

Divergence and Convergence of Classical Sociological Theorists

Efa Tadesse Debele (PhD Candidate)

**Department of Sociology, College of Social Sciences, Addis Ababa University,
Ethiopia**

Divergence and Convergence of Classical Sociological Theorists

Max Weber and Emile Durkheim. To begin with, Max Weber preferred interpretive or verstehen understanding of social phenomenon. Max Weber devoted to subjective understanding causality of empirical realities. On the contrary, Emile Durkheim interested in scientific approach or positivistic to understand social realities. Durkheim employed statistical application to identify social causes of suicide rates in different societies. This asserts that Max Weber and Emile Durkheim have different position in choosing the methods of social research. Weber is positivist, rationalist, empiricist whereas Emile Durkheim is rationalist, positivist and realist. Weber and Durkheim purport neutrality of social research but Weber did not put into practice in this regard because he seems that of Marx's passionate researcher or scientist. Both Durkheim and Weber focus on empirical realities. Theoretically, Max Weber mentioned that individuals are shaped by social forces like religion as he indicated in Protestant ethics and spirit of capitalism this implies that for the conscious of individuals religion play a pivotal role which proved in Protestantism that shaped individuals behavior towards capitalistic way of life. But, his work is not well theorized and lacks critical aspects. Weber is more or less symbolic interactionist. On the other hand Emile Durkheim articulated that individuals are the product of society that oscillated by external forces or social facts this implies that individuals are shaped by external forces like religion, family, culture, etc. In this regard Max Weber and Emile Durkheim have common stance. Durkheim's epistemological stance of positivism questioned due to less likely or May not invariant law exists in social world. Even there is doubt that social facts are not free from interpretation. Durkheim is functionalist that exposes him to be conservative. Wax Weber

is pessimistic about future of individual in a society because of iron cage but Emile Durkheim is hopeful that even though religious power vanishing there would be morality of science.

Max Weber and Karl Marx. They share similarity and difference. To start with, Max Weber supports interpretive understanding of empirical realities however Karl Marx attuned to dialectical materialist or critical method. Max Weber opts for value free social research though Karl Marx contends that values and facts are inseparable. Weber is Idealist, Interpretist and empiricist but Karl Marx is nominalist and Dialectical materialist. Max Weber believes that cause-effect relationship to understand social phenomena but Karl Marx deny cause-effect and argue for reciprocal relationship or dialectically. On the other hand, Max Weber and Karl Marx developed opposite theoretical ideas concerning about idealism and materialism that Weber certainly devoted a lot of attention to ideas, particularly systems of religious ideas, and Weber was especially concerned with the impact of religious ideas on the economy. Weber believes ideas in world religious affect development of capitalism or material while Marx argues that material or economic life determine other social life. Max Weber did tend to view Marx and the Marxists of his day as economic determinists who offered single-cause theories of social life. Instead of focusing on economic factors and their effect on ideas, Weber saw economic factors as fairly autonomous forces capable of profoundly affecting the economic world. From this it can be seen Weber developed his ideas in opposition to those of Karl Marx.

Max Weber and George Simmel relationship in terms of their theories and methods. Max Weber as mentioned Earlier attuned to empirical approach and interpretive understanding or verstehen whereas George Simmel is more methodological relationist highly prefer level of analysis as appropriate way of understanding social reality through interpreting social interactions by social forms and social types. Weber and Simmel concern role of individual actor and collective role in constructing social phenomenon. But, Simmel more emphasizes on small scale while Max Weber concern with more on large scale yet both of them lack distinction for micro and macro phenomenon. Max Weber lacks critical analysis whereas George Simmel lacks coherent framework for theoretical analysis. Both believe that in modern society the significance of individuals diminish. They are pessimistic about future what Weber says iron cage.

Emile Durkheim and Karl Marx have different stance in regard to methods of social study. Emile Durkheim believes that society can be studied scientifically via positive approach whereas Karl Marx purports that society need to be studied via value laden. Marx is antipositivist and nominalist as well as is more or less philosophically oriented social thinker. Marx use Critical Method. Marx's focus on real, existing contradictions led to a particular method for studying social phenomena that has also come to be called "dialectical". In dialectical analysis, social values are not separable from social facts. Theoretically, Emile Durkheim avows individuals are under yoke of social morality or collective conscience while Karl Marx also states that individuals are subjects under bourgeois society. Durkheim's optimistic faith is in moral education whereas Karl Marx's optimism is in communistic society or classless society. Durkheim see human consciousness as it causes problem like unrestrained passion and that lead to anomic. But Marx appreciates human consciousness that can cause rebellion against structure or capitalism and replace by socialism. Durkheim supports social reform but Marx holds revolution needed because problem is inherited in society.

Emile Durkheim and George Simmel's works have convergence and divergence. For Emile Durkheim society and social phenomenon can be studied by positivistic approach or scientific principle whereas George Simmel disregards scientific convention attuned to level of analysis and methodological relationist position. In terms of theory Emile Durkheim worried about decline of general spirit and flourish of individualism but George Simmel worry about decline of subjective /individual culture that he mentioned tragedy of subjective culture and dominance of collective or objective culture. Simmel was famous by forms of interaction (for example, conflict) and types of interactants (for example, the stranger). Basically, Simmel saw that understanding interaction among people was one of the major tasks of sociology. However, Durkheim known by two themes. The first is the priority of the social over the individual, and the second is the idea that society can be studied scientifically. Durkheim could develop sociological theories but Simmel lacks systematic theories just collections of essays.

Finally, let us see relationship between **Karl Marx and George Simmel's** works. Karl Marx is dialectical materialist, critical and nominalist. George Simmel dedicates to methodological relationist and emphasizes on level of analysis. Marx and Simmel are philosophically oriented, antipositivists and dialectical oriented. For Marx dialectics is within material between working

class's material needs and bourgeois' material needs but for George Simmel dialectic is in individual culture and structure or objective culture that reflect in Fashion. Theoretically, George Simmel developed the concept of labor power which has resemblance with labor time value of Karl Marx which is base of capitalistic society but exploited via commodification of humans. Labor products are alienated which results in worship of objects via externalization that is fetishism. George Simmel also mentioned that labor power create objects via objectification that results in reification. However, alienation for Karl Marx is imposed and can be removed from human nature but for George Simmel alienation is inherently in human nature and propose nothing to way out. Whereas Karl Marx was occupied with large scale issues like the political economy, Simmel was best known for his work on smaller scale issues, especially individuality and social forms as well as social types. In spite of the similarities between Marx and Simmel in their use of a dialectical approach, there are important differences between them. Of greatest importance is the fact that they focused on very different aspects of the social world and offered very different images of the future of the world. Simmel concerns the tragedy of individual labor in modern society. Simmel had a view of the future closer to Weber's image of an "iron cage" from which there is no escape. However, Marx hope that someday capitalist society overthrown through working class consciousness and struggle of working class then classless society would replace and paradise happen on the earth. Marx is more optimistic about future of modern society expecting that communistic way of life is inevitable.

References

Émile Durkheim;Suicide;A study in sociology; Translated by John A. Spaulding and George Simpson; Edited with an introduction by George Simpson; London and New York

George Simmel: On Individuality and social forms; edited and with an introduction by Donald N.Levine; Selected Writings ;The heritage of sociology; THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO;PRESS ;CHICAGO AND LONDON

Max Weber: The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism: Translated by Talcott Parsons with an introduction by Anthony Giddens; London and New York; First published 1930 by Allen and Unwin; 29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

Karl Marx's;A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy; Written: 1859 Publisher: Progress Publishers, Moscow;First Published:1859,Translated: S.W. Ryazanskaya,On-Line Version: Marx.org 1993 (Preface, 1993), Marxists.org 1999,Transcribed: Tim Delaney, Zodiac;HTML Markup: [Tim Delaney](#) 1999.