

**Classical Sociology Theory**  
**Professor. R. Santosh**  
**Department of Humanities and Social Sciences**  
**Indian Institute of Technology, Madras**  
**Lecture No. 45**  
**Ferdinand Tonnies (1885-1936)**

(Refer Slide Time: 00:11)



Ferdinand Tonnies (1885-  
1936)



Welcome back to the class. I hope you remember the previous sessions, where we had very elaborate discussions on Max Weber. This scholar is considered to be one of the most important persons, who laid foundation to the further development of Sociology. A person, who very significantly, contributed for the methodological advancement of the discipline. A person who contributed substantially for the development of very important themes within the discipline. So, we discussed Max Weber elaborately. I think, we must have had more than 7 or 8 sessions on Max Weber, and we are moving forward.

We discussed these 3 people, Durkheim, Weber and Marx elaborately, and we will also discuss another person George Simmel, in detail from the next class onwards. And after that, we will have a look at a couple of thinkers in short. That means, we will not spend as much time that we as we dedicated for the discussion on Marx, Durkheim and Weber, because they are considered to be the central figures in classical Sociology. But we will touch up on these scholars, in a rather brief matter, in comparison with the time that we spent in analyzing these three people.

Before the next class, we will be starting with Georg Simmel, another very important German sociologists whom we might take maybe three classes and three sessions to understand Simmel's arguments, Simmel's contributions and his overall arguments both social conflict, his arguments about the form and content of Sociology, his arguments about Pure Sociology and more importantly his study about the economy and the circulation of money.

But before that let me take this opportunity, take this particular session to discuss Ferdinand Tonnies, another very important scholar. Though Tonnies has written on various other aspects, but he is still remembered, or is considered to be a very important sociologist. And he is often remembered for his very important contribution, but he makes a distinction between the community and society. This particular distinction, the community and society, *Gesellschaft* and *Gemeinschaft*, is something so central even to the contemporary sociology thinkers.

Because that is something important, so that is why I thought that, I will have one session discussing the core argument of Ferdinand Tonnies, again a German sociologist, born in 1885 and passed away in 1936.

(Refer Slide Time: 3:08)

- *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* ("Community and Society") 1887
- The former refers to the natural, organic forms of group existence, the latter to the artificial group which is held together by some common, conscious purpose.
- The community grows out of the organic relationship of man to his environment and those natural, involuntary bonds that inevitably grow up between human beings and between groups; the society, on the other hand, is an artifact which arises out of those voluntary and teleological bonds that are the product of conscious choice and purpose



So, we not discussing his other arguments, many are kind of controversial and many have lost its relevance, many are no longer discussed in the contemporary Sociology. But this particular work, which was published in 1887, titled, "*Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*", it is titled, it is written in Germany, in German language. It is roughly translated as community

and society. It is an important work, and I think that students of who are studying Sociology, need to be familiar with that. That is why, I am dedicating or I am devoting one session for studying Ferdinand Tonnies.

So, let us see what his arguments and major contributions are. Why Tonnies is still invoked among the contemporary sociologist? Why that he is still remembered? Why and what is his significance of this particular work? So, the former, that is this *Gemeinschaft*, refers to the natural organic forms of group existence, the latter to the artificial group which is held together by some common conscious purpose. And is a very extremely important division.

It is two broad category. He is dividing this whole societies that were existing during his time into two broad categories, or he is arguing that, almost every existing societies, can be divided into these two major types of societies, *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*. Or he argues that are two fundamental types of societies. One is our first, natural, organic forms of group existence; while the latter is an artificial group which is held together by some common conscious purpose.

The first is seen as natural, it is seen as unconscious. Something that, we do not really have to labour, in order to identify ourself with. We are born into certain identities. We know that, we are born into certain caste, we are born into certain language, we are born into certain religion, and we are born into certain tribe. So, we are born into that by accident, and our belonging to that particular group is quite natural. First of all, it is not out of our volition, it is not out of our choice, but it just happened. So, that kind of society, that kind of membership, or that kind of society, he says, it is quite natural, it is organic. It is an organic process, it is something so natural, and it is something so organic, a form of group existence.

Whereas, the second one that, *Gesellschaft* is more artificial and which is held together by some conscious, by some common conscious purpose. For, the second type of membership, second type of society requires that, you hold together to that particular community on the basis of certain conscious thinking; that means it is not a reflexive process, it is not an unconscious process. It is rather, a result of a conscious action. You think about certain things, you use your rationality, and then you think that you need to become a part of this particular group and then you identify with that. And the group also identifies themselves with you and then you become a part of that.

Whereas, the other one the first one is, that you do not have to do anything, you are naturally a part of that. He argues that is what he makes this distinction between community and society. Society, he argues, is that the result of some common conscious purpose; society. Whereas community is more natural, it is something more organic, it is something more spontaneous, you are born into certain thing and you feel quite at home. So, Tonnies further elaborates that, the community grows out of the organic relationship of man and to his environment and those natural involuntary bonds that inevitably grow up between human beings and between groups.

The society, on the other hand, is an artifact, which arises out of those voluntary and teleological bonds that are the products of conscious choices and purposes. So, it is exactly the same thing that I have explained. The community grows out of the organic relationship to a man, and to his environment and the usual examples; that are given by Tonnies, or even other sociologist, is the kind of a distinction between a tribal society or a agrarian society, a less advanced society.

And that is what usually, we know that, is the picture of a tribal society, always tell, gives you this impression of a very natural society; as a group of people who are living amidst the nature. A group of people who are not corrupted by the vices of modernity, by that of technology, by that of advancement; people who are more natural, that is the kind of our common understanding.

Tonnies more or less invokes a kind of a similar idea and argues that it emerges out of an organic relationship. It is a very spontaneous one, it is an organic relationship of man at to his environment and those natural involuntary bonds that inevitably grow between human beings and between groups. When people are born into such a kind of community, when they grow up, the kind of relationship that binds them together, will be very strong. I hope, you remember a parallel in Durkheim. When he discusses this distinction between societies characterized by organic solidarity and societies characterized by mechanical solidarity.

He is referring something similar to the societies characterized by mechanical solidarity. Where again Durkheim was indicating this primitive societies, tribal societies, simple societies; where, there is hardly any division of labour. So here, as well while Durkheim emphasized on division of labour, here Tonnies is talking about the kind of relationship. He says, it is quite natural that somebody is born into particular family, develops a kind of very

spontaneous, very thick, very strong relationship with the immediate family, the clan, the tribe, the immediate relationship, and is not it? So, that the tribal identity becomes very strong and thick.

On the other hand society is an artifact, which arises out of the voluntary and teleological bonds that are the product of conscious choice of purpose. What is this teleological bond? Teleological bond is used to understand, that many of these arrangements, many of these groups are formed in order to serve a particular purpose. This very existence of this particular group is justified, is explained on the basis of the purpose, is supposed to fulfill after sometime.

That is the kind of a teleological argument, and quite a lot of functionalist, structural functionalist argument, is having a teleological problem. Because they tend to explain the functions of a group, or the structure of a group, on the basis of the function that it is supposed to have fulfilled. So, on the basis of an effect, you try to explain the cause of its existence that is a kind of a teleological explanation.

A society Tonnies argues that it is an artifact, it is an artificial creation, it is not something natural, and it is not something spontaneous. It is an artifact, which arises out of the voluntary and teleological bond. You voluntarily do certain thing, you consciously do certain things. It is not very unconscious, it is not very natural, it is not very organic, it is not very spontaneous, rather you consciously think about it, you rationally think about it, you voluntarily think about it, and produce a kind of a group, or a membership, or a group of people with a certain purposes. And people come together because they employ their conscious choice.

These are the two maybe, if you borrow Weberian term, these are the two major ideal types that Tonnies creates in order to differentiate; Gemeinschaft from Gesellschaft.

(Refer Slide Time: 11:53)

- The community arises out of what Tonnies calls a common *Wesenwillen*, or those life-forces associated with the instincts, emotions, and habits.
- Society rests on a common *Kiirwillen*, which, unlike the former, is characterized by the predominance of deliberation and conscious choice over the strivings rooted in man's nature.
- former is a more highly integrated and organismic behavior than the latter, which is segmental. In the former, the correspondence between means and ends is direct and close; in the latter, means and ends may be far removed from each other, and the one may not necessarily grow out of and lead to the other.
- The latter is the more mechanical and rational behavior. The community is a product of nature, while the society is an artifact.



The community arises out of what Tonnies calls a common *Wesenwille*, or those life-forces associated with the instincts, emotions, and habits. Society rests on common *Kiirwille*, which, unlike the former, is characterized by the predominance of deliberation and conscious choice over the striving roots, are strivings rooted in man's nature. Another very interesting set of topics and concepts are brought here.

He talks about *Gesellschaft*, *Gemeinschaft* and he says that this *Gemeinschaft*, the community arises out of what Tonnies calls a common *Wesenwille* or those life-forces associated with the instincts, emotions and habits. Something connected with the human body, something connected with the world of emotions. And this is something very important, because he argues, this community is connected with the world of emotions, whereas, the society is connected with other world of reason, or rationality

And, this is a fascinating theme, and even in today's contemporary sociological discussion these themes are being brought back. These themes are being brought back, about how far we have been using this world of emotions in our everyday life, to what extent the kind of modernization theory, or a host of classical sociological theory which argued that, we are living in a society, which is characterized by rationality, is true. What is a place of emotion in today's world?

That are very fascinating theories about, especially some of the most recent theorizations about hate speech. They use the term extreme speeches, that you come across in Facebook, or in Twitter, or in propaganda, in a host of trolling in the Internet and Facebook. So, there are

very interesting theorizations, why that there is this extreme speech becoming quite evident, or become quite commonplace in contemporary society. And there are very fascinating theorizations, by invoking this word, or all of the emotions, which we believed that; when we progress over a period of time, we would be able to master these emotions and we would be able to speak from the platform of rationality.

When it is assumed that when we invoke rationality, we have mastered emotions, we do not invoke emotions. We keep emotions away because emotions are something supposed to be used only in your private personal realm. Whereas when you talk in public, when you engage in public, you are supposed to be a perfectly rational organism, which uses only a rational, you know rational means. And it is been widely assumed that emotion does not have any role in the world of rationality.

Now we realize that, especially some of this very recent theorizations will tell you that, how you know, how baseless or how problematic these assumptions were; but Tonnies brings forth this argument, that those life-forces associated with their instincts. You know the term instinct is usually associated with that of animal. We talk about animal instinct, the kind of bodily drives, like that of hunger, sexual urge, fear, anger, is not it? So, these are the kinds of bodily instincts, which we attribute to every animal. Then we realize that human beings are also animals, but we know how to contain this instincts; we know how to regulate that, and emotions, and habits.

On the other hand, society rests on a common *Kiirwille*, again a German term; which, unlike the former is characterized by the predominance of deliberation and conscious choice over the strivings rooted in man's nature. Society is a product of rationality, society is a product of deliberation. When you deliberate, you use your rational faculty, you think from various perspectives, you analyze a particular situation from various vantage points and then you adopt the most appropriate way. Just remember Weber; Weber talks about the legal rational action, instead of the traditional or the emotional action.

So, former is a more highly integrated and organismic behavior than the latter, which is segmental. So, in a community, you see more integrated and organismic behavior. It behaves like an organism, there is an organismic character. There is a complementarity between each other. It is a more integrated one and I hope you can easily understand because we have already discussed this when we discussed Durkheim. A traditional simple society, a tribal society. It is, very simple in its character, they are all integrated, everybody does every kind

of work, nobody specializes in anything, and division of labor is very minimum. There is a very strong sense of integration and of unity.

The ideas about what is right, and what is wrong, those ideas are very clear. Anybody who violates these roles, these rules, will be punished very violently. Because these rules are supposed to be very stringent. On the other hand, the correspondence between means and ends is; in the former, the correspondence between the means and end is direct and close. You have to get certain things, then and these are the means which are very clear. In the later, means and ends may be far removed from each other, and the one may not necessarily grow out of, and lead to the other.

In a society you may not have any particular end which is stated. On the other hand, there could be quite a lot of values, there could be quite a lot of means, which are associated, which are being seen a part of that, which are not seen as directly connected with that to the goals. The latter is the more mechanical and rational behaviour; something that we discussed so far. Society is understood as more mechanical, it is seen as more rational. The community is a product of a nature, while the society is an artifact. That is, why he reemphasizes that. It is a product, community, society is a product, product of a very rational action.

(Refer Slide Time: 19:08)

- Tönnies asserted that pre-modern society was dominated by Gemeinschaft ties, while modern industrial capitalist society featured more Gesellschaft ties.
- These Gemeinschaft relations were maintained in the context of private sentiment and loyalty, rather than simply productivity in the marketplace. In contrast, in more modern Gesellschaft societies, interactions were more "rational," and reflected impersonal relationships mediated by money, and in particular cash wages, or what Tönnies calls "rational will."
- In other words, Gemeinschaft-based relationships tend to be affectual, while Gesellschaft relationships tend to be instrumental.



Tönnies asserted that, pre-modern society was dominated by Gemeinschaft ties; while modern industrial capitalist society featured more Gesellschaft ties. And, this is, I think, we expected this argument. Is not it? Why a sociologist who lives in the late twentieth century, talks about, or early, late nineteenth century and early twentieth century talk about



Gesellschaft and Gemeinschaft, basically is to make this kind of a distinction between, what demarcates a modern society from that of a pre-modern society. And he says that, in pre-modern societies including that of Europe, before the emergence of modernity, these societies were characterized by Gemeinschaft ties. They were communities, they were not kind of off-grown into societies.

Whereas, in the modern era, maybe in the time, when Tonnies lived, the major European societies, they have become more societies. They have lost their characters of community. This is a very important claim. And why it is an important claim? Because it is an important claim, and this claim has been some of the most fundamental claims of our understanding about social change. These claims are some of the fundamental claims of this modernization theory. And these claims are important because when we analyze the way in which we live in our contemporary world, in the twenty first century, in 2020.

If you adopt this particular framework, is it the way we live? Have we lost in cities, or in urban centers, in a globalised society, have we completely lost our sense of community? Is it so, or are we trying to create different forms of community? Are we all living in a very rational deliberately, you know, a society which is completely driven by deliberations and rational exchanges and other things? This Gemeinschaft relations were maintained in the context of private sentiments and loyalty, rather than simply productivity in the marketplace. This Gemeinschaft relationship were maintained in the context of private sentiment and loyalty.

We know that, how in feudal societies for example, or in agrarian societies how various social institutions function. They worked on the basis of sentiments, on the basis of notions of tradition, on the basis of loyalty, on the basis of personal bonds, on the basis of the kind of Kinship ties, blood relationship, caste relationship, rather than the simple productivity in the market place; which is often argued by Weber and others in a market, is supposedly blind to all these primordial affiliations and primordial relationships. Market is supposed to be ruthlessly rational. It is ruthlessly impersonal, it is supposed to be; but we know that it is not.

In contrast, in modern, Gesellschaft societies, interactions were more rational, and reflected impersonal relationship mediated by money. And in particular cash wages, or what Tonnies calls the rational will. We know that, it is something, nothing of course, quite new for us. We have already discussed that, when in compared to if you adopt a kind of a Marxian stages of development; in the era of primitive communism, or to that of a slavery or to that of a

feudalism. In each of these three modes of production of these three stages, people came to visit people, engaged in productive activities not on the base of wage labour, but on the base of number of other kind of ties.

But in a modern market society, market situation, it is mediated by money and in particular cash wages. Salary, cash wages, or what Tonnies calls as a rational will. We know, that why the workers make themselves available for the work, they are able to bargain with others, and the employers are able to hire people looking at the profits. There is so much of rational exchange taking place.

In other words, Gemeinschaft-based relationships tend to be affectual, while Gesellschaft relationships tend to be instrumental; something which summarizes all of whatever we have being saying. So, this whole question of affectual relationship and instrumental relationship. This again, is a very powerful tool to examine the kind of types of relationships. Is it affectual? And if it is affectual; it is supposed to be older forms, old-fashioned, less efficient, less effective. Whereas, if it is instrumental, it is supposed to be very rational, it is supposed to be more efficient, it is supposed to be more techno-savvy, or technologically oriented.

So, that has been the argument that we are moving away from a world, dominated by affectual society into that of a society, which is more of an instrumental. We know that usual lament, the usual complaint by people that the world has lost all its values; that people are treating each other as commodities, the life has become very instrumental, and the world has become very instrumental. So, that is a kind of an argument that Tonnies also reflects.

(Refer Slide Time: 24:57)

- Tönnies thought of the development of the modern world as being an evolutionary one, in which European societies emerging from the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century and became more rational and "Gesellschaft"-like, overwhelming older forms of *Gemeinschaft* society.
- Tönnies' formulation assumed that the new *Gesellschaft* society was superior because the material advantages of modern life would eventually overwhelm the older forms of *Gemeinschaft*, with all its sentimentality, family-based favoritism, tribal organization, and economic inefficiencies.



Tönnies thought of the development, of the modern world as being an evolutionary one, in which European societies emerged from the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century and became more rational and Gesellschaft-like, overwhelming older forms of just Gemeinschaft society. Again something very common for us now, because every scholar or almost every major scholar whom we encountered so far; starting with Tocqueville, to Comte, to Montesquieu, to Spencer, to Durkheim, they all believed that, this is a kind of a natural law, this is a kind of a social law. That, it is an evolutionary one.

We discussed that, how this notion of evolution was heavily influenced by Darwinian notion of evolution and others. So, there is a gradual displacement of Gemeinschaft society by that of Gesellschaft societies. So, revolution of the nineteenth century, and became more rational and Gesellschaft-like, overwhelming older forms of Gemeinschaft society. Tönnies is talking about the change in a quality of social ties; change in the nature of social ties.

Tönnies' formulation assumed that, the new Gesellschaft societies was superior because the material advantages of modern life would eventually overwhelm the older forms of Gemeinschaft, with all its sentimentality, family-based favoritism, and tribal organization economic inefficiencies. Exactly the same that we discussed. They all believed that, we will become extremely very efficient people who will dump all these unnecessary emotions and affects; the kind of a baggage that comes with your membership and primordial identities.

We will become more science like or scientific, we will become more rational people; who will be able to think and behave in a more efficient manner. And that was the hope, and but

we know, how flawed that analysis was; how the affect is something so important even in contemporary society. How the whole question of sentimentality and other things are something so central even in today's life. Whether, it is what, in every form of social life.

So Tonnies' formulation assumed that the new *Gesellschaft* society, was superior because of the material advantages of modern world, would eventually overwhelm the older forms of *Gemeinschaft*, with all its sentimentality, family-based favoritism. So, they believed that family-based one will have lot of baggage of sentimentality, nepotism, favoritism and other things, and modern bureaucracy based society will have none of this. And again, we know how faulty that assumption is; tribal organization and economic inefficiencies.

(Refer Slide Time: 28:14)

- These terms became popular in Europe and in American sociology
- In particular, Tönnies framework meshed well with the “modernization theorists” who viewed economic development as a process of gradual modernization in which “old-fashioned” *Gemeinschaft*-style society was displaced by rationalized efficient forms, especially market capitalism and democracy.
- Weber accepted Tönnies basic distinctions, but he emphasized that both types of society always coexisted, albeit uncomfortably. Weber saw this coexistence in pre-modern societies where the *Gesellschaft* was small and the *Gemeinschaft* all-encompassing. But most particularly Weber saw coexistence in modern society where the *Gesellschaft* seemingly overwhelmed underlying *Gemeinschaft* values.



And these two terms, this *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* became extremely powerful, extremely popular in Europe and in American Sociology. So that is why they are quite often invoked in sociological analysis; this *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*. Because they in a very crisp manner, they are able to capture some of the very essential differences in terms of the quality of relationship between a community and a society. One which we discussed.

In particular, Tönnies framework meshed well with the modernization theorists, who viewed economic development as a process of gradual modernization, in which old-fashioned *Gemeinschaft*-style society was displaced by rationalized efficient forms; especially market capitalism and democracy. So, I do not know whether, we discussed about modernization theorists, but this is an extremely powerful, extremely powerful theoretical orientation, heavily influenced both by economic as well as sociological theories, especially the

sociological theories of modernization were heavily influenced by all these people, starting with Comte, Spencer, Durkheim, Marx and Tonnies.

All these people, they all believed that the process of modernization is unstoppable, and in the process of modernization you will bulldoze all the older forms of existence from a traditional society to a modern society. There are arguments about the leap, the jump, the sudden jump from traditional society to the modern society. So, all that is traditional would be withered away, it will be withered away. All that is traditional, all that is old will simply disappear and a new modern world will emerge.

They believed that the western societies, especially the western European countries; Germany, France, UK, Italy, Netherlands, these countries were undergoing the process of modernization and the rest of the countries are supposed to follow the suit. They believed that is an inescapable process. So, they believed that from a plethora of different forms of existence, different forms of a social organization, every society supposed to lead to this particular mode of development. So that is why, our understanding of development was heavily influenced by this modernization theory.

What constitutes development, how can we imagine development? Development is very important term, extremely important term. And till maybe 1970s, the term development was never problematized. So, what do you mean by problematized? Till 1970s, there was no debate about development. Development was seen as something unproblematic, it was seen as if that everybody understood it. It was never seen that could be different or this could be a contested terrain. It was never understood so.

Development was seen as that, that there is a consensus about everybody among everybody about how to develop, that you increase your consumption, you increase your per capita income, you increase in GDP, you become more industrialized, you bring in more science and technology, you consume more natural resources. So, this was seen as development. And after 1970s, by 80s, by 90s, this term became extremely contested on various grounds. I am not going into the details.

Now later, we realized that this term development is very problematic term. It is a little problematic term, that people can leave differently, people can have different ideas about living peacefully, living with their sense of fulfillment. And we do not know, there is no singular mode of development. But, if you look at the policy formulations, if you look at the

power of this particular concept, the influence of this particular concept, it is something so gigantic, something so powerful. It is so hygienic, this western notion of development. And that has heavily influenced the trajectory of the West, it has influence the trajectory of coronial societies, it has invoked, in fact, influence the trajectory of almost every society.

So, in that theorization, this modernization theory played a very significant role. Because, modernization theory, just like that of arguments by Tonnies, provided sociological explanation or sociological justification for the notion of development. That, whatever is there in the tradition, everything is bad, everything is inefficient, everything is so sentimental, everything is so obscurantist. And you need to dump all of them, you need to move into a modern society.

And now, we realize that particular assumptions were very flawed. We are now supposed to be in a post development stage, where we realize that many of the things that we initiated in the name of development were extremely problematic. Or they did not provide you the kind of results, that they promised or they also brought in quite a lot of other consequences, which we never were aware of. And there are very fascinating theorizations about late-modernity, about post-modernity, about liquid-modernity, about risk-society. That, this modernization has brought in, its own set of risks which we never anticipated and which were never kind of ready to face.

Now let us see, how Weber, looked at it. Weber, Max Weber accepted Tonnies basic distinction, but he emphasized that both types of societies actually coexisted, albeit uncomfortably. Weber saw this coexistence in pre-modern societies, where the *Gesellschaft* was small and *Gemeinschaft* was all-encompassing. But most particularly Weber saw coexistence in modern society, where the *Gesellschaft* seemingly overwhelmed underlying *Gemeinschaft* values.

So, Weber is far more sensitive than many of these people who, very mechanically, who produced their version of a mechanical kind of a social change; where one type of society is completely obliterated and then completely new society come into the picture. Even in Weberian argument about power or authority. He does not say that, the traditional forms of power completely disappears. He only says that, the modern legal rational kind of power becomes more dominant.

So, here as well, Weber says that, in a modern society, it does not mean that, all the characteristics of a Gemeinschaft society disappear. It does not do, rather the more dominant form of society becomes that of Gesellschaft. So that is why, he says, but most particularly Weber saw coexistence in modern society, where the Gesellschaft seemingly overwhelmed underlying the Gemeinschaft values.

(Refer Slide Time: 35:55)

- The field of sociology proper is thought of by Tonnies as comprising three main divisions: Pure, Applied sociology and Empirical sociology



Pure sociology includes,

1. The fundamental concepts community and society.
2. The study of social interrelations or structures
3. The study of the social norms forming the content of the structural forms which are the social realities.
4. The study of the social values inhering in the social realities or structural forms.
5. The study of the constellations of relations arising out of the interaction between the various social realities or structural forms.



Another is the central theme of Ferdinand Tonnies, his distinction between Gesellschaft and Gemeinschaft, or distinction between community and society. Now, let us move to his another kind of more, minor interventions. He thought about three major divisions of sociological themes, three broader divisions within Sociology. One is Pure, Applied Sociology and Empirical Sociology.

So, the Pure Sociology includes, the fundamental concepts of community and society, as we discussed so far and that is its central thesis. The study of social interactions or structures. Again by the time of Tonnies and Simmel, at least or by the time of Weber, for that matter, we know that Sociology had become more established. Scholars across the spectrum came to a different consensus, that there is a new discipline and this new discipline has its own subject matter, exclusive subject matter. And that subject matter is nothing, but social interactions, and social structures.

The study of the social norms are forming the content of the structural forms which are the social realities. So here, you come across this term, form; the social norms forming the content. So, this whole distinction between the form and content which we will come across

again when we discuss Ferdinand Tonnies; George Simmel in the coming class. So, he is talking about, what is the content of the structural form which are all the social realities. The study of the social values inhering in the social realities or structural forms. So, it is not only the kind of a form, or the structure, but also the content, the kind of a values.

You know that how values was brought in, into the ambit of sociological exploration, basically through Weber. The study of the constellations of the relations arising out of the interaction between the various social realities or structural forms and this is nothing but the kind of social change. What are the kind of a new relations for the kind of major changes that are happening as a result of the interaction between various social realities of social structural forms? So, in other words, the major profound thematic areas of Sociology calls it as Pure Sociology.

(Refer Slide Time: 38:31)

#### Applied Sociology

- Economics, politics, and mental life, which includes art, morals, and science, constitute the field of applied sociology in the sense that here the fundamental concepts of sociology are illustrated and find application to concrete materials.

#### Comparative Sociology

- The observation and the comparison, and of course the measurement, of the actual social phenomena as they appear in real life constitute the realm of empirical sociology.

⏪ / ⏩



And Applied Sociology is for Weber; is economics, politics, and mental life, which includes art, morals, and science, constitute the field of Applied Sociology in the sense that here the fundamental concepts of Sociology are illustrated and find application to concrete materials. So here, he talks about how, other disciplines make use of sociological concepts for the kind of into concrete situations. For example, how one of the very important discipline, which has not formed during Tonnies time, is social work.

So, social work is supposedly a kind of an applied sociological kind of a discipline. Social work aims at intervention. Social work aims at policy intervention as well as intervention in their community, intervention in a kind of a concrete setting. So, Empirical, Applied



Sociology is, you use, you apply the sociological principles into the concrete reality. For example, your sociological understandings about crime and law. And, how can you use this social understandings, in a prison, for an example.

Or, how can you use this understanding in order to reframe the existing laws about the child delinquency in a particular place, or sociological understanding about divorce? How can you use sociological understandings about family and marriage? How can you use these understandings in formulating better laws regarding sexual harassment, or domestic violence or divorce and other things? So here, the sociological knowledge, which is supposedly at the theoretical level, is brought in with a possibility of application.

And the third one is, Comparative Sociology. The observations and comparison, and of course, the measurement of the actual social phenomena as they appear in real life constitute the realm of Empirical Sociology, or the Comparative Sociology. You look into the different forms of Comparative Sociology; you try to compare different societies into different things. And then you use this empirical framework, in order to do this kind of a comparison.

So, the final component is the Comparative Sociology. So, it is about the observation, comparison, and of course the measurement, of the actual social phenomena, as they appear in real life constitute the realm of Empirical Sociology. So, these are the three categories, or three divisions, that Tonnies envisages as comprising the subject matter of Sociology. So but, as I told, host of other writings of Tonnies are not, are no longer kind of referred to or no longer seen as something very important.

But his fundamental contribution of this *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, are still debated upon their, still used by sociologists. Because, they offer very important entry points into the discussions, not only about the transition from traditional society to modern society, but also to critically look at about the kind of a contemporary society, that we are living in. What is the role of affection? What is the role of affect? What is the role of emotion in the contemporary society?

To what extent have we become rational, or what has become the term rational? Or what has happened to this term rational or how there can be multiple rationalities? So, Tonnies still informs many of this discussions. So, let us wind up the topic. So, this is only one session on Tonnies, because I just wanted to introduce you to his, this fundamental distinction between

Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. We will continue with another thinker, and that is George Simmel in the next class. So, see you then and thank you.