud to the character of contemporary society and politics was the subject of much research, scholarly and otherwise. He was considered by some to be a philosopher of the sexual revolution. Marcuse’s distinctive intellectual heritage was based on the democratic and socialist philosophy originated by G. W. F. Hegel and developed by Karl Marx - combined with the psychoanalytic theories of Sigmund Freud. On this basis he took a stand against fascism, as it appeared in Europe from the 1920s until the end of World War II and as it appeared later in the allegedly fascist elements of advanced industrial society. In the year 1934 Marcuse emigrated to the United States and joined the Institute of Social Research in New York City. In 1941 he became a U.S. citizen. Marcuse book *Reason and Revolution, a Study of Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory* (1941), an attempt to draw a distinction between Hegel and the contemporary fascist interpretations of Hegel’s theories.

Marcuse’s advocated Sexual Openness, his work *Eros and Civilization* (1955), presents a Neo-Freudian view of man. It argues for a greater tolerance of eroticism than that permitted by the status quo. The book argues that a tolerant attitude toward sexuality would lead to a more satisfactory life in a society devoid of aggression.
Because of this book Marcuse is considered one of the philosophers of the "sexual revolution." Marcuse criticized the advanced industrial societies of the United States and the Soviet Union for constructing a civilization that requires ceaseless production and consumption of unnecessary goods and for perpetuating themselves at the expense not only of other nations but also of their own populations. In Soviet Marxism (1958) Marcuse views the Soviet Union as actually worse but potentially better than the United States. One-Dimensional Man (1964) continues Marcuse's attack on advanced industrial society - especially that found in the United States. He writes that America's affluence is facilitated by self-serving technology - such as military defense - in which the only reason products are consumed is that they are available. As a result, humanity's authenticity is undermined, and its potential for aggression is elevated to the point at which nuclear holocaust is probable. One-Dimensional Man is a pessimistic work in which the United States emerges as the most dangerous nation on Earth. It was, however, an important work during the following decade of radical political change.

Advocating revolution he wrote "An Essay on Liberation" (1969), before the French student rebellion, and dedicated to the student militants. Marcuse hoped that this might affect the revolution he deemed justifiable against the oppressiveness and aggressiveness of contemporary industrial society. He published Five Lectures: Psychoanalysis, Politics, and Utopia in 1970. In the year 1972, he also published Studies in Critical Philosophy, a study of authority; From Luther to Popper; and Counterrevolution and Revolt. He focused again on Marx in The Aesthetic Dimension: Toward a Critique of Marxist Aesthetics (1978). Other articles and essays Marcuse wrote include: Remarks on a Redefinition of Culture Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (1965); Negations: Essays in Critical Theory (1968); Art and Revolution, Partisan Review (1972); Marxism and Feminism, Women's Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal (1974); The Obsolescence of the Freudian Concept of Man and Philosophy and Critical Theory, Critical Theory and Society: A Reader (1989). Besides this, shortly before his death in 1979, Marcuse reflected upon the inseparability of human beings and nature in Ecology and the Critique of Modern Society, in which he stated that the natural environment must be shielded from capitalist and Communist destruction.
He fled Germany after the Nazi seizure of power in 1933. After working in U.S. intelligence in World War II, he taught at several universities, principally Brandeis University (1954 – 65) and the University of California at San Diego (1965 – 76). In his best known and most influential work, *One-Dimensional Man* (1964), Marcuse argued that society under advanced capitalism is unfree and repressive and that modern man has become intellectually and spiritually complacent through his psychological dependence on the blandishments of consumer society, a phenomenon he termed “repressive desublimation.” He was also hostile to the Soviet system. He argued for a sexual basis to the social and political repression in contemporary America; the book made him a hero of New Left radicals and provided a rationale for the student revolts of the 1960s in the United States and Europe. Moreover, this book provides an influential study of modern consumer culture and of today’s man who finds that even as his life fills with gadgetry and convenience, it is emptied of meaning and fulfilment. His works were popular among student leftists, especially after the 1968 student rebellions at Columbia University and the Sorbonne. His other writings include *Eros and Civilization* (1955) and *Counterrevolution and Revolt* (1972).

He was educated at the University of Freiburg and with Theodore Adorno and Max Horkheimer founded the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research. A special target of the Nazis because of his Jewish origins and Marxist politics, he emigrated (1934) to the United States and became a naturalized citizen in 1940. He is best known for his attempt to synthesize Marxian and Freudian theories into a comprehensive critique of modern industrial society. His other works include *Reason and Revolution* (1941), *Eros and Civilization* (1955), *An Essay on Liberation* (1969), and *Counterrevolution and Revolt* (1972). He had returned to Germany after World War II and militated against social democracy, defended a critical Marxism, and participated along with Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, in the creation of the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt. He had a Marxist training and his Marxist trained revealed from his work 1958 published *Soviet Marxism: A Critical Analysis* (1958). He also harbored a passionate yet critical interest in psychoanalysis. These two facets of Marcuse contributed to his writing, where one can discern individual libidinal structures and economic, political, and social realities characterized by domination and alienation continuously coming into conflict. His best-known works were widely read by students.
in the United States and Europe in the 1960s. In *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud* (1955) and *One Dimensional Man* (1964), he denounced "repressive sublimation" in consumer society, where society caters to the individual's drives only to better control the individual. Ever the rebel, Marcuse also published *Reason and Revolution* (1941), *An Essay on Liberation* (1968), and *Counterrevolution and Revolt* (1973).

Marcuse's essay *Repressive Tolerance* (1965), in which he claimed capitalist democracies can have totalitarian aspects, but this view criticized by conservatives. Marcuse argues that genuine tolerance does not tolerate support for repression, since doing so ensures that marginalized voices will remain unheard. He characterizes tolerance of repressive speech as "inauthentic". Instead, he advocates a discriminating tolerance that does not allow repressive intolerance to be voiced. Marcuse's book *Eros and Civilization* (1955) concern with the sociologist and political philosopher attempts to relate sexual repression to political and social repression. Advocating more sexual freedom and openness, the book is considered one of the theoretical sources for the sexual revolution of the 1960s.

Marcuse's critiques of capitalist society (especially his 1955 synthesis of Marx and Freud, *Eros and Civilization*, and his 1964 book *One-Dimensional Man*) resonated with the concerns of the leftist student movement in the 1960s. Because of his willingness to speak at student protests, Marcuse soon became popular as "the father of the New Left", a term he disliked and rejected. His work heavily influenced intellectual discourse on popular culture and scholarly popular culture studies. He died on July 29, 1979, after having suffered a stroke during a visit to Germany.

3.1.3.d. Theodor Wiesengrund. Adorno (1903-1969)

Theodor W. Adorno was a German sociologist, philosopher, pianist, musicologist, and composer. He was a member of the Frankfurt School along with Max Horkheimer, Walter Benjamin, Herbert Marcuse, Jürgen Habermas, and others. He was born in Frankfurt as the only child to the wine merchant Oscar Alexander Wiesengrund of Jewish descent, converted to Protestantism. He has studied music, philosophy, and sociology in Frankfurt, after which he continued his musical pursuits in Vienna, where his teachers included Alban Berg, at the same time he worked as a composer, music
critic, and editor of the Viennese journal for avant-garde music, Anbruch. At the University of Frankfurt he studied philosophy, musicology, psychology and sociology.

His main areas of interests are social theory, psychoanalysis, musicology, cultural studies etc. In the study of sociology his notable ideas include, The Culture Industry, the Authoritarian Personality, The Negative Dialectic, Non-Conformist Conformist. He has been influenced by scholars like Kant, Hegel, Kierkegaard, Marx, Nietzsche, Weber, Freud, and Husserl. But he has been influenced Jurgen Habermas, Jean Baudrilled, Pierre Bourdieu. By the end of 1924, he graduated with a dissertation on Edmund Husserl. Before his graduation, he met with his most important intellectual collaborators. In 1930 he took up an appointment at Frankfurt University, and worked with its director, the sociologist Max Horkheimer. Although his main interest was in philosophy, he took courses in psychology, sociology, and music, and wrote a dissertation on Husserl's phenomenology.

Retaining his intellectual roots in Hegel and Marx, Adorno moved freely across diverse academic disciplines to probe into the nature of contemporary European culture and the predicament of modern man. He was a leading member of the influential intellectual movement known as the Frankfurt School. After his return Adorno became associated with the Institute for Social Research, which was established in 1923 as an affiliated body of the Frankfurt, but it was personal rather than formal because of his youth and student status. It was Max Horkheimer, eight years Adorno's senior, who introduced Adorno to other senior scholars there who were embarked on a variety of projects aimed at determining the social conditions of Europe. Although Marxist and progressive in outlook, the researchers at the Institute were concerned with intellectual work rather than direct political action. Together they constituted what came to be known as the Frankfurt School credited with the creation of the Critical Theory.

Adorno began teaching philosophy at his alma mater in 1931 but the seizure of political power by Hitler disrupted his academic career and eventually forced him into exile. He took refuge first at Oxford, England, between 1934 and 1937 and thereafter in the United States until his return to Germany in 1949 to resume teaching at the Frankfurt University. The sufferings of the Jews and the crimes of the Third Reich became two of the major concerns in his philosophical reflections to the end of his life. In his early writing career, Adorno’s association with the Institute was marked by the
inclusion of his article entitled *The Social Condition of Music* in the first issue of the Institute's official journal in 1932. His article entitled “Jazz” in the same journal in 1936 revealed his life-long prejudice against that form of music which he argued was devoid of any aesthetic value.

Of more lasting value is his article on “The Fetish Character of Music and the Regression of the Listeners” in the 1936 issue of the Institute's journal. With upholding values Adorno makes the observation that the commercially oriented music industry manipulates the musical tastes of the listeners by seductive psychological methods. He points out how helplessly the listeners are seduced into accepting the arbitrary cuts and interruptions in radio broadcasting. He maintains that such cuts are made for commercial gains and at the expense of the integrity of the original composition and performance and in utter disregard for the intelligence of the listeners. This article is valuable because it contains his lines of arguments against the culture industry to be developed more fully in his later writings.

Toward the end of the World War II Adorno and Horkheimer wrote *Dialectic of Enlightenment* published in Amsterdam in 1947. Defining enlightenment as demythologizing, the authors trace the process of taming of nature in Western civilization. The main thrust of the argument is that in the name of enlightenment a technological civilization which sets humans apart from nature has been developed and that such a civilization has become a cause of dehumanization and regimentation in modern society. They contend that the notion of reason is accepted in that civilization mainly in the sense of instrument for controlling nature, and subsequently people, rather than in the sense of enhancing human dignity and originality. In the new edition of the book published in 1969, shortly before Adorno’s death, the authors declare that the enlightenment led to positivism and the identification of intelligence with what is hostile to spirit.

His book *Minima Moralia: Reflections from Damaged Life* (1951), consisting of articles which he wrote during the war. The purpose of the book is to examine how “objective forces” determine even the most intimate and immediate experience of an individual in contemporary society. *The Negative Dialectics* (1966) is a sustained polemic against the dream of philosophers from Aristotle to Hegel to construct philosophical systems enclosing coherently arranged propositions and proofs. One of
the most terse statements in the book is “Bluntly put, closed systems are bound to fail”. As this statement indicates, his aim in this book is to vindicate the vitality and intractability of reason. Another book Prisms (1967) contains essays on a wide range of topics from Thorstein Veblen to Franz Kafka. However, the main theme running throughout the book is the gradual decomposition of culture under the impact of instrumental reason. In this book and in Aesthetic Theory, his last major work unfinished at the time of his death in 1969 but edited and published posthumously, Adorno advances the thesis that the integrity of creative works lies in the autonomous acts of the artists who are at once submerged under and yet triumphant over social forces.

A persistent critic of positivism in philosophy and sociology and a bitter foe of commercialism and dehumanization promoted by the culture industry, Adorno championed individual dignity and creativity in an age increasingly menaced by what he regarded as mindless standardization and abject conformity. At a time when many academic philosophers were weary of dealing with large questions for fear of violating the canon of rigorous philosophical reasoning, Adorno boldly asserted that the function of philosophy is to make sense out of the totality of human experience. Adorno, who was hailed as one of the ideological godfathers of the New Left Movement in the 1960s because of his indictment of both capitalism and communism, was criticized and humiliated by his former followers for his opposition to violent social activism. He was once forced out of his lecture room by female students at the Frankfurt University.

The exceptionally wide-ranging subjects treated in Adorno's oeuvre, his highly perceptive mind, independent judgement, and pervasive preoccupation with aesthetics are in some measure reflected in his collection of aphorisms, Minima Moralia.

3.1.3.e. Jurgen Habermas (b.1929)

Jurgen Habermas is a German Philosopher and sociologists in the tradition of critical theory and American pragmatism. He studied at the universities of Gottingen, Zürich, and Bonn and earned a doctorate in philosophy from Bonn in 1954 with a dissertation entitled, "Das Absolute und die Geschichte. He is influenced by scholars like Immanuel Kant, Karl Marx, Max Weber, Martin Heidegger, Jean Piaget, Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse. His main areas of interest are social theory,
epistemology, political theory, communicative rationality, discourse ethics, deliberative democracy, and universal pragmatics. Jurgen Habermas, a well scholar known for his work on the concept of the public sphere, which he has based in his theory of communicative action. His work has focused on the foundations of social theory and epistemology, the analysis of advanced capitalistic societies and democracy, the rule of law in a critical social-evolutionary context, and contemporary, and in particular German, politics. Habermas's theoretical system is devoted to revealing the possibility of reason, emancipation and rational-critical communication latent in modern institutions and in the human capacity to deliberate and pursue rational interests.

He studied philosophy and sociology under the critical theorists Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno at the Institute for Social Research at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt am Main. But because of a rift between the two over his dissertation, Horkheimer had demanded for revision. Habermas that the Frankfurt School had become paralyzed with political skepticism and disdain for modern culture. However, he finished his habilitation in political science at the University of Marburg under the Marxist Wolfgang Abendroth. His habilitation work was entitled, in English as *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: an Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* published in the year 1989. It has accepted in the year 1962. Strongly supported by Adorno, in 1964 Habermas returned to Frankfurt to take over Horkheimer's chair in philosophy and sociology.

Habermas visited the People's Republic of China in April 2001 and received a big welcome. He gave numerous speeches under titles such as "Nation-States under the Pressure of Globalisation." Habermas was also the 2004 Kyoto Laureate in the Arts and Philosophy section. He traveled to San Diego and on March 5, 2005, as part of the University of San Diego's Kyoto Symposium, gave a speech entitled The Public Role of Religion in Secular Context, regarding the evolution of separation of Church and State from neutrality to intense secularism. He received the 2005 Holberg International Memorial Prize. Habermas considers his own major achievement the development of the concept and theory of communicative reason or communicative rationality, which distinguishes itself from the rationalist tradition by locating rationality in structures of interpersonal linguistic communication rather than in the structure of either the cosmos or the knowing subject. This social theory advances the goals of human emancipation,
while maintaining an inclusive universalist moral framework. This framework rests on the argument called universal pragmatics – that all speech acts have an inherent “purpose” or “goal” i.e. the goal of mutual understanding and those human beings possess the communicative competence to bring about such understanding.

He carries forward the traditions of Kant and the Enlightenment and of democratic socialism through his emphasis on the potential for transforming the world and arriving at a more humane, just, and egalitarian society through the realization of the human potential for reason, in part through discourse ethics. While Habermas concedes that the Enlightenment is an “unfinished project”, he argues it should be corrected and complemented be should not be discarded. In this he distanced himself from the Frankfurt School, criticizing it and much of postmodernist thought for excessive pessimism, misdirected radicalism and exaggerations. In a value frame. within sociology, Habermas's major contribution is the development of a comprehensive theory of societal evolution and modernization focusing on the difference between communicative rationality and rationalization on the one hand and strategic/instrumental rationality and rationalization on the other. This includes a critique from a communicative standpoint of the differentiation-based theory of social systems developed by Niklas Luhmann, a student of Talcott Parsons.

His defence of modernity as a value with relation to civil society has been a source of inspiration to others, and is considered a major philosophical alternative to the varieties of poststructuralism. He has also offered an influential analysis of late capitalism. Habermas sees the rationalization, humanization, and democratization of society in terms of the institutionalization of the potential for rationality that is inherent in the communicative competence that is unique to the human species. Habermas believes communicative competence has developed through the course of evolution. but in contemporary society it is often suppressed or weakened by the way in which major domains of social life, such as the market, the state, and organizations, have been given over to or taken over by strategic/instrumental rationality, so that the logic of the system supplants that of the lifeworld.

Jurgen Habermas wrote extensively on the concept of the public sphere, using accounts of dialogue that took place in coffee houses in 18th century France. It was this public sphere of rational debate on matters of political importance, made possible by
the development of the bourgeois culture centered around coffeehouses, intellectual and literary salons, and the print media that helped to make parliamentary democracy possible and which promoted Enlightenment ideals of equality, human rights and justice. The public sphere was normative designed and guided by modern values like rational argumentation and critical discussion in which the strength of one's argument was more important than one's identity. According to him, a variety of factors resulted in the eventual decay of the bourgeois public sphere of the Enlightenment. Most importantly, structural forces, particularly the growth of a commercial mass media, resulted in a situation in which media became more of a commodity - something to be consumed - rather than a tool for public discourse. In his book *Theory of Communicative Action* (1981), he criticized the one-sided process of modernization led by forces of economic and administrative rationalization. Habermas traced the growing intervention of formal systems in everyday social lives as parallel to development of the welfare state, corporate capitalism and the culture of mass consumption. These reinforcing trends rationalize widening areas of public life, submitting them to a generalizing logic of efficiency and control. As routinized political parties and interest groups substitute for participatory democracy, society is increasingly administered at a level remote from input of citizens. As a result, boundaries between public and private, the individual and society, the system and the life world are deteriorating. Democratic public life only thrives where institutions enable citizens to debate matters of public importance. Anticipating the possibility of the revival of the values public sphere, he hopes for the future in the new era of political community that transcends the nation-state based on ethnic and cultural likeness for one based on the equal rights and obligations of legally vested citizens. His discursive theory of democracy, as a modern value requires a political community which can collectively define its political will and implement it as policy at the level of the legislative system. This political system requires an activist public sphere, where matters of common interest and political issues can be discussed, and the force of public opinion can influence the decision-making process.

Habermas is famous as a public intellectual as well as a scholar; most notably, in the 1980s, he used the popular press to attack the German historians Ernst Nolte, Michael Sturmer, and Andreas Hillgruber. Emphasizing the human values in the public
sphere he argued that they had tried to detach Nazi rule and the Holocaust from the mainstream of German history. More recently, Habermas has been outspoken in his opposition to the American invasion of Iraq.

3.2. The Study of Values in Indian sociological Tradition

The discipline of sociology in India has not developed along the particular theoretical orientation like the western sociology. But the study of social phenomena has been always a central theme among the Indian scholars in different forms and orientations. Strictly speaking, the development of sociology in India, from the view point of theory, methodology, and research interests, has been significantly influenced by that in the western countries. (International Encyclopedia of Social Science, Vol. 11: 898) In the beginning, many Indian sociologists were trained in western countries and they have developed western theoretical orientation while carrying out field studies or any research work in India. They are simply adding collected data from the field along the line of western theoretical framework in their studies. Describing the growth process of Indian sociology Ramkrishna Mukherjee stated, the pioneers in Indian sociologists were emerged through a series of structural and functional alterations in the society, and alterations in value preferences, dating from the British conquest of India, beginning with Bengál in 1757. The alternatives were due to various trends in the external (British) and internal (Indian) force of work in the subcontinent of India. (Ramkrishna Mukherjee: 1979: 20)

The structural and cultural differences between the Indian and western society is not always adequate/sufficient to understand Indian reality through western theoretical orientation. There has been a long debate and discussion regarding the issues related to Indian Sociology and Sociology for Indian since long and continues this debate even in our times. In this critical juncture, Yogendra Singh pointed out that; the theoretic directions in Indian Sociology can be analyzed through the basic tensions which have existed in this discipline since its inception. These tensions are theoretical as well as ideological. Theoretically, the important tension in sociology exists, on the one hand, between the ‘master theory’ or ‘general theory’ and ‘conceptual schemes’ and on the other, between ‘universalism’ of concepts and propositions and their ‘particularism’ or contextuality. (Yogendra Singh: 2004: 97)
Matraiyee Chaudhury, in her edited book *The practice of sociology* (2003) reflects that, the study of sociology as a discipline has two parts. Firstly, the western context of modernity within which sociology emerged in western subcontinent. Secondly, the colonial context within which sociology arose in the Indian subcontinent. However, Yogendra Singh has come out with an idea that, Indian social reality was understood through certain predominant theoretic and ideological systems, it is quoted in his work *Ideology and theory in Indian Sociology* (2004) concern with the major theoretic orientations in Indian sociology which have shown varying degrees of ups and downs during the quarter of a century are philosophical, culturological, structural and dialectical- historical approaches. Though professor Singh has given the theoretical orientation on the formalization criteria of theory but none of these orientations has existed in a systematic form.

Regarding the development of sociology in India, Professor Jaganath Pathy says, in India, sociology is a comparatively late entrant into the academic world. But its origin can be traced back to the British colonial power realized that the knowledge of Indian social life and culture was an essential requirement for the maintenance of its dominance, since then, it has made a phenomenal growth and has shown, in the process, sufficient capability to adapt itself to shifts in the socio-political structure. (Jaganath Pathy: 1987: 55-6)

Yogendra Singh in his book *Indian Sociology* (1986) argues, the sociological tradition gathered strength after independence in India and the debate on various ideologies of the notion of Indian social structure become intense. The Structuralists, Ethno-sociologists, Marxist, and Historists come increasingly under the pressure of criticism. It is usually difficult to assign a specific theoretical label to any particular work on social structure. Since the present study is based on the two aspects i.e. positive and negative parts of value orientation in the society, here the basic concern is with structural functional, conflict and integrative approach with reference to positive values and negative values.

### 3.2.1. The Study of Values in Structural Functional Approaches in Indian Sociological Tradition

It is clearly noticeable from the colonial administrator who have began the sociological writings on Indian reality especially in the works of C.H. Hutton and W. Wiser, the
elements of early functionalist orientation found the tendency of western functionalism. However, some of the pioneer Indian sociologist despite their western functionalist orientation, they made a monumental efforts to understand Indian reality. It is very difficult to locate them who fall in which theoretical tradition. This section is an attempt to understand how the Indian sociologists were engage with values in structural functional, conflict mode, and integrative approach.

3.2.1.a. Benoy Kumar Sarkar (1887-1949)

B.K. Sarkar is well known as one among the founding fathers of modern Indian Sociology. He was the first to have discussed the theoretical dimension of the continental as well as American Sociology in the Indian Universities. His translation of the Sanskrit text ‘Sukraniti’ in English and publication of the first volume of *The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology* (1914) marked distinct move in Sarkar’s innovative skills and ideas. Being a nationalist he did not deviated from his academic activities. Sarkar’s value preference in sociology explained by Ramkrishna Mukherjee, that, society is upheld by the might of man; the growth of which is hindered by colonialism through economic, political and ideological exploitation of the dependent people. (Ramkrishna Mukherjee: 1979: 38) Benoy Kumar Sarkar’s famous for his work *The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology* (1914), in which he took the word ‘positive’ from Auguste Comte who coined the term sociology and spoke about positive philosophy. But Sarkar deviated from the Comte’s analysis i.e. evolution of human mind through the law of three stages. However, for Sarkar, positivism, humanism, secularism, materialism is related terms. Indeed, Sarkar talks about “Asiatic positivism” that consists of the religion or morality of good citizenship. Benoy Kumar Sarkar’s orientation to sociology reflects that the Indians were positive in their temperament. India’s past could be described in terms of positive, materialistic term.

Benoy Kumar Sarkar has attempted to understand the secular components of Indian culture. According to him the tradition of India were rooted in religion and spirituality. He argued that Indian society had materialistic as well as secular components. He also viewed that, the colonial rule in India had broken up its isolation and brought it into the global mainstream. Sarkar was a strong believer of religion but he does not agree with India’s religious tradition. But he believes that, India’s religious values have a secular basis. For Sarkar, the deities such as Shiva, Parvati or Ganesha were
the creations of human mind rather than divine origin. Therefore, Sarkar was not in favour to religious revivalism in India. Rather he was a supporter to development of a social perspective along the line of capitalist order. Benoy Kumar Sarkar's formulations for Indian sociology in the context of values have been pointed out by sociologist Ramkrishna Mukherjee that, "while the might of man is ultimately dependent on the values projected by a few it is stabilized, promoted or retarded by the contextual social structure and its functions". (Ibid: 41) He was also one among the few who had discussed Marx, Weber and Pareto at a time when these were not fashionable with the sociologists in India and abroad. He quoted judgments of the western scholars' one after another and identified flaws and fallacies in their understanding the nature of Indian society and culture.

Sarkar's research orientation incline towards, structural-functional approach to Indian (and Asian) social organization and culture from a historical, contemporary and futuristic perspective in order to dispel the notion of the 'other worldly' outlook of the Orientals and to examine the process of development of the might of man especially in the Indian context. (Ibid: 46)

3.2.1.b. Louis Dumont (b.1911)

Louis Dumont was grounded in a structuralist methodology for the treatment of social reality in general and the Indian social reality in particular in the context of ideology. Ideology to Dumont 'commonly designates a more or less social set of ideas and values; which in the case of social facts, taking care not to mix up facts of 'representation' with facts of 'behaviour'... are constituted in the principle of hierarchy. (Yogendra Singh: 1986: 23) According to Dumont, Indian Sociology should be a Sociology of Indian civilization. Its constituents are Indology on the one hand on the other social 'structure', which as 'representations' articulate the specific principle of 'hierarchy' with its own governing components of ideology, dialectic, transformational relationship and comparison.... i.e. the basic elements of a structuralist perspective. (Ibid: 23) The study of the caste system in India in Dumont's Homo Hierarchicus (1970) offers several new and leading perspectives on the study of social structure that reflects values of the caste in India. Dumont has brought the method of structuralism to bear upon his study of the caste system the chief elements of its methodology are: ideology, dialectics, transformational relationship and comparison. (Ibid) Dumont
seeks the ideology of caste that operates with this concept of separate levels. Here Dumont uses the word “ideology” that commonly designates a more or less unified set of ideas and values. A distinguishing feature of Dumont’s structuralist approach is its solid grounding in substantive observations. Dumont make a distinction between facts of representation and facts of behaviour; For Dumont, the primary aim of sociology was of values. (Yogendra Singh: 1986:33)

Caste was so much predominated in Indian society that, Dumont has taken so much of interest to reveal its relevance in relation to other social components of Indian reality. Dumont’s Homo Hierarchicus (1970), is an interpretation of Indian society in which caste is regarded as crucial, the essence of caste being hierarchy underlying which the opposition between the religious idea of pure and impure. Unlike in western society, status is diversified from power in India, so that the Brahmin is ranked above the powerful Kshyatriya and rich Vaishya. (T.K. Oomen and P.N. Mukherji: 1986: 44) However, Dumont’s Homo Hierarchious (1970) was a landmark in reflecting the values of caste and its social implication how takes a dominant role in understanding India social reality.

Apart from ideology and structure, the notion of hierarchy has a pivotal place in Dumont’s study of the caste system. Hierarchy implies opposition between purer and impure, and that also determines its dialectics. He writes: ‘This opposition underlies hierarchy, which is the superiority of the pure to impure must be kept separate, and underlies the division of labour because the pure and impure occupation must like wise be kept separate. (Yogendra Singh: 1986: 34) He has attempted to reveal the various functions of caste bound Indian social life on the basis of structuralist perspectives in relation to social system as a whole. “He accomplishes it by analyzing the notion of varna, division of labour, regulation of marriages, rules concerning contact and food, institutions of power and authority, caste government through ‘Panchayats’, and several cultural surrogates of these institutions in the framework of his structuralist sociology. He also examines the institutions of caste in non-Hindu societies and in general the future of caste in India.” (Ibid: 35) As far as the existences of caste among the Muslims are concern, “Dumont writes...influence of caste certainly made itself felt among the Muslims...At first sight one might see in this an aspect of the cultural osmosis between the two societies. But if it is true, that ultimate values were not affected, which is
shown by the political movement, this would still be an inadequate view; the society was affected on both sides, but at a lower level than that of its overall identity and of the values on which the later is based. The case is thus of great sociological interest, and one would like to know more about it.” (Ibid)

Taking of the modern social revolution, Dumont writes: “societies of the past, most societies, have believed themselves to be based in the order of things, natural as well as social; they thought they were coping their very conventions after the principles of life and the world. Modern society wants to be “rational”, to break away from nature in order to set up an autonomous human order. That end, it is enough to take the true measure of man and from it deduces the human order (Ibid: 36)

3.2.1.c. Govind Sadashiv Ghurye (1893-1984)

G. S. Ghurye a trained Social Anthropologist has done a wide range of research from Sanskrit text and very intelligently interpreted Indian culture and society. In the context of Indian society Ghurye viewed that, Brahanical ideas and values performed the central role in the past. He was an ethnographer, studied tribes and castes of India using historical, Indological and statistical data. Ghurye’s value preferences pointed out by sociologist Ramkrishna Mukherjee that, “the needs and aspirations of individuals for a better life are to be fulfilled without establishing core, if it is established coercively by removing) ‘A well divided chequer-board of humanity’. (Ramkrishna Mukherjee: 1979: 38)

Ghurye’s early training in Sanskrit predisposed him to the view that, classical literary and religious works are an important source of values. He argued culture relates to the realm of values. His theoretical formulation and abstract generalization pointed out by Ramkrishna Mukherjee that, “development of man is culture-specific since ‘cultural development’ is reflected in the trend of thought about man as a living entity.” (Ibid: 40) G. S. Ghurye has played an important role for the development of sociology in India. His conception of the sociology of India in the realm of values included the study of modern, medieval and ancient India, as well as rural urban and tribal India. His central approach to understand Indian social phenomena was structural-functional. His research orientation described by Ramkrishna Mukherjee is that, Ghurye employed “structural–functional approach” to India’s social organization and culture in a
historical context and also through an examination of their varied contemporary aspects. (Ibid: 41)

Ghurye studied Indian society according to his own ways of understandings of the Indian reality. However, his perception of the Indian values that has been dealt through structural-functional approach is comprehensively discussed in the next chapter.

3.2.1.d. Radhakamal Mukerjee (1889-1968)

Radhakamal Mukerjee has started his career as a lecturer in economics and later on moved to Lucknow University (L.U.), where he introduced an integrated approach in economics, sociology and anthropology in research as well as teaching. He viewed sociology or the science of man cannot ignore the question of values. He emphasized on inter-disciplinary approach to understanding the human life and society. Mukerjee, sought to develop a general theory of society. For this, he proposed to break the barriers between physical or natural sciences. He stated that, the basic problem for modern societies is to create and nurture values. This will be directed to human development and helps to maintain harmony and social solidarity. He also viewed that, values and valuations can be verified and validated in the social process. Unlike other sociologist, who inherently given space to values in their studies, but Radhakamal Mukerjee comprehensively dealt with values and developed theories on values in his book *Social Structure of Values* (1965). He has special interest in values and its impact on society. His value preference is that, development of man is possible through commonality and cooperation in a free society, and not through contradictions and conflict. (Ibid: 38)

Mukerjee viewed that values were formed and organized into a hierarchy of higher and lower levels. Thus, society fulfills its basic requirements of sustenance, status and value fulfillments. His vision on sociology though rooted in the Indian tradition, he saw the possibility of developing a general theory of sociology based on a social action theory. According to Mukerjee, since human institutions form an indivisible unity of the individual, society and values, any consideration at social facts without their value-component is unreal; instead, there should be a fusion of ‘empirical’ and normative sociology. (Ibid: 40)
For Mukerjee, the values and norms are the key concepts in social analysis. Apart from dealing with theories on values, his understanding about the relationship between economic and social behaviour, social ecology, rural and urban social problems, Indian culture and civilization are also reflect the value orientation. His research orientation to understand social phenomena pointed out by Ramkrishna Mukherjee that, beginning with the structural-functional approach to ascertain the inter-dependence between the economic sphere and the entire socio-historical-cultural order of Indian society, the ‘transdisciplinary’ approach was to be used for a comprehensive appraisal of social reality in the Indian and world context. (Ibid: 41) How Mukerjee has developed theories on values and discussed it at length has been reflected in the Chapter-IV.

3.2.1.e. Nirmal Kumar Bose (1901-1972)

N. K. Bose was a trained anthropologist from Calcutta University who has made a significant contribution to the development of sociology in India. He has tried to identify the ongoing principles of human society which have ensured its continuity for centuries and have weakened due to the forces of social change. He tried to bring together the approaches of Ethnology, Indologist and Social Historians to build up a civilizational approach to understand Indian reality. Bose extensively studied the tribes of Chhotanagpur and Orissa and explored the core values of tribal society. Being a trained anthropologist and believers in social evolution, he stated that societies pass through various developmental stages. He conceived that Indian tribes are not uniform and simultaneously they are not same in relation with the larger society. He used the criteria like technological development, geographical location and social isolation for identification and analysis of tribal communities in India.

In a widely acclaimed paper on “Hindu Method of Tribal Absorption”, Bose elucidated upon the co-existence and assimilation of marginal communities/tribes in the non-Aryan Hindu folds. He viewed that, the Hindu society remained broadly unaltered right until the advent of the British rule. Even the Muslim rule did not do structural change to the religion, social organization, caste system or the culture. For N.K Bose, the basic elements in the design of Hinduism are elaborate division of functions, assignment of three functions to particular families, lineages and sub-caste right to these groups to pursue their own particular customs, culture and social arrangement in a certain hierarchy of all the groups. In the stage, later his structural analysis found in
Dumont's work on *Homohierarchious* (1970), Bose has analyzed Ramayan, Mohabharat, Smritis, which showed this contemporary tendency and the consequences of such vastly expanding society. According to Bose, the village and caste based divisions of labour was the distinctive character of Hindu social organization which gave its basic design and sustainability. N. K. Bose in his understanding about Indian civilization has given emphasis on Indian culture, language and tradition. According to him, culture is a term which covers everything from the traditional manner in which people produce, cook, or eat their food; the way in which they plan and build their houses, land; the manner in which men are organized into communities, to the moral or communities values which are found acceptable, on to the habitual methods by means of which satisfaction is gained in respect of the higher qualities of the mind. (N.K. Bose: 1967: 15)

The habits of using different foods, garments, shoes, turbans, sarees etc. are varies from region to region as per the cultural differences and the values hold by the people. In the context of religion, tradition, culture and food habits among the people. N.K. Bose observes and says that, the traditional manner in which food is cooked, or offered with specific rituals to a community’s gods or goddesses and ancestors; or the method of wearing garments in everyday life or on ceremonial occasions; or the form or method of manufacture or the way in which tools and implements connected with man’s day to day needs, can all be mapped, and inferences drawn of a historical nature from their distribution in space. (Ibid: 169)

N.K. Bose was also a political and social activist. He was all his life a true Gandhian. Even he was Gandhiji’s personal secretary, during Gandhiji’s Noakhali (Presently in Bangladesh) visits in the year 1947. Meanwhile his scholastic and academic work was continuously interrupted by calls to political and social work. Moulded with the Gandhian values. “Bose was basically a student of Indian civilization and culture, and his approach was historical. His interests were wide ranging, from studies of tribes to urban problems, social movements, national integration, the process of cultural and social change, and scriptural norms governing sacred and secular life.” (T.K. Oommen and P.N. Mukherjee: 1986: 31)

He was influenced by diffusionist like Kroeber and Wissler and applied diffusionist approach in the study of spring festivals, culture complex, elements of
temple architecture and his fascinating book on *Cultural Anthropology* (1929) Bose accepted the views of Marx about the critical significance of the social organization of production and applied it in the study of persistence and change in the caste system in India. He also responded very favourably to Malinowski’s functional approach to anthropology and has independently taken a functional approach in defining the nature of culture as an adaptive device in his book on *Cultural Anthropology* (1929). Bose was very much concerned about the nature of unity and diversity in the structure of Indian civilization and the problem in transforming an old civilization into a revitalized new nation. His preference for Gandhian ideology vis-à-vis Marxist socialism and capitalism grew out of his intellectual search for the appropriate perspective for transformation of traditional society into a modern nation. (Surjit Sinha: 1972: 06)

3.2.2. The Study of Values in Conflict Approaches in Indian Sociological Tradition

In a similar time of Western Sociological tradition, the structural functional approach has established a dominant mode of sociological analysis among the Indian sociologist. However, there are several conflict approaches which seek to explain specific aspect of social phenomena. Beginning with Kautilya’s *Arthasastra* which was written in the third century B.C. provided a comprehensive account of conflict as a major fact of a society. Every society has some sorts of conflict and every society has persons who face conflicting situation in their day today life. Even the great epic such as *Ramayan* and *Mahabharat*, and many Hindu mythologies focuses on conflicts in a colourful manner. If we turn out the pages of Indian history, since the beginning of the ‘Indus Civilization’ conflict was one of the major components of the Indian society. There are enough of evidences about kings, princes feudal chiefs and the influential persons who were engaged in territorial occupation leading to several war and aggression. The historians have left an indelible account on loss of life and property due to such war and aggression.

This part is an attempt to explore how the Indian sociologists were engaged with the conflicting values in their mode of sociological analysis. It is difficult to locate the works of sociologist who falls under conflicting tradition as some sociologists have left integrative approaches on Indian social reality in their theoretical orientations.
However, some of the sociologists who advocate conflict tradition are falling under the Marxian or historical dialectical tradition.

3.2.2.a. Dhurjati Prasad Mukerji (1894-1962)

D.P. Mukerji was one of the popular pioneer Indian sociologists who analyzed Indian social history in terms of a dialectical process. He was student of history and economics but after completion of his degree, he joined as lecturer in (L.U.) in Economics and Sociology. Mukerjee was an outstanding Indian scholar, apart from sociology, he has made landmark in the field of Economics, Literature, Music and Art. He has hold different positions and served for the purpose and made a unique distinction wherever he was given the responsibility. He was a founder member of the Indian Sociological Association and was also became the Vice-President of the International Sociological Association. In the later part of his life D.P. Mukerji gained international reputation as a sociologist. He was well known as a Marxist Sociologist and always thinking that Marxian ideas were relevant for Indian social conditions.

According to D.P. Mukerji, Marxism helped one to understand the historical developments but it could not offer a satisfactory solution to human problems. The solution was to be found in the regeneration and reinterpretation of India’s national culture, which reflects *rational values* through the ages and strengthen after the independence through secular and democratic values. D.P. Mukerjee emphasized the desirability of developing a different approach to sociological studies in India because of the special traditions, special symbols, and special patterns of culture and social action in Indian society. (Yogendra Singh: 1986: 45) In the context of India’s unity in diversities, he has given a dialectic approach to understand Hindu – Muslim relations since historicity and differentiates the distinct values posses by both the communities in terms of land holding, military positions, culture, ritual and their different views regarding the nation building process. He was opposing to the western positivism that reduce individual to biological organism and psychological unit. Mukerjee opined that, western material culture had pushed individual into self centric agent and as a result western society became ethnocentric. Perhaps with this understanding Mukerjee prefers historical – dialectical mode of sociological analysis rather than empirical-positivistic one.
With referring to Indian social research that has carried out by the Indian sociologist in the context of value preferences, Mukerji argues that, "if Indian social existence is not fully exhausted by the pursuit of material wants, if Indian life has a room for other values that are geared to wantlessness, and further, if these values are operative in the sense that norms of conduct are operative, then some philosophy which is related to such values and norms should be the philosophical groundwork of Indian social research. One can therefore feel that although the technique of research has to be anthropological, field-oriented, quantitative, sectional and scientific, both beginning and end of social research should be the discovery of the social norms, values and symbols, the measurement of their operative strength under the stress of new social forces, and the deviating of ways and means by which these norms, values and symbols can be utilized for furthering social change in the manner easiest, most economical, and hence, practicable for India. Once this argument is accepted, the technique of social research may have to be revised. The technique of ‘understanding’ will sometimes demand a different, probably, precision will be less, but the compensation is closer approximation to reality. After all the choice has to be made some day or the other whether we are going to write doctoral dissertations with graphs, charts and equations, or we are understanding the complex reality of Indian problems. In this sense, a little more regard to Indian values than what is given to them in the prevalent methods of social research under American aegis may be more practical. For India philosophy is not metaphysics. It id a severely practical discipline for existence hence it cannot but be useful for research into social life." (K. M. Kapadia: 1954: 237)

D.P. Mukerji’s approach to the teaching and research in sociology was more innovative and non-conventional, this led him to write on many themes which were not very much popular during his days but those writings assume greater significance later as sociology began to expand and grow with a separate discipline in the teaching and research in many Indian universities. He also emphasizes, additional to the usual requirements of social research, in which American social scientists are supreme, Indian social research should be grounded on the study of Indian traditions, customs, mores, rituals, symbols, myths, and folkways. Most of those can be covered by the knowledge of dialects and by participations. (Ibid: 237) For D.P. Mukerji, the first task of sociology is to understand the specific type of forces that sustain a particular society.
over the tie. Perhaps for this reason Mukerji stresses that Indian sociologist must understand an Indian tradition which has nurtured Indian society for centuries. Because, traditions have great power of resistance and speedy process of social change can be achieved by violent revolutions. By any means if a society go for revolution, it patiently work out the dialectic of economic changes and its traditions.

3.2.2. Ramkrishna Mukherjee (b.1919)

Ramkrishna Mukherjee is one of the popular student of D.P. Mukerjee, like his teacher Ramkrishna used Marxist methods in his early works and later changes towards both Marxist and Weberian Sociology. During his distinguished career, professor Mukherjee has held a number of positions in India as well as in abroad. He has contributed numerous scholarly articles and authored many books. Some of them are very much incline towards the Marxist approach and reflects Indian social values in dialectical manner. Some of his famous work are, The quality of life: Valuation in Social Research (1983) Society, Culture and Development, What will be? Exploration in Inductive Sociology (1979), Sociology of Indian Sociology (1965), West Bengal Family Structure, The Sociologist and Social Change in India Today, The Rise and Fall of the East India Company and The Dynamics of a Rural Society. (Ramkrishna Mukherji: 1993: 31)

Ramkrishna in his book The Systemic Sociology (1993), very exclusively discusses about the disintegration of joint family in India and emergence of Bangladesh how influencés traditional values of unity and harmony in the society. Before the emergence of Bangladesh there was harmonious social structure among the Hindus and the Muslims. But with the emergence of Bangladesh there was a mix type of reactions among the Muslims, Hindus and the non Hindus. Some Hindu intellectuals lamented the loss of the decay of Muslim literature and culture, but in general, the Hindus remained oblivious to it. Moreover, their reaction to the situation was influenced by the resurgence, in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, of government supported religious orthodoxy in both communities, which tended to separate the Hindus and the Muslims who had previously been brought closer by the propagation. (Ibid: 31) He also says because of the prevailing forces of economy and polity at the top level of the society, there was drastic change in cultural base of interaction among the Hindus and the Muslims. As per the changing cultural interactions the new values have been
emerged and shape up. This developments, later occasions frequently led to communal riots between the Hindus and the Muslims.

He characterizes ‘society’ in the form of ethnicity, language, religion, political authority, habitation of a common territory, etc. he also explained the meaning of action and reaction attached with the process of interaction. Interaction ... presupposes the intention and awareness of the interacting persons regarding how to react. The act of slapping a ‘friend’ on the back is reacted to by the return of a ‘friendly’ back-slap or a smile or some such gesture. But the same action from an “enemy” would be reacted differently, such as, with a punch on nose. (Ibid: 13) Mukherjee evaluated the social values and regarding the value preferences he says, the cardinal valuation of humankind is differently interpreted in the context of what is appropriate in appropriate, desirable or detestable, good or bad for humankind. These are ordinal valuations which translate the cardinal valuation with reference to how (and not only why) to survive, be secured in life, ensure material prosperity, and mental progress. The focus on ‘how’ substantiates that the four cardinal values are intrinsic to the human species in the light of evolution of life.

Analyzing the emergence of new values Mukherjee made comparative statements on Bihar and West Bengal. In early 1960s Bengal was the most advance state and the West Bengal was the most backward state in terms of living standards, health, education, sanitation, communication and transportation etc. Bengal’s role during the India’s freedom movement is well known for revolutionary patriots and freedom lovers. Where as the most of the regions of Bihar was remained more or less away from the current of political, economic, and social movements in India since last two centuries. With this observation Mukherjee was in impression that, “... the emergence of “new values” in society is likely to be more apparent in Bengal than in India on an average, while the selected region of Bihar would be expected to present a picture of the least deflection from the “traditional values”. (Ibid: 03) But the recent time has witnessed the emergence of new values in different parts of the country depending on its culture, region, political leadership and technological advancement.

Regarding the India’s rural economy he refers to R.C. Dutt who states that, the deterioration in India’s rural economy set in a century earlier and spreading insidiously over the subcontinent because of the lack of effective checks... came up clearly on the
surface from the beginning of the present century. The end of the First World War unveiled the object poverty, squalor and disorganization of village societies; the rumbling of the rural discontent began to reach the ears of the government and the educated public in towns and cities. (Ibid: 169-170) The government had to take the serious note on the ongoing agrarian crisis and these crises ultimately leading to the appointment of the first royal commission on agriculture in 1926. It was in this critical phase of India’s history of ‘village studies’, in the sense the label is employed today, took its birth in order that facts and figures could be gathered for an objective understanding of how the rural folks live, what are the wants, and why are they obliged to lead a sub-human existence. (Ibid: 170) In 1930s village studies began to be carried out extensively all over India by various organizations and individuals. These extensive village studies reflect various types of social values that have associated with the life of rural people. In 1940s also the orientations of the social scientists towards “village studies” remain virtually the same as before. Only it could be noticed that henceforth they began to launch extensive enquiries by covering large tracts in the light of the picture of rural society already built of by means of the over increasing numbers of isolated “village studies”. Concurrently they were often found to concentrate on specific aspects of the rural problem in a particular area. (Ibid: 172)

Being concerned with the new value formation and current changes in village society, an economists may point out the growing phenomenon of entrepreneurship in rural areas and the emergence of a class in village society with improved means and techniques of production and distribution etc. where as a social anthropologists or sociologists may describe the content of the urbanization process in rural areas against the schematic formulation of rural-urban continuum and may ascertain the role of village elite in that context. But there again it may be desirable to bring the two sets of phenomena in focus simultaneously so as to appreciate the crucial character of the emergent leadership in rural society. (Ibid: 179)

According to Ramkrishna, the upshot is that today we encounter, virtually, two different worlds of concepts and models, of analysis of interpretation, and of idioms of expression and inference concerning the same topic as “village studies”. Ramkrishna in his book Sociology of Indian Sociology (1979), attempted to classify some of the pioneer Indian Sociologist about their value preferences, theoretical approaches and
methodological orientation in their studies. More about Ramkrishna Mukherjee has been discussed in the Chapter – IV.

3.2.2.c. Akshaykumar Ramanlal Desai (1915-1994)

A.R. Desai is a well known Marxist sociologist specialized in rural sociology and political sociology made a significant contribution to growth of Indian sociology. Most of his writings are basically comprised of writings, which aim to critically examine revolutionary Marxists thought pursued by traditional communist parties and their follower. He was a staunch supporter and employed Marxist revolutionary approach to address Indian reality. During the early 1980s regarding the Marxist path of developmental issues, A.R. Desai argued, the debate and scholarly researches are found on a preferred value premise, common to traditional Marxists adhering to various stages of revolutions. A.R. Desai in his book *India's Path of Development* (1984) argues regarding the value premises in the sociological research and growth of sociology in India that, “During the last thirty years, as stressed by a number of eminent scholars, sociologists have acquired greater technical skills in data generation, a fair amount of sophistication and precision in observing and recording the data, and skills in processing and analyzing data generated. Recent publications of the ‘experience and encounters’ or the ‘field workers and the field’ type reflect the anguishing experience of researchers conducting micro studies in terms field work difficulties and value conflicts involved in field and other researches.” (A.R. Desai: 1984:02-03)

According to Desai the dominant approaches which shaped sociological studies have been basically non-Marxist. The supporter of such dominant approaches have always adopted an attitude wherein the study of the Marxist approach to understanding of an Indian reality has been either underrated or summarily dismissed prima facie, by castigating it as dogmatic, value biased and, therefore, lacking objectivity, and value-neutrality (A.R. Desai:1984:p:8). In supporting Marxist approach in the context of the studies Desai argues that, the Marxist approach gives central importance to property structure in analyzing any society. It provides ‘historical location or specification of all social phenomena’. (Ibid: 13)

A.R. Desai was very much concern about the depressed and backward communities. While talking various forms of existing inequalities, poverty, caste evils
and educational backwardness he states, India's population has remained poor and Indian society continues to suffer from acute inequalities. Inequalities of wealth and income distribution are increasing. The same is true of social and educational opportunities. Educational opportunities are being so created as to be accessible only to those who have resources to buy them. This tends to accentuate social inequality in the country. In the context of caste system, inequalities have tended to assume sharper, weirder and more anguish forms than in other societies. (Ibid: 13) Desai has focuses on wider range of value preferences and value orientations in understanding Indian society. In the context of development of capitalist market and its influence in rural India he pointed out that, competitive and acquisitive values, and the rationality of the capitalist market economy are increasingly replacing the semi-feudal traditional values of subsistence and barter economy. Calculation based on the cash nexus, and profit as the goal, increasingly permeates economic relations in rural India. (Ibid: 193) Desai very systematically reviewed the on going political processes and various developmental plans and programmes that has been under taken and implemented by the government. In this process he observes how the bourgeois individualist values and norms trying to influence different spheres of life. He states, under the operations of economic and political processes initiated as part of the planning adopted by govt. a network of institutions is emerging which operate on the principle of bourgeois individualist value and norms and which try to rationalize various activities in the spirit of these norms. (Ibid: 193)

Desai was very critically analyze how the bourgeois norms and values gradually grappling in Indian society and became dominant in various activities of the Indian population. According to A.R. Desai, the Indian cultural climate is thus being permeated by two distinct types of content. In economic and political operations, the norms and values of bourgeois rationality are encouraged; in the social and cultural fields and in the area of providing alternate world view, the other worldly, non-rationalist, non-militant, non-class, mystical, superstitious, religious, obscurantist value system is systematically fostered. (Ibid: 194)

3.2.2.d. Tharaileth Koshy Oommen (b. 1937)

T.K. Oommen is a retired Professor of sociology from the centre for the Study of Social Systems, and was Dean, School of Social Sciences, J.N.U., New Delhi. His areas of
specialization include social movements, political sociology, and agrarian relations and social transformation, areas in which he has written several articles for reputed journals and books. Prof. Oommen is also the author of *Protest and Change: Studies in Social Movement, from Mobilization to Institutionalization, Doctors and Nurses, A Study in Occupational Role Structure*, and *Charisma, Stability and Change*. It is very difficult to locate his thought in any particular theoretical perspectives. However, if somebody carefully reviews his above-mentioned works, certainly he will find Prof. Oommen as a pluralist. Taking into account his contribution in the areas of social movements, ethnicity, citizenship, pluralism, equality and identity, particularly in the arena of contextualizing nation building, insider and outsider debate, perhaps it will not be wrong to discuss some of his contributions in the conflict approach while defining Indian sociology and its engagement with values. It is also discussed in Chapter – V.

His book *State and Society in India, Studies in Nation-Building* (1990) suggests that apart from ethnicity, language and religion the major problem associated with nation building in India is the conflict between the traditional and modern values. According to Prof. Oommen, “to recall the familiar cliche, India’s is an old ‘society’ and a new state. Traditional Indian society was anchored to the values of hierarchy, holism and pluralism. Modern Indian polity is wedded to the values of socialism, democracy and secularism. According to most commentators the task of nation-building in India is one of rejecting old values and institutionalizing new ones.” (Oommen: 1990: 18) Moreover, he has argued that, “three prominent factors create the disjuncture between citizenship and nationality within a nation-state. These are ‘race’ (used loosely mainly to refer to colour), language (including dialect) and religion (including sect). If there is complete congruence between these factors there would be hardly any tension between citizenship and nationality.” (Ibid: 37)

He has carefully analysed the historical roots of continuity of tension that still prevails in the socio-religious, political and economic and cultural complexity of mainstream Indian social life. In the view of Prof. Oommen, “starting with the 6th century BC, there have been numerous anti-Hindu (i.e., anti-Brahminic) protest movements but very few emerged as distinct religions while others finally led to the formation of Hindu ‘sects’. The more distinct of these religions are Jainism, Buddhism and Sikhism. But Hindu militants of all hues claim that these are mere extensions of
Hinduism and they trace the rationale of their argument to the Hindu Code Bill and the Indian Constitution, which treat the believers of all these religions as 'Hindus'." (Ibid: 49) Besides this, emphasizing importance of language in the nation building, he has observed that, "the central issues of nation building in India revolve around the persistent tension between the hindi-speaking twice-born Hindus, who define themselves as the norm setters and value-givers, the cultural mainstream, and a multiplicity of other primordial collectivities occupying the periphery of the system, who face either the threat of expansionism or exclusivism, depending upon their positioning in the socio-cultural space of India." (Ibid: 65) His discussion on social movements concern with three bases of secessionist movements in independent India: language, tribe and religion. "However, the movements based on languages and tribes have been more or less contained by accommodating the 'nationalist' aspirations of these collectivities within the Indian polity. Thus, the secessionist tone of the Tamil and Mizo movements has disappeared and the secessionist streak is fast disappearing from the Naga movement. Those which persist, namely, the movement for an independent Kashmir and for a separate Sikh state (khalistan), are based on religion.” (Ibid: 97)

In his analysis of the problematique of nation-building in India, Prof. Oommen asserts that most of these conflicts are the result of erroneous conceptualizations arising out of misplaced polarities which juxtapose nation and state, political nationalism and cultural nationalism, 'Indianism' and 'Localism'. According to him these dimensions, in fact, coexist and are mutually reinforcing and enriching. Thus, most confrontations do not pose a threat to the Indian polity as they are essentially assertions of cultural identity. In his argument on language-based nation formation and cultural pluralism, Prof. Oommen argued that any attempt to shape nations on the basis of religion is the only real threat to the Indian polity and should, therefore, be discouraged. According to the Prof. Oommen, the Indian genius is one of gradual transformation, piecemeal accretion and cautious reconciliation: Therefore, the real task of nation-building entails nurturing pluralism in all contexts-values, technology and culture. His book *Doctors and Nurses, A Study in Occupational Role Structure* (1978) concerns with the study of modern occupation or profession in India provides an insight into the occupational and role structure among the medical professional. In order to understand the value orientations of doctors and nurses in regard to patient-care Prof. Oommen has probed
into the aspects of the values they uphold in medical treatment, and their perspectives on patient care. He has tried to major the values that hold by medical professional i.e. Doctors and Nurses. With a view to understand the values of doctors and nurses uphold he has elicited their response on three statements. These are, “the responses are recorded on a five point scale: Strongly agree, agree, indifferent, disagree, and strongly disagree.” (T.K. Oommen: 126) The study reveals that, “the statements administered to doctors and nurses represent three different value orientations. The first statement implies routinization of role activities and lack of personal touch in attending to patients. Those doctors and nurses who would agree with the statement are bureaucratically oriented. The second statement denotes altruism and self-realization in patient-care. Those who agree with the statement are patient-oriented. The third statement in the case of doctors implies an interest in accumulation of knowledge and in the case of nurses, a desire for relative professional autonomy. Those who approve the statement are professionally oriented.” (Ibid: 127) In this context Prof. Oommen stated those who disagree with the statements subscribe to opposing values. The analysis of value orientations relating to patient-care of doctors, house surgeons, and nurses indicates that there is considerable isomorphism between their occupational role-perception and occupational value-orientations. “Thus, while all the three categories are predominantly patient-oriented, the differentiating point between them is seen in the relatively high professionalism of doctors and the substantially more bureaucratic values upheld by nurses, as compared to each other.” (Ibid: 140)

According to Prof. Oommen, “analysis of role conflicts can be pursued in two different contexts: role conflicts which emanate from the contrasting role-demands made on the professionals by the clients, colleagues and the bureaucratic norms of organisations, and role conflicts, which are anchored in the contrasting demands made on the professionals from the occupational sector as against the extra occupational sector in which one occupies general social roles such as husband, wife, father, mother or brother.” (Ibid: 144) In his further discussion of role conflicts is justifiably based on the sex status of professionals, he spoke about the “widespread culture stereotypes that the male role is essentially instrumental (e.g., that of a bread-winner) and the predominant content of female role is expressive (e.g., child rearing).” (Ibid: 144)
Upholding the family ties at the backdrop of values and occupational role conflict, according to Prof. Oommen, it is widely believed that the conveniences of one's working wife is not taken into account by Indian husbands and the working woman in India herself gives primacy to her familial role obligations. Again, strong joint family ties are believed to be in existence in India. Both these may generate contexts for role conflicts among professionals. Besides this, in his analysis of the marital preferences of doctors and nurses Prof. Oommen indicated the logical possibility of role conflicts being found in a greater measure among the exclusively female category of nurses as compared with the predominantly male category of doctors. In order to further explore this issue of role-conflict he has classified into three categories i.e. high, medium and the low. As per their response what doctors and nurses feel, he found 9 percent more of their professional peers would experience high and medium level of role conflicts, than they themselves would, in adjusting with working spouses. In contrast, the house surgeons think that 10 percent more of their peers would adjust with their working spouses with less role-conflict than they themselves would. Here Prof. Oommen notes an element of other righteousness in their estimate of colleaguial behaviour. (For more details see Ibid: 154)

The study of occupational role structures marks most striking conclusion that emerges from Prof. Oommen's statistical analysis is marital status, rural-urban background, length of experience, etc., which are not related to role conflicts in this context, whereas the type of role activity is clearly correlated with generation of role conflicts. Prof. Oommen further states that flexibility in ordering role activities seem to decrease and rigidity in ordering role activities seem to increase conflicts between occupational and familial roles. According to Oommen, the situations he projected both in regard to families of procreation and orientation unfold the majority of respondents experience only 'low' role-conflicts. "Although the two situations are not exactly comparable, available data indicate that a greater proportion of professionals experience role conflicts based on their loyalty to family of orientation." (Ibid: 158) Besides this conflict approaches, some of the other works of Prof. Oommen has been discussed in the Chapter – V.

If we locate his debate on insider and outsider, language or religious ideological orientation in nation building, social movements, ethnicity and
pluralism, it clearly indicates a conflicting tendency in Indian society. As per the definition of values i.e. standard for desirability, the occupational roles of doctors and nurse demands the effective patient care. The medical professional have family obligation, social norms, and they hold different values of urban or rural areas, experience in taking patient’s care and other professional practices etc. As per their individual value how they encounter conflicting roles has been carefully analysed and reflected by Prof. Oommen.

3.2.3. The Study of Values in Integrative approaches in Indian Sociological Tradition

It has clearly understood from the theoretical and methodological orientation of pioneer Indian sociologists that, Indian sociology is necessarily different than the western sociology in terms of its structure and functioning including its culture, norms, values, customs and traditions. The application of western sociological concepts, theories and methodology is not always relevant to understand the Indian reality. Thus, in the study of values in Indian sociological tradition, it is possible to understand basic structures of society and its dynamics through the procedures of empirical observation and verification and intuitive philosophical reflection in a value framework through Integrative approach. The ways of understanding society are manifold and those who seek to know it may not necessarily agree on the adequacy and the utility of a particular mode of understanding. It is with this broad positivist yet liberal conviction that this part seeks to focus on the possibilities of integrating alternative approaches to the understanding of social reality. It has been discussed in this part about the status of theory and the role of social values in understanding Indian sociology in favour of an integrated approach to the understanding of social reality.

Implicit in this argument on integration of perspectives, i.e., analytical integration, which is possible by synthesizing theoretical formulations and empirical findings produced across different areas of sociological studies. All those sociologists interested in studying social reality in an integrated and interdisciplinary perspective may have cognitive orientation has been considered not only necessary but also desirable as an integral part of any scientific pursuit. Sociologists operating within an integrated frame may have confine themselves to purely cognitive-type of scientific
studies, whether descriptive or explanatory or both. Implicit in this position is an assumption that complete objectivity and value-free knowledge are possible.

Regarding the prospects of an integrated approach to social reality D.N. Dhanagre states that, “our own preference is for a social science that is committed and is socially relevant. This choice is dictated by two considerations. First, that absolute ‘value-neutrality’ is not possible except in the form of pure and simple abstraction or mental construct. Thus, ‘value-freeness’ borders on ‘valuelessness’. Often value choices tacitly influence scientific endeavours and still claims to ‘scientific objectivity’ are voiced most vociferously. This is far more dangerously misleading because in that case value-loads operate at the unconscious level under the faced of scientific objectivity. Therefore, the best course for social scientists is to make their value-preferences explicit, whatever they may be, and then try to conform to the rigours of scientific objectivity. In fact, “to be aware of one’s own value-preferences itself is a step towards scientific objectivity”. (D.N. Dhanagre: 1993: 101)

Upholding values in sociology he further explained that, “in our view, suppression and distortion of basic facts are most injurious to one’s own values, and they weaken the cause or the efforts in the direction of the desired end-states. Within the matrix of value-commitments, a certain objective methodology could be followed without any wavering on one’s ultimate value-choices.” (Ibid: 102)

Some of the works of sociologists which are discussed, neither fall in structural or conflict approach or in western orientation of critical theoretical approach have been discussed in this integrative approach. In this section it has been attempted to understand the works of renowned sociologists and social anthropologists like S.C. Dube, Yogendra Singh, Andre Beteille within the parameter of an integrative approach.

Yogendra Singh’s integrative approach to understand social change in his famous book Modernization of Indian Tradition (1986) is such a unique effort to understand Indian social reality. It is abstracted from his work and mentioned below.
PARADIGM FOR AN INTEGRATED APPROACH

MODERNIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF CHANGES</th>
<th>CULTURAL STRUCTURE</th>
<th>SOCIAL STRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterogenetic changes</td>
<td><em>Little Tradition</em> Islamization</td>
<td><em>Great Tradition</em> Secondary-Islamic Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthogenetic changes</td>
<td><em>Primary-Westernization</em></td>
<td><em>Secondary-Westernization or (Modernization)</em> Cultural Renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sanskritization or Traditionalization</em></td>
<td><em>Micro Structure</em> Role Differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>New-Legitimations Pattern-Recurrences, Compulsive Migration Or Population Shift</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Macro-Structure Political Innovations</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>New Structures of Elite, Bureaucracy, Industry, etc.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Elite Circulation, Succession of Kings, Rise and Fall of Cities and Trade Centres</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRADITIONALIZATION


3.2.3.a. Mysore Narasimhachar Srinivas (1916-1999)

M.N. Srinivas a noted Indian Social Anthropologist, specialized in regional India, especially south India and Gujarat, theoretical aspects of Indian social phenomena, caste, social change and religion made a unique contribution to Indian sociology. As an academician he has hold various important positions as per his individual capacity.

The important landmark on Srinivas's theoretic work on cultural and sociological value orientation focuses from his sociological work, Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India (1952). This work well known for his formulation of the concept ‘Brahminization’ that represent the process of the imitation of life ways and ritual practices of Brahmans by lower caste people. Srinivas replaced ‘Sanskritization’ in place of ‘Brahminization’ because of its use as a concept at a more abstract level. In his book, Social change in Modern India (1966), where Srinivas defines ‘Sanskritization’ as ‘the process by which a lower caste or tribe or other group takes over the custom, ritual, beliefs, ideology and life style of a higher caste people’. Along with the concept ‘Sankritization’ Srinivas used the concept ‘Westernization’ for people those who follow the western life style, values and culture in a similar fashion of ‘Sanskritization’. This systematic formulation of the concepts like ‘Sanskritization’ and “Westernization” reflects a structure of culture and cultural values of the Indian society.
Caste and Religion is one of the basic components of the Indian social structure and it is not possible to understand Indian social values without reference to the structural framework in which value formation takes place. Srinivas in his book *India: Social Structure* (1969) focuses that, the Indian social structure and cultural pattern are characterized by its unity as well as diversity. He also says India has been hospitable and accommodative to numerous ethnic groups of immigrants from different parts of Asia and Europe, and the culture of each group has undergone many changes over the centuries to become an integral part of the mainstream Indian society. It is important to note that caste is found not only among the Hindus but also among the Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, Jains and Jews. According to the values of caste principles and religion us ideology, the social structure is shape up in Indian society. In the later stage social values have been influenced by family, marriage, kinship and economic relations among different groups.

During the recent years social values have been undergone many changes due to external as well as internal forces of social changes that has been pointed out by Srinivas and it has been systematically discussed in the next chapter.

3.2.3.b. Shyama Charan Dube (1922-1996)

S.C. Dube, an internationally known social scientist specialized in Social Anthropology and Society of Development with special interest in Social Structure, Social Change, Communication, Bureaucracy and Political Sociology. He has taught Social Anthropology and Sociology both in India as well as in abroad. The more about Dube has been discussed in the Chapter - V.

Dube in his book *India since Independence* (1977), mentions about India’s situation and progress in the various areas during the first 25 years of its independence and says there has been many changes in the mood of the people; the spectrum has ranged from euphoria to despair, from ecstasy to anguish, and from faith to cynism. In this book author has attempted to survey the changing social scene in India from 1947 to 1972. It seeks to examine the social situation as it was on the eve of India’s independence and it was twenty five years later. Regarding the development issues in the context of value preferences Dube pointed out that, “today mankind has a very real concern for its future... there are deeply disturbing signs of a threat to its very survival.
Population explosion, rapid exhaustion of non-renewal natural resources, growing atmospheric pollution, and alarming ecological imbalances, are menacing signs. They point to a bleak future of possible confusion and chaos and even to the ultimate destruction of human civilization." (S.C. Dube: 1977: 5) Dube also provided an insight into the world view on social development and focuses in the context of value preferences that; equally significant are the disharmonic and imbalances in the world order and a manifestly unequal and unjust distribution of the control over natural resources and technological processes. This has led to the serious state of instability that poses challenges which must be met with imagination and insight of mankind has to survive. (Ibid: 5)

Referring the importance of science and technology for the progress and development of the nation in the context of value preferences Dube pointed that, "it is conceded that mankind has utilized the infinite potential of science and technology any partially. Science and technology are capable of contributing mere not only to man's capacity for survival but also to his building a framework of motivators and incentives rooted in the structure and values of society. In order to be productive they need efficient organization and imaginative management. More important perhaps is a clear definitions of purpose behind scientific and technological endeavour and the adequacy of social control to prevent it from misdirection." (Ibid: 6) He further goes on speaking regarding the misuse of science and technology in relation to human society. In other sense Dube was also very careful about the negative values associated with the human being and argues that, science and technology have the capacity to sustain human society and to enable it to develop, but they can easily be put to destructive uses as well. They can contribute enormously towards building a new order with a promise of enrichment of the quality of life for every one, but it would be only wishful thinking to assume that they can do so on their own power. (Ibid) Regarding the relevance of science and technology in this critical juncture of human society and safer transformation of values Prof. Dube says, the human factor is important and our efforts in the fields of structural modifications of society, or bringing about necessary value transformations, and of providing a thoughtful base for science and technology to serve mankind will require a herculean effort. Limitless faith in ability of science and technology to solve all human problems is not really adequate to cope with the
infinitely complex total reality. (Ibid) According to Dube there are many who believe that the human condition has been mishandled but at the same time do not find cause for despair. In this context what is needed must today is reflection followed by action.

While taking note on national and global problems in relation to human development Dube remarks, problems of survival and of redesigning the future have to be contemplated in their global as well as national contexts. Because of its pathologies and dysfunctions the world order is as much in need of repair as the intra-national systems which suffer from inadequacies of thought and action. At both levels the task involves two major components – first, a critical assessment of the existential reality, and second, normative reflection of what it ought to be. In rational terms these two components are closely interlinked; together they will provide a base for action. (Ibid: 7) Since the colonial period the concept of nation building in India was an important task. Thanks to our political leaders after partition of Pakistan and India separate as independent nations, Indian leaders manage to hold almost all the princely states together to form an independent nation named as 'India' or 'Bharat' or 'Hindustan'. In this crucial point of our nation building process Dube pointed out that, the integrative dimension of nation building has been in the forefront of India's national priorities. The country appears to have adopted a policy of stabilized cultural pluralism and has made a special effort to bring about the integration of the minorities, as well as the scheduled castes and the scheduled tribes, into national mainstream without detriment to their individual cultural identities. (Ibid: 11)

3.2.3.c. Yogendra Singh (b. 1932)

Yogendra Singh is an internationally acclaimed Indian sociologist holds many important academic positions in his academic career as per his ability. His research interest covers a wider range of areas that includes culture, social change, tradition, modernity, social stratification, sociological theory and methodology and issues on globalization. He has very systematically analyzed the Indian sociology and given a profile of Indian sociology in terms of its concepts, theories, methodology, origin, growth and development. He has attempted to unmask the foundations of Indian sociology in terms of its concepts, theories and methodologies on which most Indian studies are based. Most of his sociological works are based on value preferences and
especially his work on *Indian Sociology* (1986) he made a comparative analysis of how the Indian social realities were understood by the different scholars.

In his much debated and widely known book *Modernization of Indian Tradition* (1988) he has very systematically discussed various issues on values in the context of modernization and social change. In his article ‘Academic Role – Structure and Modernization: A study of University Teachers”, centering around the issues on values, modernization, culture and change Y. Singh, pointed out that, modernization could be analyzed structurally, in terms of roles and roles sets, and culturally, in terms of values and ideologies. What such studies often neglect is that roles and values are not fully autonomous; nor is the autonomy between structure and culture absolute. Role is defined as a “patterned sequence of learned action or needs performed by a person in an interaction situation” … learning evidently implies internalization of values and their incorporation into the system of behaviour. The motivational element in action is thus invariably mediated by values. Thus role embodies culture. (S. Saberwal: 1972: 196)

The details about Yogendra Singh’s value orientation and value preferences in his sociological analysis has been discussed in the Chapter - V.

3.2.3.d. Andre Beteille (b. 1934)

Andre Beteille was very much popular as a Sociologist and Social Anthropologist of our time. He has completed his M. Sc. from Calcutta University (C.U.), and obtained Ph.D. degree from University of Delhi (D.U.). He has hold different positions and nurtures the discipline with his intellectual ability. He has been awarded with the prestigious national award Padma Bhusan as an educationist. Specialized in social stratification and political sociology professor Beteille has authored many sociological books, articles which reflect wider range of theoretical framework on Indian reality. Beteille’s works on conflicting values has been discussed in an integrative approach with reference to his Weberian orientation to understand social reality. Beteille’s early work *Caste, Class and Power* (1969) denote a step forward to appraise the Indian social reality particularly with reference to caste, class relation and social stratification. Continuing with efforts of village studies that popular during 1960s the year 1970s saw a further continuation of village and community studies with special reference to agrarian relations, land reforms, peasants and agricultural labourers etc. “these interests were focused on specific problems of the rural masses and the nature and degrees of
exploitation of the lower classes by the upper classes. The problems of rural society were formulated in the Marxian framework of analysis emphasizing conflict and contradiction.” (T.K. Oommen and P.N. Mukherjee: 1986:163) More about Beteille is discussed in the Chapter-V.

In the context of values Beteille argues that, all sociologist view their discipline as kind of natural science; today perhaps the majority of them view it as a moral science. One of the problems keeping values strictly-separate from facts in the moral or human science is that values themselves important part, some would say the most important part of their subject matter. In other words, the sociologist has to treat values as facts, as a part of his data, whether he is studying his own society or some other, or both. But even here, he has to distinguish as clearly as possible the different kinds of facts with which he has to deal; for instance, the demographic composition of a community as against the religious ideas of its members. (Andre Beteille: 2002: 25)

Beginning with the Max Weber the debate on value free social science is one of the ongoing issues among the social scientists and scholars even today is an unsolved question. Beteille was very much concern about these on going debate on value free sociology. He states that, it takes a special kind of discipline-at once intellectual and moral-to insulate the values being investigated by the sociologist from his own personal and social value. In a sense, what the sociologist, investigates and by means by which he investigates it are of one piece, more or so where the study of one’s own society is concerned. This mistakes the separation between the two particularly urgent on the intellectual plane and particularly difficult on the moral plane. Beteille argues that. as Max Weber had observed on this question: nor need I discuss further whether the distinction between empirical statements of fact and value-judgments is “difficult” to make. It is here, and particularly in India that the sociologist is most frequently tempted to let go of his slippery hold over the resources of his discipline and to revert to plain common sense. (Ibid: 26)

Andre Beteille in his book Antinomies of Society: Essays on Ideologies and Institutions (2002) discusses that, there are contradictions and tensions among norms and values. Unlike the Indian Marxist who discussed the conflicting values and norms in a historical and dialectical method, Beteille has observed in detail about the inexhaustible variety in the habits, practices and customs of the people of India in a
structural approach. But he agrees with the Indian Marxist in the sense that, the modern principles of equality was largely absent in traditional Indian society. He argues that, India's continuity as a civilization was social and cultural rather than political: order and stability were maintained not by means of the state but through a peculiar balance of social morphology values. (Ibid: 204) He also opined that, today Indian society is characterized not only by diversity but also by conflicts of various sorts. But this conflicting value has been either overlooked or ignored by the structural functional social anthropologist like N.K. Bose. In the context of conflicting values and norms Beteille says, there are pervasive conflicts between the norms and values in Indian society that has inherited from past and regarded as appropriate to the modern world. Beteille differentiates between the values and norms and define, “values – in the pattern sense – we regard as the primary connecting element between the social and cultural systems. Norms, however, are primarily social.” (Ibid: 209)

Beteille very carefully understood diversified Indian society and realizes India's unity lies in its diversity. In the context of India's unity, diversity, norms and values Beteille says that, the diversity of norms and values is related to the conflict of interest to the social morphology. Society is not a simple aggregate of individuals but a differentiated structure of groups, classes, and categories. The ideas and values of the individuals are shaped in part by his location within this differentiated structure. Even where uniform rules are established, these are refracted by the social morphology so that they are perceived and applied differently by the different sections of society. (Ibid: 209) Indian societies differ greatly in their scale and complexity. India has a population of more than 1 billion and the country divided by different language, region, religion, sect, caste, tribe, wealth, occupation, education and income. But the tolerance of diversity was a core values within Indian tradition. Today modern Indian accepts this diversified values that give the existence of a democratic pluralist society. Beteille observes the decline of moral values in contemporary India and argues that, the turbulence that is endemic in contemporary India is often attributed to the decline of moral values or their displacement by the pursuit of narrow personal or sectional interest. There is a constant refrain that values have given out of politics, civic life, the professions and education. (Ibid: 208)
In the context of value conflict he says that, the traditional India was governed for centuries and left many traditional values that have socially and culturally deep influence on the mainstream Indian society. For instance the practice of untouchability was being practiced since long which clearly mentioned in Manusmriti and even today it exists in many parts of our country in various forms. But as constitutional provision such practices has been punishable under the legal process and discourage to continue such practice. Thus the basic concern of value conflicts in Indian society between the tradition and modernity.

3.3. Concluding Observations

Initially value was not studied very specifically but the values have been understood and expressed through various social institutions like Family, Marriage, Kinship, Groups, Property, State, Education, Cultural traditions and Religion etc. Even before the coming up of sociology as a separate discipline, man tried to understand their origins, social structures, functions and growth. Perhaps the human intervention to explore the knowledge in the areas of philosophy, polity, history, religion, economy, etc. played an important role in the identifications of social values. The social values can be studied through careful observation of various social institutions. Though, the study of values are relatively new in the discipline of social sciences but before the existence of sociology as separate discipline, man tried to understand their origins, social structures, functions and growth and attempted to explore knowledge in the different areas of social life which subsequently contributed in the identifications of social values. The study of values has started with the pioneering effort in the subject of sociology by Thomas and Znanicki on their work *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (1918). In this chapter the existence of values is tied with the various theoretical orientations that have been propounded by the prophet, philosopher, intellectuals and some others.

For the better understanding of values in the present context of sociological discourse, the classical works of pioneer sociologists like Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx, Max Weber and some others have been discussed. The understanding of values and its relations with individual and society in the various aspects of social life has been explored through the western and Indian
sociological tradition. This chapter mainly concentrates on the positive and negative aspects of values. Keeping in view with these two aspects, in this study, the social value has been studied and explored through the dominant approaches like Structural Functional Approaches, Conflict Approaches, works on Critical Theorist, in the Western Sociological Tradition. And in Indian Sociological Tradition Structural Functional Approaches, Conflict Approaches, and Integrative Approach have been employed to understand the theoretical orientation of values in the sociology.

The origin of sociology as a separate discipline has its roots in the 19th century social transformation after the F.R. and I.R. The study of values through the structural functional approaches in Western sociology has been reflected from the works of Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, Talcott Parsons and R.K. Merton. Values have been also studied through the conflict approaches in western sociological tradition in the work of Karl Marx, Pareto, Veblen, Gramsci, Georg Simmel, C. Wright Mills, Lewis Coser and Ralf Dahrendorf. Besides this, values have been studied in the approaches of critical theorists like W. Benjamin, M. Horheim, H. Marcuse, T. W. Adorno, and Jurgan Habermas.

To begin with structural functional approach, Comte’s new science sociology was basically aimed at social reconstruction. Like Comte, Spencer was also concern with the evolutionary changes in social structure and social institution rather than with the attendant mental states. In a new environment the new social values were took time to shape up with the changing social structure and its functioning. Comte’s new science ‘sociology’ was basically aimed at social reconstruction. Like Comte, Spencer was concern with evolutionary changes in social structure and social institution rather than with the attendant mental states. According to Weber Values are based upon beliefs, not rationality. Values are what people acknowledge as precious. Weber clearly indicates that values as separate from scientific facts, Weber’s doctrines of value-freedom do not mean that scientific researches may give up values from his own conduct. Weber concerned with the analysis and understanding of values, as these are the important elements of any society and this is the foundation of Weber’s notion of value free sociology. As a part of rationalization Weber argued for a value free social science, a debate that continues even today in our times. Parsons also describes society sets common standards for role expectations from its members and imposes sanctions
in terms of rewards for positive values and punishments for negative values (the values that violate social standards). Merton tried to add value to the functional theoretical orientation in sociology. Merton argued that the existing social practices are not uniform for society. Common values produce common goals and different values produce different goals. Similarly social values may be functional, dysfunctional or non-functional for society as value are not uniform and it differs from individual and society.

Karl Marx asserted that value formation and social change is initiated by conflict of interest group. The values institutionalized are in all cases the values of the ruling class in the society. The ruling classes shape social values according to their favour, protect their vested interests and compel other suppressed people to follow those values. Those social values are not shared values, hence these inequalities among the people leading to social conflict. Simmel took conflict as positive values that shape the society. His stand on conflicts with referring social values, Simmel saw how the intensity of emotional arousal maintains some kind of social solidarity. The conflicting values in American society could be understood from C. Wright Mills theory power elite in relation to that of economic, prestige social and political power in American society that influences American values. Pareto’s circulation of elite, Gramsci’s hegemony and Veblen’s leisure class provides an insight into the conflicting values. Coser argues that, conflict within and between groups in a society can prevent accommodations and habitual relations from progressively impoverishing creativity. He also says that conflicts of interest and values or conflict between interest groups prevent stagnation and preserve vitality. Dahrendorf argues, conflict not only causes change of social structure but changes of structure also cause conflict. Class conflict is only one form of a more general social conflict. Throughout human history, ideology, values, lifestyles, customs and belief systems have provided ammunition for social unrest.

Critical theorist oriented toward critiquing changing society as a whole. Drawing the ideas from Marx and Freud, the primary goal of critical theorists is to understand the social structure through which people generally dominated and suppressed. Believing in the scientific knowledge, they used it as an instrument to the emancipation of human goal. Combining the ideas of historical materialism, German idealism and Jewish mysticism, Benjamin is known for his literary and cultural
criticism through his political, philosophical, and religious essays. Horkheimer and Adorno's have developed a critique of scientific positivism, whose 'instrumental rationality' became a form of domination in both capitalist and socialist countries. Marcuse reflected a discontent with modern society and technology and their destructive influences and advocates for the necessity of revolution. Habermas concerns with the development of a comprehensive theory of societal evolution, modernization and focuses on the difference between communicative rationality and rationalization on the one hand and strategic/instrumental rationalization on the other.

Functionalist views that society held together informally by norms, values, and common morality. Where functionalist focus on shared social values, there conflict theorists emphasize the role of power and authority in maintaining order in society. Conflict theorists say, conflict is inherent in the social structure, it is not always violent or manifest. Social conflict can be latent, regulated or momentarily constrained. Similarly, the studies of values have also been studied through the structural functional, conflict and integrative approaches in Indian sociological Tradition. Beginning with the structural functional approaches in Indian sociological tradition the works of Benoy Kumar Sarkar, Louis Dumont, G.S. Ghurye, Radhakamal Mukerjee, and N. K. Bose have been discussed. Keeping in view the conflicting tendencies in Indian society, the works of sociologists like Dhurjati Prasad Mukerji, Ramkrishna Mukherjee, A.R. Desai and T.K. Oommen has been discussed very comprehensively on conflicting tendencies in Indian society. And in Integrative approaches the scholars like Mysore Narasimhachar Srinivas, S.C. Dube, Yogendra Singh and Andre Beteille have been discussed.

The contributions of some of the Indian sociologists in the study of values have been discussed through structural functional, conflict and integrative approaches. Benoy Kumar Sarkar has studied the Indian society through structural functional approaches. Dumont attempted to reveal the various functions of caste bound Indian social life on the basis of structuralist perspectives in relation to social system as a whole. Ghurye viewed that, in Indian society is based on Brahmancial ideas and values performed the central role in the past. Ghurye inherently given space to values in his studies, and Radhakamal Mukerjee comprehensively dealt with values and developed theories on values. For Mukherjee, the values and norms are the key.
concepts in social analysis. Apart from his theories on values, his understanding on relationship between economic and social behaviour, social ecology, rural and urban social problems, Indian culture and civilization are also reflect the value orientation. From the writings of N.K. Bose Indian values could be understood as Indian tradition and civilization. M.N. Srinivas attempts to systematic formulation of the concepts like ‘sanskritization’, ‘westernization’ and ‘modernization’ reflect as a structure of culture and cultural values of the Indian society. According to the values of caste and religion the social structure is shape up in Indian society. In the later stage social values have been influenced by family, marriage, kinship and economic relations among different groups. S.C. Dube left very comprehensive writings on values in a structural functionalist approach. Yogendra Singh also attempted to reflect the values in the process of continuity with change. Beteille has highlighted conflicting values in a Weberian model through integrative approaches. He argues there are pervasive conflicts between the norms and values in Indian society that has inherited from past and regarded as appropriate to the modern world. He also said there are the diversity of norms and values related to the conflict of interest to the social morphology.

The conflict approach in Indian society began with much before it has begun in western society. The evidence of conflict approach began with Kautilya’s in his Arthasastra. In modern Indian, D.P. Mukerji was one of the popular and pioneer Marxist Indian sociologist analyzed Indian social history in terms of a dialectical process. The legacy of D.P. Mukerji carried forward by his student Ramkrishna Mukherjee which clearly reflects in his sociological works. In his book Sociology of Indian Sociology (1979), Ramkrishna attempted to classify some of the pioneer Indian Sociologist about their value preferences, theoretical approaches and methodological orientation in their studies. A.R. Desai, student of G.S. Ghurye has also focuses on wider range of value preferences and value orientations in understanding Indian society through the conflict approaches. T.K. Oommen’s insider and outsider debate, language and religious ideological orientation in nation building, social movements, ethnicity and pluralism deals with conflicting tendency in Indian society. According to him, apart from ethnicity, language and religion, the major problem associated with nation building in India is the conflict between the traditional and modern values. He says traditional Indian society was anchored to the values of hierarchy, holism and pluralism. Modern Indian polity is wedded to the values of socialism, democracy and secularism.