

**A Comparative Analysis of the Views of
Emile Durkheim and Karl Mannheim
On Education and Society.**

Dissertation submitted to the Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfilment of the requirement for
the award of the degree of
MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

AMARENDRA KUMAR PATNAIK

ZAKIR HUSSAIN CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI—110067. INDIA
1988



C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that this dissertation entitled "A Comparative Analysis of the views of Emile Durkheim and Karl Mannheim on Education and Society", submitted by Mr. Amarendra Kumar Patnaik in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the Master of Philosophy (M.Phil.) degree, has not been previously submitted for any degree of this or any other University. This is his own work.

We recommend this dissertation be placed before the examiners for their evaluation.

Karuna Ahmad
Dr. Karuna Ahmad
Supervisor

Suresh C. Ghosh
Prof. S.C. GHOSH
Chairperson



CONTENTS

| | <u>Pages</u> |
|---|--------------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | |
| CHAPTER I DEVELOPING A BASIS FOR COMPARISON | 1 - 40 |
| CHAPTER II DURKHEIM AND MANNHEIM: THEIR APPROACH TO SOCIETY | 41 - 95 |
| CHAPTER III MANNHEIM AND DURKHEIM ON EDUCA- TION | 96 - 153 |
| CHAPTER IV CONCLUSION | 154 - 198 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 199 - 205 |

*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to my supervisor Dr. Karuna Ahmed for her inspiration in taking up this work, and the patience with which she guided me till the completion of this work.

I am obliged to the libraries of Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi School of Economics, NCERT, NIEPA and Teen Murti which helped me in collecting materials for this dissertation. Without the help of these libraries it would have been extremely difficult for me to complete the present work.

I am thankful to my friend Jaqruti, my brother and sister-in-law and other friends who extended me necessary emotional support. Also, I am thankful to Mr. Om Prakash for his meticulous typing.

The present work is based on literature review from primary and secondary sources. In case of any mistake, I stand for correction.



AMARENDR A KUMAR PATNAIK

CHAPTER I
DEVELOPING A BASIS FOR COMPARISON

Durkheim, Mannheim and the changing
contours of Sociology of Education:

The growth and development of sociology of education cannot be divorced from the uneven tract Sociology had to traverse, because it had to depend on the conceptual and theoretical developments in the latter. Even for many years it was not recognised as a part of Sociology. Rather, it constituted a part of the discipline of education. John Dewey gave it the initial push that finally culminated in its acceptance in the colleges and universities in the U.S.A. As a result there was a marked increase, between 1910-1920, in the colleges teaching a course in educational sociology and a good number of text books on the subject were published between 1916-1936. But by 1940s it suffered a decline only to be revived recently.¹ According to Robinson, in spite of the contributions of Durkheim towards the end of 19th century and Karl Mannheim's writings in the 1940s, the subject came to be recognised as a distinct field of enquiry very recently.²

-
1. Banks, Olive, The Sociology of Education, 1968, p.1.
 2. Robinson, Phillip, Perspective on the Sociology of Education - An Introduction, p.21.

Durkheim, among the classical sociologists, took up the subject of education with special interest, because he viewed education as a process that recreates society and is linked to the survival of society. In his writings the beginnings of a functional sociology of education are clear. It became the 'traditional conceptual framework' in the study of education.³ In Durkheim's writings education formed part of an institutional analysis in the functional framework that ultimately is directed towards the maintenance of 'social cohesion' and 'social unity'.

The structural-functionalist tradition dominated sociology in the 1950s. The emphases in this approach centred on the function of education, and the need of the society that it fulfils. The views of Durkheim on these points were broadly applied by Talcott Parsons in the American context. Parsons in late 1950s dealt in detail the functions of socialisation, selection and allocation performed by education.⁴

Socialisation as an important aspect is emphasised in much of the anthropological literature. But, the under-

3. Banks, op. cit., p.4; Also see Shukla, S. and Krishna Kumar, "Introduction" in Shukla, S. and K. Kumar (eds.), Sociological Perspective in Education, 1985, p.1.

4. Banks, op. cit., p.4.

standing of the process of substitution of traditional socialising agencies by that of educational agencies, is what makes sociology of education important for the study of industrial societies. In this context Floud and Halsey pointed out that the reverse may also be true, i.e., such specialising agencies like education "may promote or impede change, produce unintended as well as intended, dysfunctional as well as functional consequences".⁵ The examples they give are the attempts by well-entrenched institutions disallowing any change in the 'curricula' or 'teaching methods' or teachers acting as strong pressure groups for promoting educational change.

The structural-functional approach related education to other institutions of society like the economy, the stratification system, the value-structure of society etc. It made possible a "macro cosmic" study of educational institutions.⁶ But it also contributed to the lacunae in sociology of education. These include the dominant concerns in social integration, consensus, social equilibrium etc., which Floud and Halsey found to be problematic in their application to the industrial societies. This difficulty still remains when equilibrium is considered to be a dynamic one. The

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., p.5.

problem arises because these societies are characterised by 'social change', that implies the over-riding concern for consensus and integration has little sense in this context.⁷ The questions of change and reconstruction of society in a capitalist society like America received Dewey's attention who focussed on the role of individual in 're-orienting' education.⁸

The role of education in the recreation of an "oppressive" order came from the Nazi rule in Germany. This disturbed Mannheim and with his socio-historical analysis of the aims and objectives of education he sought education to be helpful for a 'progressive social change'. He examined, if it was possible for education and culture to reverse the obnoxious state of affair.⁹ Mannheim's recognition of social conflict did not prevent him from postulating a positive role for education in bringing social integration.¹⁰

The development of moral standards depend on the chances of social mobility, availability of justice etc., which in turn cannot be realised without adequate educational facilities. In this respect the works/thrust of Mannheim

7. Ibid., p.5.

8. Shuka and K. Kumar, op. cit., p.2.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid., p.3.

and his colleagues resembled the works of Durkheim and his followers. Both the groups emphasised, among other things, sociology's vital function of putting education in the context of society and in treating 'school as a social institution'. Later psychological analysis contributed to this, taking up many of the issues which Durkheim emphasized namely 'discipline, the social and moral development of the young pupil and the question of variable talent and potential'.¹¹

In Britain, 1950s and 1960s saw the wider acceptance of sociology as a discipline which initially, of course, had little impact on colleges and faculties of education. In the teacher training curricula sociology came to be taken up with psychology. The British sociology of education concerned itself with the issues of "educational provision, achievement and the relationship between social class, schooling and social mobility."¹²

Floud and Halsey pointed out the dominance of "political arithmetic" in the British sociology of education prior to 1960, though they recognised it not to be the only influence. Political arithmetic was a British rationalist invention in 1830s which emphasised that, the central concern

11. Fenton, Steve, Durkheim and Modern Sociology, 1984, p.165.

12. Ibid.

of the Social Sciences should only be the 'collection of facts' without any opinion being added to it. The other 'influences included the works of Margaret Mead and Karl Mannheim'. Mannheim's sociology of the school included the aspects of organisation of knowledge and how the 'schooling and experiences' of the students are guided by the assumptions of the teacher.¹³ The British sociology of education with a dominant tradition of political arithmetic was strengthened by the growth of structural-functionalism in USA, which had roots in the works of classical thinkers like Comte, Spencer, Durkheim, Radcliff-Brown and Malinowski etc. but popularised by Talcott Parsons in the 1950s.¹⁴

The expansion of teachers training in which education formed an important part, the academic study of education, and the concern of the academicians and policy makers to explore the types of social inequalities, and the influence of class background on educational attainment were responsible for the growth of sociology of education in the 1960s. The theoretical emphasis changed from order to control. Floud and Halsey appreciating such a trend, commented it to be replacement of a 'dehumanised', 'over-socialised', 'amoral sociological man' by one of 'autonomous', 'creative',

13. Robinson, op. cit., pp.21-22.

14. Ibid., p.23.

'morally responsible sociological man'.¹⁵

The sociology of education took a new direction in the 1970s, the changes were effected by the failure of the reform-oriented educational policies of the 1960s. The inequalities in educational opportunities still persisted, Functionalist explanations were inadequate and it was increasingly felt that differential educational achievement has roots outside the classroom, especially lying in the home and class background of the pupil. Secondly, the emphasis changed from Macro to micro perspectives. Lastly, there was a revival of the influence of Marxism applied to education and also radical writings on the subject. This became critical of the role of education as being used by the ruling class for maintaining its dominant position and the recreation of the class-structure of the society through education.¹⁶ The works of Gramsci, Althusser, Bourdieu etc. guided the views on social and class reproduction through education which will be taken up later in this study.

15. Ibid., pp.23-25; Banks, op. cit., p.3.

16. Robinson, op. cit., pp.26-27; Shukla and Kumar, op. cit., pp.3-4.

The Social context of Emile Durkheim:

According to Fenton, the Sociology of Durkheim grew as a response to the crises of the French society of his time, their historical analysis so as to trace the causes and advance ways of social reconstruction. The defeat of France in the hands of Prussia and the uprising and setback of the Paris Commune in 1870-1 had not only a dragging effect on the material development of France but at a deeper psychological level affected the sense of national pride and solidarity at the social level.¹⁷ The solidarity of the people gave way to divisions, as class conflict grew in an industrialising country. The growth of working class had to be reckoned as a force. The sociology of Durkheim could not ignore the divisive potentials of inequality that give rise to class-conflict.¹⁸

Durkheim grew up as a young man when the Third Republic was just formed and which was facing a great deal of instability. A crisis arose when the monarchists adopted a constitution in 1875 calling for a presidential system of Government. It set, the church, the big bourgeoisie and the protectors of law and order against the Republic Left consisting mainly of the lower middle classes,

17. Fenton, Steve, Durkheim and Modern Sociology, p.8.

18. Ibid.

the anti-clericals and the working class. But such an authoritarian design could not succeed after the political victory of the Republicans in 1879.¹⁹

The Republic was relatively stable. But the initial period under even the control of the Republic Left could not prove to be a security against the major social and economic problems. This is ascribed to the lack of principles and branded as an 'opportunistic Republic'.²⁰ But at least in the arena of secular education the achievements were commendable, considering the opposition of the church to it.

Though staunch anti-clericals demanded a complete replacement of church-controlled schools by the state-owned ones but legislation could only provide for a ban on religious instruction in Public schools and its replacement by civic education. The expansion of new schools covering particularly the girls, the training of the teachers according to the new secular system assumed too much importance.²¹ While the antagonism between the clerical right and the secular left was still continuing,

19. Coser, Lewis, Masters of Sociological Thought, p.156.

20. Ibid., p.157.

21. Ibid.

the Boulanger affair temporarily shook the Republic. The authoritarian design of General Boulanger following the election of 1885 were frustrated and a greater degree of political stability accrued after this affair.²²

It was also considered to be another step forward towards the achievement of Democracy and Weakening of the Bonapartist influence among the people. The last two decades of the forty years life of the Third Republic since 1870 is described as a period of rapid strides, of economic prosperity. As industrial development picked up, French overseas investment increased so also their internal savings.²³ The intellectuals among others hoped for a durable stability in their professional careers. The developments during this period resulted in a shift in the emphasis of Durkheim from 'orthodox Judaism to rational philosophy'.²⁴ The intellectuals like Durkheim, Henri Bergson, Jean Jaures etc. were extremely happy over the bills of 1882-84 making primary education compulsory and free and a parallel weakening of the confessional schools.²⁵

22. Ibid.

23. Fenton, op. cit., p.9. Henri, Pyere, "Durkheim: The man, his time and his intellectual background" in Kurt H. Wolff (ed.), Essays on Sociology and Social Philosophy, Emile Durkheim et. al., p.6.

24. Coser, op. cit., pp.57-58.

25. Pyere, Henri, op. cit., p.6.

The social order continued to remain unstable even during this relatively peaceful period. Two events, namely the Panama scandal and the Dreyfus affair gave rise to cleavages in national opinion and the question of morality became the central issue of a debate that in turn was linked to the issue of social order based on secure foundations.²⁶ The Republic survived when the defenders of Dreyfus won the battle. The consequences of this were significant for the French society. A strong anti-clerical regime under the banner of the Radical party came to power which put an end to all forms of opportunism. The regime lasted till the World War I containing a clear-cut division between the Right and the Left in its political spheres, between loyalists of the ancient regime and those inspired by the French Revolution.²⁷

Durkheim supported the forces fighting for Dreyfus. The anti-Dreyfusards criticised him as a spokesman of the liberals. This propelled Durkheim to write the article 'individualism and the intellectuals', in which were expressed his views on the glorification of the values of

26. Panama Scandal involved a bribery of officials by the Panama Company to get the approval of the Parliament of a lottery loan. Dreyfus affair involved the conviction of Alfred Dreyfus on the charge of selling information to Germany. For details, see Coser, op. cit., p.158.

27. Coser, op. cit., pp.158-59; Fenton, S., op. cit., p.12.

'intellectual inquiry', justice, liberty, rights and dignity of the individual. He differentiated the two shades of individualism, namely, one which promotes the above-mentioned values in the individual from one that encourages 'disruptive' or 'unrestrained' individualism which he was falsely accused of advocating.²⁸

But Durkheim's support for the Dreyfusards was not because of his Jewish origin. He viewed the slow rate of assimilation of Jews in the national life as detrimental for the whole nation. The right of Jews forms part of the rights and liberties of all men.²⁹ It could not be isolated as confined only to Jews. Despite the renunciation of a Jewish life, Durkheim, however, could not get rid of the indelible early Jewish influence of a 'disciplined', 'solidary' moral community which remained all through his life. That is why he looked for an alternative moral order when the social conditions could no longer uphold the traditional foundations of morality.³⁰ Durkheim's ideas gained ground in the academic circle and outside before

28. Fenton, S., op. cit., p.15; Giddens, Anthony, Durkheim, op. cit., pp.10-17; also see Thompson, Kenneth, Emile Durkheim, op. cit., p.44.

29. Fenton, op. cit.; Lukes, Steven, Emile Durkheim, His Life and Work, see the footnote 44, p.333.

30. Fenton, op. cit., pp.15-16.

the first World War when the church was separated from the state and the clerical and military groups were cut to size.³¹

Intellectual roots:

The intellectual tradition of France also influenced Durkheim a lot. To name a few, Rousseau, Montesquien, Comte, Saint-Simon were foremost in shaping his thought. The inter-relatedness of social and cultural phenomena, the holistic view of society was inherited from Montesquieu. The notion of social solidarity and difference between individual, psychological facts from social facts were an outcome of the Social contract of Rousseau. In his methodology and quest for positive laws of social behaviour, Durkheim appreciated Comte but he was not fascinated by the theological or metaphysical analyses of Comte. The interrelatedness of social phenomena in the writings of Comte also attracted Durkheim. Also Comte's notion of consensus is reflected in another form as 'conscience collective' in Durkheim.³² But, at least on two major points Durkheim differed from Comte. First is latter's 'emphasis on the need for value consensus in modern society' and secondly, the 'view that division of labour is inherently socially

31. Pyere Henri, op. cit., p.6.

32. Coser, op. cit., pp.149-50.

divisive'.³³

The influence of Saint-Simon on Durkheim was second to none. Saint-Simon was among a few who realised the direction of change towards an industrial civilization containing a new type of division of labour offering grandiose technological and social avenues to people.³⁴ An organic and rational social order could be possible despite the complexity and differentiation of such a technological society. Besides, the importance of science, its application to society and the possibility of constructing evolutionary stages of society together with the direction of progress were the influence of Saint-Simon on Durkheim.³⁵

What impressed Durkheim most in Saint-Simon was his view of Socialism. This was reflected in his ideas of social reconstruction in an increasingly industrialising society, with complex division of labour as the basis of

33. Fenton, op. cit., p.17; Pyere, H., op. cit., pp.23-24.

34. Pyere, H., op. cit., p.23.

35. Fenton, op. cit., p.16. In this context it should be worth noted that despite his appreciation of Saint-Simon's works on Sociology and Socialism, he praised Comte's separation of Science from Practice which is an improvisation of Simon's attempts at applying Science before they gained firm roots. Thompson, op. cit., p.33.

social solidarity. Socialism, he advocated, but not in a Marxist or revolutionary framework, because he believed that, not social revolution but prolonged social evolution brings substantial social change. He held a view of "reformist socialism" which alone could help in 'progressive social reconstruction'. For him State, far from being an instrument of class domination could act effectively for social reform by advancing 'equality of opportunity'.³⁶

By following Saint-Simon's footsteps in drawing a relationship between economic institutions in industrial society and emerging forms of social and political organisations, Durkheim sought to bring a rapprochement between the conflicting Marxian and Comtean views. He attempted to combine the four Comtean focus of 'regulating moral norms' with Marxian emphasis on 'economic institutions'.³⁷ This is in line with his socialist principles of forming occupational corporations that provide moral regulation as well as control of the property after abolition of inheritance.³⁸

36. Giddens, op. cit., p.17.

37. Gouldner, Alvin, "Introduction" in Marcel Mauss (ed.), Durkheim's Socialism, p.20; Thompson, op. cit., p.33.

38. Durkheim, Emile, Professional Ethics and Civic Morals, pp.216-18; also Thompson, op. cit., p.33.

Durkheim was also influenced by Charles Renouvier, Taine, Renan and Gabriel Tarde. The neo-Kantian Philosopher Renouvier is credited with bringing to Durkheim's knowledge the principle that "the whole is radically different from the sum of its parts."³⁹ Taine and Renan provided insights and materials for Durkheim to criticize in course of his own theoretical formulations, Taine's conception of racial determinism in explaining social phenomena. In this he agreed with Renan. Also, he favoured Renan's claim that it is not proper to explain the complex by the simple. Moreover, on posing society as combination of ideas, beliefs and feelings particularly moral ideals, Durkheim had no difference with Renan.⁴⁰ Durkheim criticized the social-psychological explanation of Tarde that the aggregate of 'individuals in interaction' constitutes society hence individual actions, motives etc. are the main focus in the explanation of society. Durkheim recognised the existence of society as being different from individuals who constitute it. It is higher than the mere Sum and Social phenomena have to be explained in structural-social terms rather than social-psychological ones.⁴¹

39. Thompson, op. cit.

40. Pyere, H., op. cit., p.26.

41. Coser, op. cit., p.153.

In his holistic and structural view Durkheim followed Espinas. The superiority accorded to collective consciousness over that of the individual and the way like-mindedness is produced in simpler societies had their reflection in the works of Durkheim. Also the superiority of society over the individual had its influence on Durkheim.⁴²

Three others who stirred the thought of Durkheim were Spencer, Kant and Wilhelm Wundt. They were not French. The individualistic approach of Spencer that viewed 'contract' between individuals lying at the root of social order was rejected by Durkheim who argued that such contracts are governed by age-old general norms. The individual striving for happiness does not account for his social nature, rather this stirring results out of social conditions in a particular type of society at a particular historical period.⁴³

Durkheim was critical of the similarity drawn between human societies and animal societies and the division of social work with that of the organs of the body.⁴⁴ However, Spencer's evolutionary view of movement from 'coherent

42. Thompson, op. cit., p.37.

43. Coser, op. cit., p.154.

44. Pyere, op. cit., p.24.

homogeneity' to 'coherent heterogeneity' was reflected in Durkheim's views on 'progressive differentiation' from mechanical to organic solidarity i.e. from a likeness to a mutually dependent unlikeness. In this Adam Smith had also some influence on him.⁴⁵

The epistemology of general philosophy of Kant did not have that much an impact on Durkheim as his philosophy of moral duty. The 'notion' of a-priori or innate categories of Human mind of Kant had no place in Durkheim's system of social origin of categories of thought, of time and place. But Kant's idea of duty and moral obligation was expressed by Durkheim as the 'desirability' of moral acts.⁴⁶ Wilhelm Wundt's concept of the 'volksseele' or the 'group soul' was reflected in Durkheim's notion of the 'conscience collective'. He also inspired Durkheim in providing a model of scientific research for the social sciences.⁴⁷

The influence on Durkheim of Ferdinand Tonnies can be traced to the distinction which Tonnies made between "Gemeinschaft" and "Gesellschaft". For Durkheim, it was between

45. Coser, op. cit., p.154.

46. Durkheim, E., Sociology and Philosophy, pp.44-45; Coser, op. cit., p.155.

47. Coser, op. cit., pp.155-56.

mechanical and organic solidarity. But the difference lies in Tonnies' characterisation of Gemeinschaft or 'older form of social organisation' to be more organic, more natural, whereas Durkheim characterised the organic type to modern form of solidarity.⁴⁸

The Social context of Mannheim:

Mannheim was not confined to a particular society, rather he had to spend a considerable period in three different societies. He was born in Budapest, Hungary in 1893, had to migrate to Germany in 1919 after both the post-war revolutionary regimes in Hungary collapsed. But again he had to migrate to England in 1933 when Nazi atrocities in Germany became intolerable and when he was deprived of the post of Professor of Sociology at Frankfurt because of his Jewish Origin, after the National Socialist enactments came into force in 1933.⁴⁹ Therefore we have to analyse the social contexts of Hungary, Germany and England in order to understand their influence on Mannheim.

The Hungary Context:

Mannheim was born in a Jewish middle class of Budapest and spent his formative years in Hungary. This

48. Ibid.

49. Kettler, David, Volker Meja, Nico Stehr, Karl Mannheim, p.11: also Remmling, op. cit., p.xii.

period of Hungary was marked by almost a total absence of any creative innovation in the social and political spheres. The societal forces were responsible for this state of affair.⁵⁰

While the majority of the middle class in the city were the commercial Jews, the power-base remained in the countryside that was 'traditional' and 'anti-semitic'.⁵¹ New ideas had no place in such a society where labour was undermined and both church and landholders had a decisive dominance over the tradition-oriented peasantry. The Social-Democratic party and the union activities dealing with labour issues were more concerned about immediate problems of a day-to-day nature.⁵² The 'dominant aristocracy' and the 'impoverished gentry' subservient to it strived at maintaining the status-quo. The Jewish middle class, instead of challenging this social arrangement preferred to remain as conformists and rendered their service to the old regime, in order to keep its 'monopoly on financial and commercial affairs' intact. The 'parochialism' and 'conformity' of the capitalists was shared

50. Loader, op. cit., p.10; Coser, op. cit., p.457.

51. Coser, op. cit. Remmling described, "Hungary was held in estates belonging to the socially and politically dominant magnates who were the favourites of the court." op. cit., p.16.

52. Loader, op. cit., p.10; Coser, op. cit., p.10.

by the intellectuals. The society gave an overall static picture.⁵³

The first decade of the twentieth century witnessed the growth of a small but progressively-oriented intelligentsia mainly concentrated in Budapest. Challenging conformity to the traditional setting, they emphasised the importance of intellect and learning and the need to change the society.⁵⁴ Though they espoused the cause of democracy, but an elitist stance was found in their position, when they believed change to follow from their ideas. These were the intelligentsia of a free-floating nature not tied to any party, class or the functioning of the society. They considered themselves to be guardians of the interests of the whole society when those at the helm of power were busy in furthering their own interests.⁵⁵

But they could not identify themselves with the important segments of Hungarian population; with the labour movement and on the other hand, had to fight the opposition from the conformist middle class and the traditionally minded academic circle.⁵⁶ The intellectuals placed

53. Loader, op. cit.; Coser, op. cit.

54. Loader, op. cit.

55. Coser, op. cit.

56. Loader, op. cit.

DISS
306.43
P2742 Co



TH2690

TH-2690



themselves over the peasantry and the proletariat who they could not unite because of the vast differences existing between the city and the countryside. They attempted to unite the progressive cultural elements of the west with the old Hungarian culture.⁵⁷

However, the reformist Budapest intelligentsia had internal divisions. There were two important groups, one led by Jaszi and the other by Georg-Lukacs. Lukacs group etc., opposed western-oriented group of Jaszi and their positivistic and social emphases. They argued that a rational social science and politics could not be alternatives for the decay of the traditional culture, rather a 'new cultural totality' had to be constructed. Their commitment to social change was couched in rather idealist terms i.e. that of the creation of a new culture instead of a new society.⁵⁸ However, both the groups were against the traditional forces differing mainly on the nature of goals that the intelligentsia had to advocate.

Though Mannheim was initially inclined to Jaszi, later he came under the influence of Lukacs. He remained primarily an academician in line with the political

57. Ibid., p.11.

58. Ibid., p.13.

position of Lukacs group. A bourgeoisie-socialist government was formed under the leadership of Michael Karolyi after the first revolution in October 1918. But it was replaced by a Communist Soviet Republic led by Bela Kun after the second revolution in March 1919. But the Communist Government was shortlived when the forces of Admiral Horthy came to power in July 1919. Many intellectuals including Mannheim were forced into exile. The Hungarian experiences led Mannheim to identify the problem of change and adaptation in cultural rather than socio-economic terms. He believed in accelerating, rather than retarding change.⁵⁹

The German context:

Though Germany presented a static picture in the twenties, but it was far from a static society. It contained groups belonging to conflicting ideological camps. The social structure characterized by a industrial-traditional order was not affected much by the revolution of 1918. The authoritarian structure continued with the Judiciary, bureaucracy and military exercising power as they were in the preceding Kaiser regime. Also, till 1933, they kept in control the forces of change unleashed

59. Loader, op. cit., p.15; also see Remmling, op. cit., p.17.

by the revolution and the establishment of the Weimar Republic.⁶⁰

German unlike Hungary, experienced a strong labour movement which, of course, could not muster sufficient strength to challenge the existing state of affairs and bring about radical social changes. Its dominant Social-Democratic wing, after 1918 had some share in the state power and remained busy in extracting benefits from their office and position. The revolutionary socialists, considering the Weimar Republic as the best possible order despite its loopholes, were not interested in any radical reorganisation of society. The communists got a shattering blow to their revolutionary hopes in 1923.⁶¹

The Left-wing intellectuals were frustrated with both the communists and the Social Democrats. They now confined themselves to political and social criticism. The basic debate in the German academic circle was between, those who favoured and strived at maintaining the 'atomistic-organic' nature of society and the section of the intelligentsia favouring the development of 'nomadic individualism'. While the essence of former was 'material', the latter had

60. Coser, op. cit., p.459; Loader, op. cit., p.15.

61. Coser, op. cit.; Remmling, op. cit., p.20.

a 'spiritual essence.'⁶² Whereas, former wanted to revert to the state before the first World War, the latter welcomed the new forces of Weimar and wished a rapprochement between the old elite with the new industrial and democratic forces, and development of national spirit along democratic lines. In a politically charged atmosphere, they adhered to the traditional values of culture giving it a primacy over other things, thus generating a sense of crisis.⁶³

Under these circumstances Mannheim found the concept of cultural organism not sufficient to link his old Hungarian culture and the new German culture. The dilemma of an organic unity and the need for change led him to propose a synthesis between these two. But the rise of Hitler's Nazi power forced him to migrate to Britain.⁶⁴

The English context:

Mannheim's emigration to England was the experience of a totally different nature than that of Germany. Here, he confronted a society and culture that required careful readjustment because in the academic circle he was considered a refugee only. Moreover, the nature of the social

62. Loader, op. cit., p.18.

63. Ibid., p.25.

64. Ibid., p.27.

contexts differed so much in their political and social arrangements that he had to shift his emphasis. The interest in 'sociology of knowledge' was replaced by a 'sociology of democratic planning' and 'social reconstruction'.⁶⁵

Large-scale unemployment and faulty economic developments characterized England in the thirties, a situation that was similar to Germany. The progressive intellectuals looked for reorganization and change, but differed among them regarding the nature of such change and reorganization. Some thought of radical changes, some opined Fabian type of reforms while others argued reform and capitalism to go together.⁶⁶ Mannheim's interest was directed at this stage towards analysing the crisis of liberalism and the social and political developments resulting from this.

During the thirties English society experienced a contradiction. The emphasis upon change was countered by the advocates of stability who had an upper hand because of their positions in the British Government. Even a majority of the people appeared to be supporting order and stability. This might be because of the fear that

65. Coser, op. cit., p.461.

66. Loader, op. cit., p.149.

change would lead to chaos and anarchy.⁶⁷ Mannheim advanced his theory of social planning as a way-out of this contradiction in which he assigned a responsible role to the social scientists, who occupied an intermediary position between the masses and the power-wielding few.⁶⁸

The Second World War changed the situation in line with Mannheim's thinking. The Labour party replaced Churchill and the laissez-faire Government was replaced by one of welfare-state. Reforms were undertaken to cover all aspects of life. Mannheim now could draw attention for his theory of social planning, as the English people who earlier were reluctant for any change and preferred stability apprehending chaos etc. to follow from change, now came to recognise the importance of social change and social planning.⁶⁹ But, the war-crazy German masses made Mannheim apprehensive of the fate of democratic societies lacking a strong ideological unity. He was afraid of their landing up into totalitarian systems. He believed, the theory of highly rational social planning has to be supplemented with the 'ethical and religious values of western humanism'. In this mass education has the crucial role of mobilizing

67. Ibid., p.150.

68. Remmling, op. cit., pp.xii-xiii.

69. Loader, op. cit., pp.150-51.

the 'emotional and volitional forces'.⁷⁰

The stability of the liberal-democracy in England, unlike Germany, where democracy could not meet the challenges of socio-economic disturbances, impressed Mannheim and re-established his faith in democracy. The English society, he viewed, was marked by a 'spontaneous collectivism' that transcended both 'complete individualism' and the 'complete absorption of the individual'.⁷¹ The spontaneous collectivism was reflected in the capacity of the individuals to control themselves and conform to the interests of the society. But Mannheim still felt democratic planning was necessary to confer 'rationality' and 'responsibility' to that spontaneous collectivism so that the problems arising in the complex, industrial society could be adequately dealt with.⁷²

Towards the end of his life, Mannheim tried to formulate his political sociology in the context of the post-World War II superpower rivalry. A cold war continued, that witnessed growing misuse of political and military power and the race for nuclear supremacy posing the menacing threat of another World War. Against this he advocated a vigorous 'planning for freedom' through 'fundamental' and 'militant democracy' as the only panacea to this threat.⁷³

70. Remmling, op. cit., p.xiii.

71. Loader, op. cit., p.152.

72. Ibid., p.153.

73. Remmling, op. cit., p.xiii.

The intellectual connections:

Since Mannheim lived in three different societies the influences that worked on him were many. The scope of this chapter allows only a brief analysis of these.

During his university days he was influenced by the 'positivistic', optimistic, and 'reform-oriented' ideas that prevailed in the intellectual sphere, which he could not totally leave, though in his later writings he criticised many aspects of these ideas. At this time he also took an interest in the philosophical and not the writings on formal sociology of Simmel.⁷⁴ His lecture on 'soul and culture' had imprints of Simmel's analysis of culture. The influences were apparent particularly in the differences between subjective and objective culture, between the individual actor and his objective culture. The Simmelian interpretation of cultural crisis when the objective culture stunts the initiatives of the individual was reflected in the writings of Mannheim.⁷⁵

Mannheim's Hungarian days came under a strong influence of Lukacs, particularly latter's contribution to aesthetics. Mannheim like Lukacs (before 1917 since

74. Coser, op. cit., p.450; Remmling, op. cit., p.14.

75. Ibid.

Lukacs' conversion to Marxian took place between 1917 to 1919) assumed a metaphysical, idealist stance in showing the interconnections of the cultural elements and raising aesthetics to a level of metaphysical absoluteness so that the principles related to the formation of new cultural elements and their expression could be comprehended.⁷⁶

Mannheim and Lukacs give an impression of having similar intellectual connections starting with neo-platonism of Ditley and Simmel, phenomenology of Husserl and neo-Kantianism of Rickert, Lask and Max-Weber.⁷⁷

Mannheim was attracted to the revolutionary character of Marxism and recognised the historical role of proletariat in overthrowing the bourgeoisie. Proletariat were the social carriers of an ideology oriented towards the future. They had no tradition except the antagonistic bourgeoisie. They created their traditions when they organised themselves into a class.⁷⁸ But conservatives had a tradition in the past. Their ideology came as a reaction to the emergence of capitalism and industrialism and in support of the pre-capitalist social relations.⁷⁹

76. Remmling, op. cit., p.13.

77. Ibid.

78. Mannheim, Karl, "Conservative Thought" in Essays in Sociology and Social Psychology, (ed.) Paul Kecskemeti, p.101.

79. Ibid., p.91.

But Mannheim did not accept Lukacs' view that, proletarian thought was the only true reflection of reality, and thoughts linked to other classes were ideological distortions. He could not grant absoluteness to Marxist thought and claimed that all thought was linked to its socio-existential reality. This was perhaps because of the influence upon him, of other relativistic ideas in German historicism.⁸⁰ But the interconnection of ideas to the action of men in the social structure was definitely a Marxist influence.

Mannheim was impressed by the "synthesizing" and "anti-atomistic" aspects of Gestalt psychology that argued, an understanding of the part must be pursued in relation to the whole. This helped Mannheim in placing the 'historical events' or cultural products in their proper historical and structural context.⁸¹ The writings on culture and intellectuals by Alfred Weber had some bearings in the works of Mannheim.⁸² Alfred Weber's distinction between a 'Process of Civilization' and a 'movement of history' was supported by Mannheim.

80. Kecskemeti, P., "Introduction" to Karl Mannheim, Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge, pp.84-85.

81. Coser, op. cit., p.453.

82. Ibid.

According to Alfred Weber culture implies 'irrational', 'psychic-emotional' phenomena like art and religion which could be grasped only through intuition, whereas civilization means a 'linear progress' in which a scientific, technological system develops gradually and cumulatively. These developments can be explained with the help of methods of natural sciences.⁸³ This prompted Mannheim to investigate the dualism between natural sciences and human sciences.⁸⁴ The natural sciences lack meaning and value and the subject has no importance since objects of nature are same for all subjects. But human or cultural sciences cannot be explained without the 'creation, interpretation and communication' of meaning.⁸⁵ A change in such meaning from one generation to another also changes the problems and issues of culture. Therefore, the method must vary from physical sciences. On this ground he differed from Alfred Weber.⁸⁶

The concept of 'socially unattached intelligentsia' formulated by Alfred Weber and their role was echoed in the writings of Mannheim. The neo-Kantian influence on Mannheim came through Rickert and Windleband in their

83. Remmling, op. cit., p.32.

84. Loader, op. cit., p.39.

85. Ibid.

86. Remmling, op. cit., p.32; Loader, op. cit., p.85.

assertion that methods of natural sciences are not suitable for analysing cultural phenomena.⁸⁷

Husserl's phenomenology stressing the active relationship between the subject and the object of knowledge was appreciated by Mannheim. There is an 'intentionality' when the subject is actively engaged in knowing the object of knowledge.⁸⁸ Both Scheler and Mannheim had roots in Husserl's phenomenology. Scheler made a distinction between 'essential knowledge' and 'factual knowledge'. Through phenomenological, factual knowledge, the 'eternal', 'immutable' value essences or essential knowledge can be approached. This was rejected by Mannheim who later advanced the active role of ideas like Troeltsch and Lukacs and the correlation existing between ideas and their social bases.⁸⁹

Mannheim praised Kant's philosophy of 'consciousness' for excluding the 'dogmatism' attached with the ontological explanations. The world according to this philosophy, is no longer taken to be immutable, an existence independent of the mind of men, but depends on the cognitive faculty of the subject for the form attributed to it.

87. Coser, op. cit., p.453.

88. Ibid., p.454; also Loader, op. cit., p.57.

89. Coser, op. cit., p.454; Remmling, op. cit., p.40.

Hegel also showed the same relationship between conception of the object with the activities of the mind.⁹⁰ Hegel's 'dialectical' method helped Mannheim to formulate his 'dialectical-rational' method for explaining the evolutionary changes in the philosophical and historical spheres. This also helped him to counter the charges of 'relativism' levelled against him since every 'new centre of intellectual organisation' is characterised as qualitatively higher than the previous one thus maintaining the overall truth value of the philosophical process.⁹¹ Development cannot be taken as the progress of a 'single static system' unlinearly nor of many autonomous systems but represents a process in which elements are organised continuously forming new centres.⁹²

Mannheim considered, among others, the 'verstehen' method developed by Max Weber as useful for the historical analysis of the values and standards of the past by the present observer. Mannheim credited Weber for combining the 'interpretative understanding' of social action (verstehen) with the 'causal explanation of its cause and effect'. However, Mannheim noted, he has not satisfied

90. Remmling, op. cit., p.23.

91. Ibid., p.33.

92. Loader, op. cit., p.57.

with the one-sided emphasis of causal explanations in the theoretical works and interpretative understanding in the historical writings. This Mannheim tried to modify with his categorisation of three levels of meanings:⁹³ (i) objective meaning - where knowledge of the observer of the given social context is sufficient without requiring the use of meaning or consciousness; (ii) expressive meaning - that includes the 'knowledge of subjective' intentions by the observer; and (iii) documentary meaning - expressing neither the objective context nor the subjective meaning, but the unintentionality involved in the action as a part of the total personality of the actor.⁹⁴

Mannheim was of the opinion that with the documentary method the 'spirit of an era' could be grasped and the theories constructed with its help gave a picture of the social structure. This is because, the 'social space' and 'historical time' of the proponent affects such theories.⁹⁵ This he later elaborated in his sociology of knowledge.

The influence of pragmatism on Mannheim is reflected in his works on planning and reconstruction. The roots

93. Remmling, op. cit., p.25.

94. Ibid.

95. Ibid., p.26.

can be found in the works of Dewey, Mead and Coser. In 'Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction' he stressed the importance of pragmatism for 'social planning' and 'interdependent thinking'.⁹⁶ These writers, particularly Dewey, drew his attention as to how one can reach the general from the particular, e.g. from individual interactions to a macro-level of social and philosophical reconstruction.⁹⁷

The psycho-analysis of Freud and others gave him insights to consider war, fascism etc. as psychological abnormalities. Mannheim stressed the need for a 'sociological psychology' that would combine analysis at a psychological level and 'institutional analysis' at a sociological level. The intense anxieties to which men in modern, industrial societies are exposed, the insecurities of a collective nature etc., he believed, could be explained with the help of the 'sociological psychology'. In this the works of Harold Lasswell etc. influenced him a lot.⁹⁸

96. Mannheim, K., Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction, p.206; Coser, op. cit., p.456.

97. Coser, op. cit.

98. Ibid., pp.456-57.

The works of T.S. Eliot, Middleton Murry etc. caused him to ponder over the role of religion and he came to believe in the integrating role of religion.⁹⁹

The Rationale for Comparison:

The views of Mannheim and Durkheim on education in relation to society cannot be ignored in tracing the history of the growth of sociology of education. The analysis of their social contexts showed the turbulences in the social, economic and political spheres. They were men of their times responding to the major problems that resulted from the instabilities in these spheres. These instabilities were characterised by rapid changes in the political power relations affecting the social and economic spheres. Both of them reacted to the authoritarian tendencies in political power positions. While Durkheim witnessed changes in the correlation of forces in the political life of France linked to its economic development, Mannheim experienced the socio-economic and political life of three different societies which led to his change of emphasis albeit trying to maintain some continuity in them.¹⁰⁰

99. Ibid., p.457.

100. Remmling Gunter divided Mannheim's areas of interest into different phases. See Remmling, G., The Sociology of Karl Mannheim, 1975, pp.6-8; also see his "Karl Mannheim: Revision of an intellectual Portrait", Social Forces, vol.40, No.1, October, 1961, p.24.

Durkheim was upset by the development that led to a growing egoistic individualism, an increase in suicide rates, social conflict etc. which he termed as pathological having a disintegrating effect on social solidarity.

Mannheim also stressed this in differentiating social disintegration from social change. The social disintegration is reflected in various forms of mass-irrationality, mass-unemployment and the tendencies to go for war etc.

Durkheim prescribed an element of morality and ethical code to be developed in all social, occupational and political spheres to counter the ills of a fast-changing industrial society. Mannheim also stressed the need for developing a morality that makes the task of elites easier in undertaking a democratic planning of reconstruction to act as panacea for the disorders of society. Durkheim sought a restoration of the social equilibrium and a stable social order, whereas Mannheim put stress up on a dynamic equilibrium which 'established' and 'reestablished' sooner than one could expect it to be.¹⁰¹

101. Durkheim's views on this has been discussed in the context of the growth of Sociology of Education. For Mannheim, see Mannheim, Karl, Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning, p.308; also see Remmling, G., op. cit., p.76; Loader, Colin, The Intellectual Development of Karl Mannheim, p.175.

They had an aversion for revolutionary solutions and a radical restructuring of the whole society. This is because of their stress upon consensus and co-operation as the mechanisms of the survival of society.

Objective of the Study:

Against this background the comparison between Emile Durkheim and Karl Mannheim is undertaken to find out the similarities and differences between these two writers. The comparison derives its justification from the fact that, though there are plenty of works on these two writers separately but no substantive work has been done comparing these two, especially, in the field of sociology of education though they still influence works in this field considerably. A detailed comparison will point out the wide-ranging contributions of these two sociologists including the similarities and differences between them. In other words, this study aims at making a comparative analysis of the views of Emile Durkheim and Karl Mannheim on education as related to society.

Sources of data collection:

As this study is purely theoretical in nature, it is confined to the review of literature. The works done by Durkheim and Mannheim and also the works written on them form the sources of literature for this comparative study.

Scheme of Chapterisation:

The study has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter has discussed the development of sociology of education to locate the place of Durkheim and Mannheim in this development, their social context that indicates whether their theoretical works were connected to the social issues of their time and the intellectual influences acting upon them, and lastly it contains the rationale behind undertaking the comparison between them.

The next chapter, i.e., the second one, is devoted to an analysis of their approach to the understanding of society. It would be difficult to understand their views on education without discussing their views on society and the relationship between these two which will be discussed in the third chapter. The third chapter compares their views on education. The fourth and the last chapter presents a summary as well as the conclusion. It also discussed the relevance of their ideas on education to the contemporary Indian society.

CHAPTER II

DURKHEIM AND MANNHEIM - THEIR APPROACHES TO SOCIETY

Introduction

Though the contending theories and schools of thought with their many variants differ on the point of the ideal type of society but they all agree, at least, on that certain degree of interaction takes place among the institutions of society, e.g., between education and economy, economy and polity, education and polity and so on. The question as to which of these institutions is the ultimate decider or has the ultimate control upon the other institutions is differently answered by these theories and the schools. For example, the function of a particular institution in the same capitalist society is viewed differently by the functionalists and the Marxists.

When the institutions are in interaction with each other, one may either start with the particular institutions and then moves up to macro-analysis of society or start with the macro-system and examines his views on it by analysing the micro-systems or particular institutions. One may not adequately draw links between these two systems but unless an analysis of his view of society is undertaken it becomes difficult to know whether the proper links exist or are

lacking. Moreover, an isolated analysis of one's writings on a particular institution does not clarify many things which are mentioned in other contexts, particularly that is the end-in-view of the writer. In this chapter their ideas on social change, social control and social order in relation to the institutions of society will be discussed which will help in placing education in the social context in its relation with other institutions of society.

Durkheim's approach to society

Durkheim presents an evolutionary view of social change. In this evolutionary perspective he identifies two forms of society, namely, one characterised by mechanical solidarity with simple division of labour and the other marked by organic solidarity with complex division of labour. The transition takes place from the simple or primitive type of society to a modern, complex, industrial society.

Along with this transition there are changes in the institutional spheres. The institutions in the modern context are also geared to bring solidarity and maintain the social equilibrium. But now they function according to the changing needs of the society. For example, the change in the nature of sanctions from the 'repressive' to the restitutive type. While the repressive law is punishment for the sake of punishment until the passion

that the crime has evoked dies down, the restitutive law intends to bring back the normal state of affair by creating a fear of punishment not for avenging the offender but for defending the society. Whereas the repressive law functions to surrender the individual completely before the collectivity under coercion, the restitutive law recognises the freedom of the individual from the strong collective conscience of the mechanical solidarity brought about by the increased division of labour.¹

The division of labour has replaced the strong collective conscience of the primitive society as the basis of solidarity in the modern, complex, industrial society. Now everyone does not have to act mechanically like the other members of the group, but a differentiation of social functions has taken place. These social functions now require specialisation and expertise as no one can perform all the functions but a particular one. This has made room for individual talents and creativity and a realisation that the growth of individuality is necessary for a healthy performance of the division of labour. The

1. Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labour, pp.69, 85-89. Durkheim argues that the punishment for the same offence decreases in organic type of society because the attitude towards crime and views of the function of punishment have changed. It is now essentially one of re-establishing social harmony. Ibid., p.127; also see Giddens, Anthony, Durkheim, pp.23-29.

respect for the individual dignity is a result of this development. Moreover, the functions are not isolated, but an interdependence and co-operation exists among the members and the institutional spheres in which they operate.²

We do not have to go into the details of the factors that account for the growth in the division of labour or the mechanisms through which it takes place.³ It is important to note that Durkheim related the progress of the division of labour and the specialisation of functions to the needs of the society.⁴ When the existing conditions no more satisfy men, the needs of the society change. There takes place a change in the social organisation, the type of division of labour being a reflection of it. But Durkheim, unlike the economists, does not consider the division of labour to be a purely economic one mainly concerned with greater production, which of course is necessary but not sufficient reason of the division of

2. Durkheim, op. cit.

3. The causes of the growth of division of labour Durkheim gives as the increasing moral density that results from a growing material density. The mechanism involved in this is the Darwinian principle of the struggle for existence and the need for differentiation. Ibid., pp. 266-68, for the growth of the division of labour see pp. 257-62; according to Kenneth Thompson the theory of change described in the Division of Labour consists of an 'interplay between material and ideal factors', E. Durkheim, op. cit., pp. 83-84.

4. Ibid., p. 272.

labour. For example, specialisation of functions, Durkheim argued, is not solely for more production, but for better adaptation to the changed circumstances.⁵

The division of labour, according to Durkheim, calls for both material and moral links among individuals. If the sense of competition brought about by the division of labour is not regulated by linking it to a feeling of solidarity, it will have damaging consequences for the society.⁶ The social solidarity is provided by the division of labour through the development of a law and a morality.⁷ Morality becomes a source of solidarity when it compels man to be concerned about others, regulates his conduct and prevents him from the mere strivings of his ego-satisfaction.⁸ Social solidarity depends on a moral order and the division of labour can bring social solidarity when it establishes this moral order.⁹

The division of labour, Durkheim argued, brings organic solidarity under normal circumstances. But it is not directed to this end and even has contrary and

5. Ibid., p.275.

6. Ibid., p.277.

7. Ibid., p.xxiv.

8. Ibid., p.398.

9. Ibid., p.401.

negative results when some abnormal forms are developed in it. Labelling these as the ills of capitalism, Durkheim categorised them into three types:¹⁰ (1) The anomic division of labour, (2) the forced division of labour, and (3) another abnormal form (the improper co-ordination).

The anomic form of the division of labour is characterised by the absence of the set of rules that spontaneously establishes relations between social functions.¹¹ This, according to Durkheim, "either does not exist, or is not in accord with the degree of development of the division of labour."¹² The proofs of such a state of affair Durkheim adduces in the industrial or commercial crises that shows a lack of adjustment of social functions and the conflict between labour and capital. The beginning of the fifteenth century, unlike the middle ages was marked by a sharp division between masters and workers, the former having all the decisive powers. The rise of specialisation, instead of bringing more solidarity brought more conflict. Durkheim calls this absence of regulations, or laws governing relations between labour and capital as a state of

10. Ibid., pp. 353-54.

11. Ibid., p. 368; Fenton, op. cit., pp. 53-56.

12. E. Durkheim, op. cit., p. 366.

'juridical indetermination'.¹³

In this context Durkheim also pointed out the importance of sufficient contacts between the organs of a system, with the expansion of the market, the distance between the producer and consumer has increased, making it difficult for the former to know the needs of the latter. The regulations on production has also slackened. All these explain the reasons of periodic economic crises arising out of a breakdown of equilibrium between demand and supply.¹⁴ There is the need of a new type of social organisation, to cope with the changes brought about by increasing industrialisation, namely, changes in the relations of employers and employees, replacement of men by machine, regimentation of the worker from the employers and from his family. A new type of social organisation with adequate regulating mechanisms does not evolve, because of the rapidity of the changes that does not give time for the different conflicting interests to settle down.¹⁵

When the worker is considered simply as a machine repeating the same work without understanding the meaning of his collaboration with others, as he does in normal

13. Ibid., p.367.

14. Ibid., p.370.

15. Ibid.

conditions, the division of labour becomes abnormal.¹⁶ Thus Durkheim concludes that the division of labour has to be viewed as a source of solidarity and not simply a means of increasing the social produce as the economists consider it.¹⁷

The 'Forced division of labour' is for Durkheim the second abnormal form of division of labour. This indicates a lack of harmony of individual with his function because the latter is imposed upon him by force.¹⁸ Durkheim gave the example of conflicts taking place in a caste or class-based societies. Class-war is the result of imposition of functions on people according to custom or by law which differs from their tastes and aptitudes. Between hereditary dispositions of an individual and the social function he has to perform there is vast possibility for change on the basis of changes in his intelligence, tastes and ambitions. When this is not recognised the sufferings of the individuals tend to be ventilated through class-wars. Similarly, the caste system is not just, if it does not reflect the occupational diversity but a situation

16. Ibid., p.372.

17. Ibid., p.373.

18. Ibid., p.xxii; also see Thompson, op. cit., p.81.

where people are forced to do certain functions that they do not like.¹⁹

According to Durkheim, in both these cases people are constrained by an external force to perform certain functions. In the normal condition, the division of labour is one in which "social inequalities exactly express natural inequalities" and it makes people happy through the realisation of their own nature.²⁰ Inequality he considered to be abnormal that is external to the division of labour and equality consists in linking individuals to one another and also to link them to their functions.²¹ He cites contract as an example of external condition of inequality. The external conditions of contract should be equal, which means the contracting parties must have equal social worth in terms of their labour. But the possession of resources helps certain class to abstain from labour that makes the contract unjust in which all hereditary and status inequalities are sanctioned by law.²²

19. Ibid., pp.374-75. The writings on Forced division of labour shows Durkheim's concern for social justice and equality, an equality of opportunity in the external conditions in which people occupy diverse positions according to their merit. See Giddens, op. cit., p.32; Thompson, op. cit., pp.81-82.

20. E. Durkheim, op. cit., pp.376-77.

21. Ibid., pp.381-82.

22. Ibid., p.384; also see Fenton, op. cit., p.101.

The contractual relations, Durkheim maintains, are not well developed and the existence of a strong collective conscience more or less neutralises whatever injustice emanates from the external conditions of it in the primitive society. But the development of a common morality containing the ideal of equality and equal dignity of man now questions all forms of unequal contract and injustice in modern society. Durkheim pointed out the essence of liberty as the "subordination of external forces to social forces", where man raises himself above nature and dominates it to create another world called society where the laws do not have amoral, fortuitous and absurd character.²³

The third abnormal form, Durkheim identified, was one in which "the division of labour does not produce solidarity because the functional activity of each worker is insufficient."²⁴ When the functions in an industrial, commercial or any other enterprise is so distributed as to provide insufficient material for individual activity there is an economic waste because of loss of effort. But Durkheim was interested in another fact - "a more or less great lack of co-ordination of these functions."²⁵

23. Ibid., p.387.

24. Ibid., p.xxiii.

25. Ibid., p.389; also see Fenton, op. cit., p.59.

The solidarity is disrupted when an "employee in a business is not sufficiently occupied". This results in a bad adjustment of the movements to one another and a lack of unity in the operations. What is expected to avert this danger by an intelligent, scientific man-in-charge is to do away with all useless works and to distribute the work in a manner so as to keep the employees engaged with their functional activity enhanced. Moreover, a growth of functional activity contributes to the growth of solidarity, when the functions are more continuous and well co-ordinated.²⁶ Because "being more continuous, they are in a much closer relation and more continually have need of one another."²⁷

Normally, the division of labour develops along with a proportionate growth in the functional activity. Also, it causes the functions to be more active and continuous. Because, as economists argued, in the absence of division of labour one has to pass from one occupation to another. Durkheim quotes Marx, saying that the division of labour helps to make up for the lost time as it "contracts the pores of the working day". Secondly, as the division of labour develops, so also the talent and an

26. E. Durkheim, op. cit., pp.389-92.

27. Ibid., p.392.

increased functional activity results from an increased complexity.²⁸

So far, we have been analysing Durkheim's account of social change in an evolutionary perspective in which, the division of labour arises out of the needs of society. This need is to place individuals into various positions which are interdependent. This is demanded by the complex, industrial society which needs organic solidarity to replace the mechanical one, that no more fulfills the conditions of the changed circumstances. Moreover, for Durkheim, that is vital to a just stratification of the society, because division of labour only reflects social inequalities in terms of the natural inequalities i.e. talent, aptitudes, tastes etc. But inequalities in the external conditions of division of labour, like property, social ranking as in the caste system etc. based on ascriptive criteria are unjust. In this context, he discusses the abnormal forms of the division of labour. For the division of labour not to show abnormal forms Durkheim stressed the need for developing a moral order appropriate for the modern, industrial society to build up a strong collective conscience to be reflected in the organic solidarity of the people.

28. Ibid., p.393.

Durkheim relates the development of such a moral order to the need for societal controls. He argues that, morality is what binds an individual to the society. But when the needs of the individual incessantly increase and he strives for the fulfilment of these needs, he does not show any concern for others and for society. The survival of society is threatened when this individualistic attitude dominates. Therefore, social controls are necessary to reduce the needs of the individual only to the vital needs.²⁹ Further, he contends that when the society functions with proper regulations, the individual gets an idea of what should be his ambition so that he does not go beyond it.³⁰

But when the influence of the society on the individual is eroded and there is no control acting upon him, the individuals are left on their own. The individual finds it difficult to decide what would be the appropriate behaviour as the societal norms which help in maintaining social equilibrium are no more effective. This state of relative normlessness Durkheim called "anomie".³¹

29. Durkheim, Emile, Suicide, p.248.

30. Ibid., p.250 - According to Thompson the main concern of Durkheim was to bring a reconciliation between individual freedom and social solidarity, op. cit., p.87.

31. Ibid.

In the complex industrial society there is specialisation of the roles, and expertise is needed for various roles. Such a society provides abstract rules that the individual has to apply to particular situations. While the absence of such things accounted for the strong collective conscience in simple societies, an industrial society is now relatively free to take decisions and to apply the abstract rules to concrete situations.³² In this, he needs the co-operation of others and also co-operate with others to perform their roles. When this type of an adjustment is not there because people are not properly socialised, it is called a state of anomie. Why does this happen?

The answer to the problem of anomie, which is a deviation from the normal course of conduct, Durkheim sought in the process of social change. When social change leads to a situation when the old institutional arrangement is not properly replaced by a new one, it leads to much anxiety and indecisiveness. The collective judgement of mechanical solidarity makes room for individual judgement in organic solidarity. The set of traditional values and faith are replaced by another one, but the rapidity of the change does not allow enough time for people to

32. Durkheim, Division of Labour, p.369.

adjust to this new type of values. This gives rise to social conflict, social disintegration in which people are led to commit suicide. Suicide rate remains stable over a period of time in a society. But it becomes a matter of concern when this rate is suddenly accelerated, for example, due to ineffective adjustment of the people to social change.³³

Durkheim draws a relationship between the rate of suicide and the degree of solidarity in a society. In the altruistic type, individual sacrifices himself for the cause of the group, collectivity or the society showing a strong social bond acting upon him. In contrast to this, 'egoistic' and 'anomic' forms show the weakening of this social bond. Anomic suicide indicates weakening of the normative regulation guiding the individual conduct, due to rapid changes that leads him to commit suicide. Egoistic suicide is the result of a weakening of the social bond between the individual and society because of detachment that throws individuals to their own devices.³⁴

33. Ibid., p.370.

34. Apart from these three forms Durkheim talks of a category of 'fatalistic suicide' which he has not elaborated. Fatalistic suicide is the case of excessive regulation, e.g., childless married women - Thompson, op. cit., p.113.

Durkheim is concerned about these later two forms because they threatened social solidarity and the survival of the society. The individual has to be attached to the society and there should not arise a situation in which, the norms do not guide him what to do. This is why an alternative morality should be developed and societal controls should act upon the individual through the development of ethics and morality in the different institutional spheres. For example, he views, egoistic and anomic forms of suicides can be prevented, by developing moral values in the occupational and political spheres.

The vital role of the corporations in the occupational sphere, consists in preventing the social functions, particularly the economic functions from the existing state of disorganisation. Recognising the failure of corporations in this respect, he identifies, the lack of moral discipline, separation of activities from obligations, as the main reasons for such a state of affair. While opposing the system of inheritance of property, he did not consider, the socialist economy based on the state control of all property would do anything good unless a moral discipline develops. This is essential, since, given the insatiable nature of men it would be difficult for him to control himself unless there is something to control him.³⁵ However, Durkheim

35. Durkheim, Emile, Professional Ethics and Civic Morals, pp.10-11.

realizes that a totally socialist type of society in which there exists no individual ownership, will ever come. He writes, "Therefore as long as such sharp class differences exist in society, fairly effective palliatives may lessen the injustice of contracts; but in principle the system operates in conditions which do not allow for justice."³⁶

For Durkheim, the inheritance of property, a survival of the age-old system of family joint ownership, does not have any ethical basis and its abolition does not affect the moral structure of present day societies. It would not disappear altogether but has to be weakened, so as to have no effect on the contractual relations. When the family is declining, gradually being replaced by occupational groups, the right of inheritance should go to the hands of these professional groups, instead of the state as the socialist system envisages. This is because state is incompetent to fulfill such a vast and complex task and only a secondary group like professional groups can take care of such property when someone dies.³⁷ The state he visualised to be the brain of the society which should function as a moral agent for the welfare of the people.

36. Ibid., p. 213.

37. Ibid., pp. 215-16; Fenton's criticism of it to be a vague formulation of Durkheim, see Fenton, op. cit., p. 101.

He was against giving too much power to the state as the state control of all property in the socialist system. But, as the moral custodian it must see to it that people conform to the norms and values of society.³⁸

The discussion so far indicates Durkheim's concern for the maintenance of social order. Social order, he argues, can be maintained if people are placed in functions for which they are best fit and they co-operate with each other. Secondly a moral order appropriate for the organic type of solidarity has to be developed which guides individuals in their conduct. The division of labour brings social order if these conditions are met, and the conditions external to the division of labour that bring inequality are taken care of. When these external conditions based on ascriptive criteria are eliminated, different classes, groups and individuals co-operate with one another in their functional spheres. The individual then finds no problem in attaching himself to society. In this the state has a vital moral task of helping individuals to carry out their functions. The secondary institutions like corporations have to be developed, that inculcate moral values in the individual and take care of the property after an individual's death as a measure for the abolition of private property.

38. Ibid.

Mannheim's approach to society -
A comparison with Durkheim

Mannheim identifies the roots of dissensus, disintegration of the modern society, in the increasing complexity, industrialisation of it. With this there are also changes in the values, roles and norms of the society that are supposed to guide the conduct of people in these changed circumstances. But disintegration follows, as the fastness of the changes give very little time for people to adjust suitably to the new situation.³⁹ This being the state of affairs in the modern, complex, industrial society, let us examine how he explains the social changes that gave rise to such a situation.

Mannheim classifies the historical stages into three main types. These three historical stages are not meant to be a definite course through which all societies had to pass, but it was only a tentative classification of historical societies, to deal with the problem Mannheim had at hand.⁴⁰

39. Mannheim, Karl, Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning, p.4, (Durkheim, The Division of Labour, p.365); also see Remmling, Gunter, The Sociology of Karl Mannheim, p.128.

40. Mannheim, Karl, Man and Society in an age of Reconstruction, p.68; also see Colin Loader, The Intellectual Development of Karl Mannheim, p.132.

The first stage, according to Mannheim, is one of horde solidarity like the solidarity of the Germanic hordes in Europe by the turn of antiquity. A strong solidarity and submissiveness were the main characteristics of the group. They showed a "relatively homogenous behaviour" sanctioned by tradition and fear. The individuality had surrendered before the collectivity. The awareness of the individual as a separate being was absent. This is evidenced by the existing system of "morals, range of foresight, consciousness, and capacity to shoulder responsibility". Therefore, there was a group-adaptation to the factors that lead to collective life, in which the individual formed an integral part. In short, his life-chances depended upon the process of group-adaptation.⁴¹

Mannheim recognises a strong group influence to be acting upon the individual at this stage of horde solidarity. This is clear when he wrote, "The actions of the group were the result of a relatively homogenous behaviour ultimately enforced by tradition and fear."⁴²

41. Ibid. Mannheim agreed with the characterisation of Primitive Society by Durkheim and his use of the term 'mechanical horde solidarity'.

42. Ibid. Similar to the notion of collective conscience that Durkheim used.

The second stage is "the world of individual competition". This stage though arose from the stage of mechanical horde solidarity, but sharply contrasted the latter. In this stage the group convention and tradition do not form the world view of the individual, rather he develops his own outlook and is also ready to take up personal responsibility. There is an element of individual interest which grows out of the individual competition characterizing this stage. The adaptation to the competitive struggle is a personal responsibility, the "stimulus" for which is provided by small property holdings. The "subjective rationality" guides the individual in his selection of the best available means, that serve his personal ends and also a preconception of the immediate effects of such means and actions taken on the basis of these means. In this, the individual is not concerned about the possible consequences of his action on the society as a whole. Society is just the fortuitous integration of these conflicting atomistic individual activities - "Society was not the result of a preconceived plan but developed from a chance integration of many antagonistic activities. Every man was for himself against the others, without caring what sort of society was being formed out of the chaos of these conflicting activities and limited personal responsibilities."⁴³

43. Ibid., p.69; Loader, op. cit., p.133.

Those who can see the harmful effects of their activities based on personal interests on society do not try for a change and let the things go as they are.⁴⁴

The third stage is the present society based on larger groups. The atomistic individuals now form a part of the larger groups sacrificing their individual interests for the interests of such larger groups. In the industrial sphere, the small-holdings in conflict with each other are now merged to form large-scale industries which are in competition with other such larger industries formed on the same basis. The formation of trade unions has given rise to the solidarity of the workers and their joint-action, although it is because of a conflict with the employers' organisations in asserting the rights of the workers. This stage is different from the mechanical horde solidarity in that the larger groups into which the individuals are absorbed are not all-inclusive like that of the mechanical type. It is also different from the stage of individualized competition, in the sense that a greater realization has dawned upon the individual to fulfill his own interests only by furthering the collective interests through safeguarding the social and economic system. The individual now possesses a holistic perspective, an

44. Ibid.

understanding of the interconnectedness of the events and the social mechanism of this interconnection.⁴⁵

This is the stage of planning, in which the individual is imbued with the "highest level of reason and morality" and shows a growing realization of the need for planning. The planning is not for any part, but for the whole. The existing state of development till then was lacking this concern for the whole because the dominant groups used planning as a means to suppress their rival groups. This sort of Planning, Mannheim calls "biased planning" in which the individual instead of becoming concerned about the whole of mankind is only concerned about his own particular group. But Mannheim is optimistic of the individual who, by using his "faculty of considered judgement" shares responsibility for the whole society.⁴⁶

Mannheim is concerned about the role of rational and irrational forces in the social life.⁴⁷ How far do they influence the course of history? What is the scope for moral standards to be realised in society? and "How far blind impulsive reactions are decisive of the turning points of history"?

45. Ibid., p.70.

46. Ibid.

47. Ibid., p.40.

There has been a "disproportionate development" of human faculties. This is an unequal and disharmonious development of the historical and social groups. This may give rise to disintegration of the society. Therefore, it follows that for social order not to collapse, there should be a harmony between the rational self-control, individual's mastery of his own impulses and the level of development of technology. Secondly, the level to which the reason would apply itself to society, impulses be ordered and the form morality would take do not depend on individuals, nor are they chance phenomena, but they depend on the problems that the society at any time faces.⁴⁸

The division of functions in society in the middle ages gave rise to an inequality giving dominance to some groups and depriving others of the psychological and intellectual functions. But modern society requires a different type of social organisation because of two processes at work: (i) fundamental democratization of society and (ii) the growing interdependence of individual activities forming larger wholes.⁴⁹

Corresponding to the three stages of society, Mannheim identifies three stages of the development of rationality

48. Ibid., p.43.

49. Ibid., p.44. Mannheim gives the example of the nobility, clergy and the caste structure of India in the Middle ages giving rise to such inequality.

and thought. The first stage of horde solidarity is characterised by substantial irrationality because they are either false or are not acts of thought like drives, impulses, wishes etc.⁵⁰ This type of thought lacks the element of intelligence which is characteristic of substantially rational thought. Substantially rational thought is associated with the third stage of society, i.e., the stage of planning. It shows the inter-relations of phenomena or events in a particular situation.⁵¹ In between these two the functionally-rational thought develops in the second stage of liberal, laissez-faire society, which involved unregulated competition for the satisfaction of individual interests. The functionally rational thought involves the achievement of a particular goal and the calculability of means for the achievement of this goal. Devoid of these two, it becomes functionally-irrational thought.⁵²

At the level of thought, "chance discovery" characterises the primitive stage of food-gatherers and hunters. "Invention" marks that of the second stage of individual competition. Man first thought of a goal and then attempted to organise his activities to achieve this goal in a definite period of time. Though he was not concerned about anything

50. Ibid., p.53.

51. Ibid., pp.53-54.

52. Ibid., p.59.

beyond that immediate task, but he was somehow aware of the interconnection of his thought to the particular environment.⁵³

The third stage of the development of the thought is that of "planning" or "planned thinking". Though, the society by and large is stuck at the level of invention, but the general tendency has been towards this third stage. There has been a conscious change from the preoccupation with "inventions of single object" or institution to that of "deliberate regulation and intelligent mastery of the relationships between these objects".⁵⁴ The advantage with the planned approach is that, it not only takes care of individual aims or goals but also considers the repercussions of these individual limited goals on the whole social structure. There exists some "key positions" in every situation, and planning tries to comprehend the totality or interconnection of events from these key positions.⁵⁵

The transition from individual competition and invention to the stage of planning depends upon the success of bringing unplanned events to the fold of planning and

53. Ibid., p.151.

54. Ibid., p.152.

55. Ibid., p.154; also see Loader, op. cit., p.130.

the technical control of nature. Sometimes, the transformation of natural processes to planning also gives rise to some problems. The example Mannheim gave of the inventions in division of labour and technology, that though by raising productivity of labour mitigates the starvation problem, but the complex process of production and distribution makes them incomprehensible, and their ineffective functioning makes people suffer more than when there is no control on natural forces.⁵⁶

The analysis of the types of society and social change shows Mannheim's advocacy for a planned society, which according to him is commensurable with the rationality and the thought pattern of an industrially and technologically growing society with complex division of labour. Before we discuss in detail about this planned society, identification of the factors that leads to the disintegration of society is necessary. Because Mannheim advanced his theory of elite and planned reconstruction against the backdrop of these factors. Mannheim's ideas on culture, is related to his analysis of disintegration taking place in modern society as a result of the disintegration of the structure of elites. Therefore, it is necessary to analyse the impact of social changes on culture. The cultural and

56. Ibid., p.155.

intellectual life is governed by two social processes:

- (1) There is the unregulated part of social life that spontaneously shapes the cultural and intellectual life, and
- (2) the regulated part which are organized into "institutions", e.g., the influence on the cultural and intellectual life of modern methods of propaganda by radio, newspaper, research institutes, universities etc.⁵⁷

The laissez-faire liberal mass-society is based on laws of an unregulated nature, whereas the dictatorially-governed mass-society is organised on the basis of institutions. What are the effects of these two types on culture needs to be examined. Mannheim classified the elite into:

- (i) the organising or political elites that has the main function of integrating more and more individual wills, and
- (ii) the intellectual, the artistic, the moral, and the religious that try to sublimate the remaining psychic energies that have not been exhausted by the daily struggle for existence.⁵⁸

Knowledge comes to be grasped in two distinct forms:

- (i) the continuum of everyday experience - this is related to the problems that the individual confronts in his daily life and his attempts to solve these problems with the

57. Ibid., p.81.

58. Ibid., pp.82-83.

spontaneous, casual knowledge at his disposal. This is not a continuous method, and (ii) the esoteric stream of transmission - the "product of dedicated effort and cultivated tradition".⁵⁹ Mannheim used the word "Public" for those who mediated between elites and the others, as the elites were not in direct contact with the masses.⁶⁰

Mannheim categorised the public into: (i) the organic public, (ii) the disintegrated public, and (iii) the organized public. They belonged to the three different stages of society respectively outlined by him. According to him there has been "a transition in the development of the public from the organic through the disintegrated to the artificially organized public of the future".⁶¹

There is no differentiation of elite in the first stage of society. The same elite dominates and monopolises both the 'esoteric stream of transmission' and the 'continuum of everyday existence'. The audience for it is provided by the organic public. A substantially irrational context prevails in which both elites and masses participated. But the separation of the two spheres of knowledge and the destruction of the organic public comes about in the liberal

59. Mannheim, Karl, Essays on Sociology of Culture, p.116.

60. Ibid., p.96.

61. Ibid., p.97.

and democratic stages. The separation of these two spheres is the result of replacement of substantial irrationality by functional rationality and a predominance of individual competition. The exposure of greater number of masses to the political, cultural and other areas of society has broken the monopoly of the elites. This is a consequence of the process of industrialisation and spread of rationality to masses. Thus, there is a change in the selection and composition of elites, where achievement principles are gradually being recognised. This has opened up elite positions to those who can compete and prove their worth.⁶²

But the social conditions of the masses do not favour their participation in the elite functions. The operation of unregulated social forces leads to the crisis of culture. The cultural elite cannot fulfill its task, because for culture to survive there should be a small, creative group to give proper expression to cultural and psychological forces and guide the masses in this respect. This crisis in culture in liberal-democratic society leads to "negative

62. Mann and Society in an age of Reconstruction, op. cit., pp.81-96; Because of the process of fundamental democratization, there is a breakdown of the political and cultural monopoly of the elites and social groups who were earlier denied access to these are now participating in these functions - Ibid., p.25; also see Coser, Lewis A., Master of Sociological Thought, p.438.

liberalism" and "negative democratization".⁶³

Mannheim considers the maladjustment and disintegration of the social structure, i.e., the ills of Capitalism to be lying in the rapidity of transition of society from small groups to great ones.⁶⁴ If the social unit is small the lack of guidance and regulation involved in this process of transition does not cause much concern. But the lack of these result in social disintegration in larger societies where the outdated patterns are either not replaced, or not adequately replaced. In this context, Mannheim differentiated social disintegration from social change. Social change is the substitution of one social structure or order by another. But when the social structure is weakened gradually without the emergence of another suitable one, it is called social disintegration.⁶⁵ He cites mass-unemployment and moral degeneration as examples. Unemployment and moral degeneration exist in all societies, but when these assume a mass-scale, they lead to mass anxieties and become symptoms of social disintegration.⁶⁶

63. Ibid., pp.84-85.

64. Freedom, Power, Democratic Planning, op. cit., p.4; also see Remmling, op. cit., p.128.

65. Ibid., p.5.

66. Ibid.

According to Mannheim, though modern society is passing through a period of disintegration but there cannot be total disintegration as the effects of disintegration are diminished by 'self-healing' processes and spontaneous adjustment.⁶⁷ But if the effects of disintegration go on accumulating finally going out of control, it leads to a chaotic situation. The factors responsible for social disintegration are discussed below.

(i) The establishment of Minority rule

Various methods of manipulation^{are} used by the ruling few, that ultimately leads to disintegration. The influence of these social techniques are felt in the spheres of politics, education, warfare, communication, propaganda etc. All these help the power to be concentrated in a few hands. For example, in the modern Army, the military techniques, now than ever before, can lead to a much greater concentration of power; in the field of government and administration too much of centralised control is possible through telephone, radio and air communication. This rapid communication also helps to bring industrial units together. In the bureaucracy a few departmental heads control the majority by formulating policies and decisions of their own.⁶⁸ Also,

67. Ibid.

68. Ibid., pp.6-7.

education helps in the manipulation of human behaviour in favour of this minority rule. All these share a common property of establishing key positions from where decisions to govern the majority are being taken.⁶⁹

The present situation, according to him, calls for an end to the laissez-faire system and the use of planning. The main question that emerges in this context is "who shall use the means of control and to what end." The modern techniques and technology are associated with the striving for power. This ultimately threatens the survival of mankind.⁷⁰

(ii) Development of monopolies from communal economy bypassing free competition

The economic system of free competition and private ownership of the means of production developed in a historical phase which lies between the local, self-sufficient economy of agrarian and handicraft communities and the planned economy spread over a larger area supported by international exchange and integration and a highly developed technology. Free competition on individual basis developed when the tribal units could no longer respond to

69. Ibid., p.8.

70. Ibid., pp.8-10.

the needs of the economic development and private ownership of means of production safeguarded the interest of the individual against state interference.⁷¹ But when the size of these economic enterprises grew more and more with a decline of their numbers, individual initiative began to decrease and also there was no free competition truly speaking. The place of independent owners was now taken by a new business bureaucracy. There was a change in the administrative techniques and also a change in the key positions. In these changed circumstances the laissez-faire system and private ownership of means of production loses its significance as these are used by some groups to their own ends,⁷² thereby threatening the stability of the system.

(iii) Displacement of self-regulating small-groups and loosening of traditional group-controls

Mannheim praises the small groups at least in one respect, that was the integration of the social pattern with the characteristics of "common living, functional interdependence and the clarity of common purpose" which are disintegrating as a result of the expansion of society.⁷³ The rapid and lopsided transformation of the society also

71. Ibid., p.10.

72. Ibid., p.11.

73. Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning, p.12.

has weakened the traditional group controls. The substitutes to the latter in the form of Army, the factory or the civil services etc. do not effectively satisfy the needs of the smaller groups. Moreover the control of these have a demoralising effect. The main danger comes from the overdiscipline like that of the factory worker when there is a closure of the plant or there is nobody to command him.⁷⁴

(iv) Expansion of Division of labour
without large-scale co-ordination

Mannheim treats the lack of co-ordination between large-scale organisation as one of the disintegrating factors. Mannheim, however, did not favour corporations of a medieval or fascist type in the name of co-ordination. What is needed is a clarity in the minds of people of the educational and moral significance of their associations that was lacking in the corporations of the medieval or fascist type.⁷⁵ The lack of co-ordination leads to a "general disorientation", in which associations are used as means to manipulate people. Here comes the question of freedom of people.⁷⁶

74. Ibid., p. 14.

75. Ibid., p. 14.

76. Ibid.

While Mannheim has no belief in absolute freedom which according to him results only in anarchy, he combined freedom with commitment. Freedom is no more there when laws cannot impose control upon the behaviour of individuals.⁷⁷

(v) Disintegration of consensus and personality

The co-operative controls characteristic of small groups are no more suitable for a society which is large and has a complex division of labour. In small groups the cooperative control helps to indicate the level of agreements and differences and also the sharing of power. It also results in consensus and shared responsibility. But there is no consensus in democratic societies based on a voting pattern of sharing of control because of manipulation of opinions, organized parties and the operation of pressure groups. No successful method has been evolved in this sphere that meets the demands of the modern society.⁷⁸

(vi) The disruptive effects of class-antagonism

Mannheim is against the revolutionary solutions to social problems. He expresses anxiety regarding the

77. Ibid., p.16; Durkheim considered the absence of laws as a state of juridical indetermination.

78. Ibid., pp.16-17.

disruptive effects of class-antagonism and the resulting disorganisation of society that does away with freedom and the democratic agreement on which the society is based.⁷⁹

(vii) The disintegration of religious bonds

The disintegration of behaviour and personality cannot be accounted for solely in terms of conduct and character in action, but the weakening of the force of religion that provided the ideological and spiritual impetus for integration. Religion offers a common purpose, and an interpretation of commonly experienced events in moral and religious terms. This spiritual unity beyond the level of daily activities was the basis on which religion acted as an integrating force. But one separation of functions of state, industry etc. left religion in a truncated form. The experiments of Nationalism and Socialism have failed to be substitutes to this function of religion. Now religion is used as a basis of antagonism and intolerance between adherents of different religions. Religion again has to perform this integrating role, not as a "creed or denomination, but as a basic institution of society."⁸⁰

Mannheim argues in favour of development of codes in army, professions, business and the moral sphere that

79. Ibid., p.17.

80. Ibid., pp.19-21.

helps bring a good neighbourly relation. The large organisations should develop their own standards.⁸¹ The absence of these and an education that teaches the virtues of good citizenship etc. ultimately affect the character of the individual. Mannheim felt the need for a morality to govern the social life, otherwise a state of anomie prevails.

People live in this state of anomie in mass society based on laissez-faire. Such a society does not provide alternative ways of orientation when old social controls prove no more effective. Hence it has got no moral basis or no moral justification.⁸²

Mannheim outlines two distinct reactions in modern times to this process of disintegration: (i) the "Totalitarian planning" which again can be subdivided into Fascism and Communism, (ii) the "Democratic planning". The totalitarian system rested on the use of force, pressure etc. and a strict-regimentation in social organisations. These systems can be understood not totally from the point of view of terror and brutality they unleashed but the problems they were dealing with. However, by solving one they were creating another.⁸³

81. Ibid., p.18. Agreed with Durkheim's analysis of anomie, i.e., the lawlessness that disintegrates the personality when a new moral order has not emerged to replace the old one.

82. Ibid., p.19.

83. Ibid., p.23.

The basic similarity between the communist and fascist types is their, emphasis on "planning in the economic, social and moral spheres."⁸⁴ Moreover, both regard planning to flow from certain central key procedures. Lastly they show similarity in carrying out planning by dictatorship, which amounts to doing away with the rights and freedoms of the individual and conferring power to a few individuals in the framework of a single party.⁸⁴

The basic difference between the two types lie in their approach to society. While communism rests on a Marxist Utopia of ameliorating the condition of working class and to establish a better type of social relations, Fascist type has no such utopian will. It only depends on immediate gains for the few individuals who have power to rule others. Mannheim criticized both these two types and pleaded for a planning based on democracy.⁸⁵

While rejecting revolutionary solutions based on a Marxian analysis of class-war. Mannheim however retains the Marxian emphasis of the economic structure. According to Remmling, he tries to solve this Marxian problem in a structural-functional paradigm that required social

84. Ibid., pp. 23-24.

85. Ibid., pp. 24-28.

revolution to be substituted by social adjustment.⁸⁶

Mannheim visualises economic development to take a course of peaceful social interdependence. The reason he advances for this is that, the individual economic self-interest by engendering a number of social controls, the control mechanisms that are different from the older practice of bureaucratic, military or political force and which produce rational, homogenous behaviour, increases the economic interdependence and acts as an unifying force.⁸⁷

By planning Mannheim does not mean planning only in the economic sphere, it embraces political, cultural and educational spheres also. He aims at a social reconstruction that would be based on the virtues of co-operation, spirit of social service etc. The extension of the Social services, he considers, what planning is for, because the older forms of neighbourly help are no more suitable for a larger society with all its complexities. The main function of social services is not only to extend material assistance but also to bring about a psychological adjustment, a "readjustment of groups and individuals who have lost their way in the wilderness of modern society."⁸⁸

86. Remmling, G., The Sociology of Karl Mannheim, p.75.

87. Ibid.

88. Man and Society/ op. cit., p.352; also see Remmling, op. cit., p.99.

The social reconstruction is possible after a reconstruction of man. This reconstruction aims at developing a democratic personality in him. The democratic personality is capable of integrative behaviour. Integrative behaviour implies a readiness for co-operation with others while being aware of the differences existing in society.⁸⁹ The democratic personality has got two sides, viz., individualization and socialization. The former is concerned about the interest of the individual whereas the latter tries to integrate him with society.⁹⁰

Mannheim seeks a harmonious balance between the two sides of personality, i.e., the individual and the social beings. He wants a democratic consensus to prevail in society which needs a social education that orients the individual towards the society. The democratic consensus and co-operation, he argues, can be achieved by social adjustment rather than social revolution. The elites which play an important part in reaching at such a democratic consensus are selected on the basis of meritocracy. Mannheim found the principles of demand and supply to be at the root of meritocratic principles in professions. Those having the necessary qualifications and aptitudes for work rise

89. Man and Society in the Age of Reconstruction, op.cit., p. 263.

90. Ibid., p. 244.

to the top that constitutes the category of planners.

After analysing the disintegrating factors in a liberal, laissez-faire society and the various reactions to tackle such forces, finds both fascism and communism as unsuitable for this purpose. He considers democratic planning to be the appropriate measure for countering the forces of disintegration and bringing stability in the society. For him, however, it is a dynamic stability that is maintained in the quick succession of changes at every moment when change takes place.

Summary

To conclude, Mannheim and Durkheim have no differences in the characterisation of the primitive society. Mannheim refers to the group control acting upon the individual which for Durkheim is a strong collective conscience. The next stage for Durkheim is the modern, industrial society based on an organic division of labour. Mannheim and Durkheim more or less agree on the characterisation of this stage of society which is of a liberal, laissez-faire type. Here, the competition is not regulated and individual striving knows no limits. Both of them oppose the emerging forms of excessive individualism where the concern for the society is relegated to the background.

Mannheim and Durkheim agree on the fact that the rapidity of the changes brought about by increasing

industrialisation causes problem for people to adjust to the changing situation. There is the need for an alternative moral order to guide people in this new situation. While Durkheim holds the conditions external to the division of labour as mainly responsible for the abnormal and pathological forms in the division of labour and disintegration in the society, Mannheim traces the disintegration process as starting with a breakdown of traditional elite control, because of the opening up of these positions to the masses in the liberal-laissez faire society.

Mannheim's analysis of some of the factors of disintegration are similar to that of Durkheim. Though he was not against the private ownership of the means of production, but he was against its concentration in the hands of a few as in the liberal-laissez faire society. Durkheim, we have noted, was against the private ownership of the means of production which he calls the external condition of inequality.

Mannheim talks of the loss of traditional small group controls by the expansion of society and its inefficient substitution in the army, factory etc. which has a demoralising effect on the masses. Durkheim also emphasises the loss of specificity of rules in the modern society which creates confusion in the minds of the people.

On the point of failure of large-scale co-ordination, their views are similar. For Durkheim it is one abnormal form of the division of labour whereas Mannheim calls it a situation of 'general disorientation'. Durkheim views liberty as consisting of the commitment of the individual to the society. The laws should guide the relationship among individuals, otherwise a state of juridical indetermination follows. Mannheim also considers that freedom cannot be possible without appropriate laws governing behaviour of the people.

Both Durkheim and Mannheim are against the use of revolutionary methods to bring order in the society. They resort to a consensus model in which development of an appropriate morality forms an integral part. Therefore, both of them argue in favour of developing codes in the professional and occupational spheres as necessary forms of controls to guide the individual behaviour. Mannheim agrees with Durkheim in his analysis of anomie. Durkheim emphasises on socialisation for converting the individual being into the social being which for Mannheim is a balance between the two sides of personality, i.e., "ego-security and social-rootedness" as he describes them.

Mannheim's stress on meritocratic principles in professions and co-operation, consensus etc. brings him closer to Durkheim and the functionalists. However, his

emphasis on planning as a measure of conscious intervention differentiates him from Durkheim. Thus, like Durkheim his goal was one of bringing social stability and maintaining social order and equilibrium. For Durkheim the stability was more static but Mannheim recognises that it cannot but be a dynamic stability as changes are taking place very rapidly.

So far we have discussed the views of Durkheim and Mannheim on society with particular references to social change, social control and social order. Before we turn to the next chapter on education let us now examine their views on sociology of knowledge. This gives the idea as to how individual's thought develops, how he comes to know of the social situation around him, and what are the influences he is subjected to that determines the contents of his thought and action.

Sociology of knowledge and Education

Knowledge for Mannheim, though influenced by the nature of the object, but the way in which it has to be approached depends upon the nature of the knower in two ways. First, it pertains to the qualitative depth of the knowledge and secondly, it requires the perceptions to be organised into categories. The frames of reference in which such organisation takes place in terms of concepts,

comes from a given historical moment. The dependence of thought on socio-existential conditions at a particular historical period is evident when Mannheim wrote, "The concepts which we have and the universe of discourse in which we move, together with the directions in which they tend to elaborate themselves are dependent largely upon the historical-social situation of the intellectually active and responsible members of the group."⁹¹

Behind every thought or point of view a complex of conditions operate. The position of the thinker in the social structure conditions his thoughts. Social positions, thus, carry with them certain social meanings. This implies that fundamental categories of thought are functions of multitudes of interests, aspirations etc. that, in turn, are related to social status, roles and position.⁹² This also relates Mannheim's Sociology of knowledge to the concepts of 'ideology' and 'utopia'. In this Mannheim attempted to generalize the Marxian contention that ideas depend on the social or class-position of those who hold it into a system of thought that includes all ideas. While Marx used it against the bourgeoisie to

91. This position of Mannheim is reflected in his analysis of ideology into 'total' and 'partial', 'special' and 'general'. *Ideology and Utopia*, op. cit., p.77.

92. Ibid., pp.263-64.

unmask the false consciousness which they want to spread through their ideas. Mannheim broadened it to include all systems of thought including the proletarian.⁹³

As thought is socially and existentially conditioned, no social group can have total access to it though relatively, at times some group has more access to it than the other. This relates thought to the perspective of the thinker. The individual thinkers mediate between the influence of social existence upon knowledge as agents of cognition. Occupying particular positions in social space and historical time they sought to bridge the gap between thought and social existence. Their socio-historic position determines the aspect of the reality they can have access to. This, Mannheim called their 'standpoint'. Thus, the situational factors have tremendous influence in forming the perspective or outlook of the individual.⁹⁴

With this socio-historical existential determination of thought Mannheim showed the difference between the particular conception of ideology and the total conception of ideology that he favoured. The particular conception of ideology tests the bias of certain aspects of the statement of the opponents whereas the 'total conception' views

93. Coser, L., op. cit., pp.430-31.

94. Ideology and Utopia, op. cit., p.244; Coser, op. cit., p.431.

the entire modes of thoughts, in both its form and content, as related to the social position of their defenders. The dependence of thought on the existential conditions invited for Mannheim the charge of relativism which he tried to avoid by resorting to the concept of 'relationism'.⁹⁵

Relativism considers every assertion of a thinker by an ideal of absolute truth independent of the subjective experience of the observe while "relationism" argues that the truth of a proposition cannot be assessed without taking into consideration the values and position of the subject and the social content. Therefore, thought is not relativistic implying more or less but is 'relational' or 'perspectivistic'.⁹⁶

When ideology is interpreted as general, it is no more a 'naive distrust' of opponent's views or statements but a methodical analysis of his thinking, a general distrust of all types of thought that includes even his own.⁹⁷ It moves from the 'particular, relative and special' plane to a 'total, absolute and universal' one. The

95. The social position, according to Mannheim not only includes class but also status and occupational categories that determine the ideas. *Ideology and Utopia*, op. cit., p.245; Coser, op. cit., p.432.

96. Shils, Edward, "Karl Mannheim" in The Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, vol.9, pp.557-61.

97. *Ideology and Utopia*, op. cit., pp.4, 31-32.

inclusion of the total thought in ideology implied all thought to be having an ideological character. This again raised the question of relativism as truth cannot be attained from thought that are ideological by nature. Mannheim, to avoid this, resorted to the notion that validity of the ideas depends upon the function they fulfill within a particular social process and their strength in countering other set of ideas. The function is judged in terms of adjustment of the society to particular historical period.⁹⁸

Mannheim realising the loopholes in relating the validity of the ideas to their functional usefulness shifted to the concept of the 'free-floating' or 'socially-unattached' intelligentsia who because of their advantage of non-affiliation to any class can have access to the truth in its totality. Their mutual criticisms against each other removes any bias, if at all, they have of their original social backgrounds.⁹⁹

In the preceding analysis it has been pointed out that for Mannheim knowledge and thought are socially or existentially determined. He relates this to education by stressing upon the fact that education is now being

98. Ibid., pp. 9, 33, 165, 232; Coser, op. cit., p.435.

99. Man and Society in an age of Reconstruction, op. cit., p.74.

gradually divorced from the 'social dimension'. In this context he emphasises two reasons of the need for having a knowledge of the social environment. Firstly, by pointing out the various influences operating in an industrial society helps man to develop the skills necessary for different functions and by giving role to an attitude to counter the harmful influences it helps in his adjustment with the social context. This knowledge of the social environment checks the disintegrating effects of the rapidity of the social and industrial changes. Secondly, this knowledge helps him to transcend the particular stage he is in for creating a better social type. People should not only have better adjustment with their situation but should also act as agents of transformation.¹⁰⁰

Education has the task of making the individual understand the interaction of different forces operating in the social environment which are not readily observable. It has also the responsibility of showing the way of dealing with and controlling these forces. In this way only education can function in the personality formation. Mannheim was convinced of the fact that men can suitably change their social and economic systems 'under certain

100. Mannheim, K., Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge, 1952, p.235; also, Introduction to the Sociology of education, op. cit., pp.22, 50.

circumstances' for which a correct observation of the social forces is necessary and education can help profoundly in this respect.¹⁰¹

Durkheim's sociology of knowledge and education

Durkheim does not clearly point out the link between his views on thought, knowledge and education. But the implication of his sociology of knowledge for education is clear when he identifies that both these are having a social origin and are oriented towards the society.

All knowledge for Durkheim have a religious origin.¹⁰² Even philosophy and science have religion as their ancestor. The religion provides necessary ideas to the intellect, constantly enriching it. But religion, ~~the~~ considered, as a representation of society, its social function being to create and maintain the collective life.¹⁰³ The categories for understanding social phenomena like time, space, class etc. are also of social origin, because they are arrangements applicable to all and must have developed out of

101. Mannheim, K., Essays...., op. cit., p.275.

102. For details of the religious origin of knowledge, see Durkheim, E., The Elementary forms of Religious life, pp.219, 314-18; also see Giddens, Anthony, Capitalism and modern social theory, 1971, p.100.

103. Durkheim, op. cit., p.10.

collective efforts. The notions of class, force, personality etc. have also originated from collective thought or society.¹⁰⁴

Durkheim's stand on the social origin of categories was a way-out of this opposition between rationalism and pragmatism. In this he accepts the apriorist position that the two strands of knowledge namely rational and empirical could not be reduced into one another. His criticism of the view of idealism that thought starts before anything else did not prevent him also from criticising the pragmatists view that action precedes thought.¹⁰⁵ The empiricist position showed the individual states which needs explanation in terms of his psychical nature.¹⁰⁶

Against the individual states of empiricists or pragmatists, Durkheim's social origin of knowledge emphasises the collective representation. It shows the mental states of the group and it relies upon the moral, religious and economic institutions. The individual is pitted against the social which has got an existence qualitatively different from the individual.¹⁰⁷ The collective

104. Ibid., pp.9-13.

105. Durkheim, E., Pragmatism and Sociology, p.67.

106. Elementary forms, op. cit., p.15.

107. Ibid., pp.15-16; Pragmatism and Sociology, op. cit., p.68.

representation is an example of the power of the reason to transcend the limits of empirical knowledge and produce a richer, more complex intellectual product through the interaction of individual minds.¹⁰⁸

The explanation for this Durkheim traced in the dual nature of man, i.e., the individual and social beings which we have already discussed. His contention is that the categories of thought are not innate but developed during the socialisation process that transforms the individual being into the social being.¹⁰⁹ Man learns what is presented to him by the society and this knowledge is transferred from one generation to the other. The social solidarity and the preservation of society requires conformity to norms, rules and values as prescribed by the society. There are recurrent occasions for the group to assemble and express the feelings of joy, sorrow etc., and the individual to interact with others. These occasions leaves imprints of powerful collective sentiments on the individual mind.¹¹⁰

The individual under the collective influence comes to know what to think and what not to think for maintaining

108. Elementary forms, op. cit., p.16.

109. Ibid.

110. Ibid., p.16.

the social order. In this, he is also driven by the fear of disapproval, punishment etc. apart from realising the merits of co-operation with others.

The claim of the apriorists or rationalists that truth, categories of understanding or an idea can be accounted for by the imposing and constraining force it has on our mind or intelligence that leads to its acceptance as some sort of virtue, however, does not indicate (of) their origin. Their origin lies in the usefulness in maintaining the social order. Therefore, individual deviances have to be checked. Apart from 'moral conformity', society also needs a 'logical conformity'.¹¹¹

The individual resistance to the forces of collectivity is checked both internally and externally. Externally, the pressure of public-opinion constrains him. Internally, reason has got a powerful authority as the representation of society also checks his whims and fancies. It cannot be taken as a matter of 'habit', nor 'physical' or 'metaphysical necessity' as categories change over time and place, but the authority of society that by arousing similar thinking forms the basis of common action and the sense of moral responsibility.¹¹²

111. Ibid., p.17.

112. Ibid.

The implication of Durkheim's sociology of knowledge to his views on education can be established by linking the knowledge to the needs of the society which thought derives from society and which have got practical application in the aims of education. The needs of the society first of all consists of the transformation of the individual to the social being. For this the individual has to know the norms, rules and values of the society. In addition to a moral conformity society also should be based on a logical conformity. The logical conformity is derived from the usefulness the categories of thought or ideas have for the maintenance of social order.

The knowledge or the thought of the necessity of moral and logical conformity, however, does not automatically dawn upon the individual. This requires a socialisation process to attach the individual to the society. There are many socialising agencies, but in modern, industrial society education has become the most important socialising agency that makes the individual understand the primacy of the survival of the society. Secondly, one may be experiencing the influence of the collectivity or society upon oneself in one's thought but it is through education that one understands the usefulness of the social influences and the need for the social constraints. This is clear in the notion of 'autonomy' that forms a part of Durkheim's moral education.

CHAPTER III

MANNHEIM AND DURKHEIM ON EDUCATION

Introduction:

It is clear that both Mannheim and Durkheim focussed on the disintegrating effects of capitalism in modern Industrial society. But they did not stop at identifying the ills of capitalism, and came forward to offer solutions to this. They were both concerned about social integration and the social consensus that was at stake. Both found education to be an important integrating factor.

According to Eric Hoyle, education as an integrating force was recognised after it was realised that neither the 'functioning of an organic society' nor the designs of the 'dominant elites' can help in maintaining the social consensus. Most of these studies were not analytical and only stressed the desirability of preserving the social consensus rather than possibility of it in practical terms. But the works of Emile Durkheim and Karl Mannheim made a difference in the sense that, they tried to 'combine moral exhortation with sociological analysis'. But what separated them was their approach, i.e. the nature of solutions they offered to the problem of social integration. For Durkheim, it was a 'quasi-syndicalist solution' in which education was given a key-role whereas Mannheim advanced

an "elitist solution" in terms of a theory of mass society.¹

A comparison between these two prolific writers on education then, has to start with their views on education, particularly its relationship with the wider society as an integrating factor. The views of Durkheim will be stated first and then ^{it} will be compared with the views of Mannheim.

Durkheim on Education:

Durkheim equated education with 'Socialization'.² Though, in general terms education includes all sorts of mental and physical influences exercised on somebody by nature and other men, but more precisely it is the influence exercised on the youth by the adults. This influence is oriented towards 'the harmonious development of all the human faculties'. But perfect harmony is unattainable and also not desirable because of the specialisations needed for various functions and also the need of a common base to balance the various organic and psychic functions.³

The utilitarian view of posing the individual as an instrument of happiness was criticized by Durkheim on the

-
1. Hoyle, Eric, "The elite concept in Karl Mannheim's Sociology of Education", Sociological Review, New Series, vol.12, 1964, p.55.
 2. Durkheim, Education and Sociology, p.61; also see Wallwork, Ernest, Durkheim, Morality and Milieu, p.121.
 3. Durkheim, op. cit., p.52.

ground that material happiness is a subjective thing without any limits which makes it difficult to decide the goals of education.⁴ Durkheim adduced historical evidence to prove that education varied in time and space according to the needs of the society. A particular society was based upon a definite type of education that best suited it and the contrary would have been devastating for it. Therefore, the claim of an 'ideal, perfect education' applying to all men is unfounded. For example, Roman city would have been in trouble, had it allowed individualism instead of subordination to collectivism that was spread by education. Similarly, the Christian education of middle ages did not encourage 'free enquiry'.

Thus, every epoch has a dominant form of education to which the individual has to submit if he does not like to invite opposition in case of any violation. The difference in the organization of education from place to place is because of the mistakes in 'determining the ends of education, or the means of attaining it.' This can of course, be corrected by taking proper lessons from history. The dominant type of education is formed by the customs and ideas meant for a common living worked out by the

4. The utilitarian view of J.S. Mill and others was criticized by Durkheim in his analysis of the goals of education - ibid., p.53.

preceding generations.⁵

Durkheim viewed education to be a life-long process that helps the individual to cope with both the physical environment and also with the socio-cultural milieu. Education varies according to the socio-cultural milieu on the basis of caste, race etc. Today, class has become a basis of such variation. For example, the education of the middle class from the working class and also the city from that of the country. The necessity of diversification and specialisation for various functions only keeps education uniform upto a certain level though equality in education is desired among various strata. In short, both 'homogeneity' and 'diversity' are sought to be achieved through education. Homogeneity in terms of ideas, sentiments and practices is essential for a common living, whereas diversity is needed to put men in various functions and eliciting their co-operation. For society to survive these two are the very essential conditions.⁶

Education is a form of learning. It is what the youth learns from the adult generation. But to what end is this directed? This Durkheim answered by stating, "its

5. Ibid., pp.64-65.

6. Ibid., pp.66-67.

objective is to arouse in the child certain number of physical, intellectual and moral states which are demanded of him by both the political society as a whole and for the special milieu for which he is specifically destined."⁷

Learning can be divided into formal learning and informal learning. The informal learning is a continuous process, a form of unconscious education that comes through the interaction between younger generation with the adults in the process of imitation, co-operation etc. In contrast, direct pedagogy or formal education is designed to make him understand the 'complex', 'abstract' phenomena. The teacher acts as an agent of society and prepares the learner for a particular social milieu. The purpose of direct pedagogy is to inculcate in the learner the intellectual concepts and moral ideas so that he can function as a member of society.⁸

Society cannot survive without a definite degree of consensus existing among its members. For this the members have to perform their functions as demanded of them by the society. This is a reciprocal relationship that not only paves the way for a proper functioning of society but also helps the individual in achieving his goals by

7. Ibid., p.71.

8. Ibid., pp.91-98; also see Durkheim, Moral Education, pp.17-18, 129-48, 177; and Wallwork, op. cit., p.122.

providing him with the co-operation and experience of others.⁹

Education has a social character. An individual has two things, i.e., the individual and the social being. The individual being is concerned about the 'mental states' of the individual and seeks to fulfil his interest without regard for anything else. The social being on the other hand recognises the relation of the individual to his group which is expressed in 'religious beliefs', moral beliefs, various collective opinions etc. What education precisely tries to do, is to convert this self-interested individual being which dominates the mind of the individual at the beginning into the social being.¹⁰

The prevalence of the social being makes the individual subordinate his own ends to higher social ends. Both internal and external sense of discipline are inculcated in the individual that also makes the process of transmitting the creative qualities from one generation to another smooth and easier. This submission, Durkheim claimed, cannot be thought of as tyrannical, rather it is voluntary because the individual realises the fact that his own interest can be fulfilled only when the interest of the

9. Wallwork, op. cit., p.121.

10. Education and Sociology, op. cit., pp.71-72.

society is safeguarded.¹¹

The creative quality is what distinguishes man from animals who learn only to imitate. The animals only learn to perform their 'natural functions' but by themselves are unable to create anything, which men are capable of by receiving the appropriate kind of education. This not only helps him in adapting to his physical surrounding but also brings out the best in the individual. By co-operating with others and attaching himself to society his strive for perfection becomes easier.¹²

From a moral point of view the individual is indebted to the society. It is society that teaches the individual to submit his personal ends to higher ends by controlling his passions, desires, instincts or by making legal and other arrangements to check him. This internal and external sense of discipline which the individual learns distinguishes him from other animals.¹³ Also, from the intellectual point of view the individual owes a lot to the society. The results of scientific work help him in understanding the notions of cause of laws, of numbers etc. The progress of science is not the result of an individual but a collective

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid., pp.73-74.

13. Ibid., p.75.

effort. In primitive societies this function of science was performed by religion. Similarly, language that helps him in getting to know, in forming ideas and in speaking, is a product of efforts at the societal level.

The human being has maintained his distinctiveness and not gone down to the level of animals because he can make use of the experiences, the knowledge of the past generations which are handed down to him through education. An element of morality binds these succeeding generations together and there exists no opposition between the individual and society, rather they are complementary. The society tries to develop the best in the individual through education and not to suppress him. Though for this the effort of the individual is a prime condition, but in making 'voluntary efforts' the individual distinguishes himself from others.¹⁴

The task of education is not simply to prepare the individuals for various functions or specialise them so that they need each other's co-operation, but to impart them with the morality which makes them understand the need for such co-operation and the need of the survival of the society. The kind of moral education which Durkheim envisioned was oriented towards maintaining this relation-

14. Ibid., pp.76-77.

ship between individual and society. We have to see now what this 'moral education' consist of.

Moral Education:

The basic thrust of moral education is character formation not in the psychological but in the ethical sense. Psychologically, it is the character that distinguishes individuals from one another. Thus, everyone has a character. But in the ethical sense character implies a 'unity of personality', a stability, constancy and dependability. According to Durkheim it is to equip the individuals with the 'fundamental dispositions that are basic to the moral life'.¹⁵

Morality is a social fact, because it is not confined to individual but stems from the society and also it is more powerful than the individual who has to conform to it. This becomes clear when we discuss the three elements of morality, viz., discipline, autonomy and attachment, as applied to education.

Discipline:

The family as a socialising agent is inadequate for the intellectual development of the child. It only prepares

15. Wallwork, op. cit., p.123.

him in a preliminary way to meet the demands of the society. The child only receives the fundamentals of the moral life.¹⁶ Morality implies conformity to a pre-established system of rules that determines what should be one's action in a particular situation. This is the realm of 'duty' or 'prescribed behaviour'.¹⁷

There are two closely-linked aspects of the notion of discipline, the regularity of conduct and authority. How one should act in a particular situation does not depend upon habit alone but is a matter of regularity that one cannot change according to his taste.¹⁸ His behaviour is guided by the moral system internalized within him. Moral behaviour which is 'duty' or prescribed behaviour is reinforced by both positive and negative sanctions. Kant drew upon the negative sanctions of the moral imperatives that come into force in case of any violation of the moral prescriptions. But Durkheim argued that the negative sanctions by themselves are inadequate unless complemented by positive ones in the form of praise, honour etc. Secondly, this performance of duties has to be continuous, that requires not only external sanctions

16. Moral Education, op. cit., pp.17-18.

17. Ibid., pp.23-24.

18. Ibid., p.28.

but also 'self-discipline' or 'internal control of behaviour'.¹⁹

The regularity of conduct is not possible without a regulating authority which the child needs. This authority comes from the parents, teachers etc. According to Durkheim, "by authority we must understand that influence which imposes upon us all the moral power that we acknowledge as superior to us."²⁰ The superiority of the impersonal moral rules applies equally to the teacher as to the student. The teacher only transmits these to the students, who in turn, should be ready to accept what is communicated to them by the teacher.²¹

Durkheim's notion of discipline cannot be interpreted to mean something opposed to the freedom of action and comes in the way of self-realization and happiness. On the other hand, by enabling someone to gain mastery over his egoistic impulses, it frees him from the chains of insatiable desires.²² Anomie ensues when such moral disciplines are absent. Moreover, the moral rules should

-
19. Durkheim, Moral Education, p.34; also see Giddens, Anthony, Durkheim, pp.65-68.
20. Moral Education, op. cit., p.29.
21. Ibid., pp.130, 140, 156; Wallwork, op. cit., p.125.
22. Moral Education, op. cit., pp.44-45; Giddens, op. cit., p.68; Wallwork, op. cit., p.126.

not be static but change according to the individual's socio-cultural milieu. Though moral rules must have the necessary authority to check the individual's egoistic pursuits, but it also should not check him from having a critical and reflective attitude towards them according to changing times.²³

Attachment to Social groups:

The second aspect of morality attaches individuals to the collectivity. In the words of Durkheim, "the domain of genuinely moral life begins only where the collective life begins" and "we are moral beings to the extent that we are social beings."²⁴ There is no antagonism between individual and society. By involving himself in society only he can make full use of his potentialities and realise his own nature. For this he has to transcend the limits of his individual goals in favour of that of the collectivity.²⁵ His existence as a human being depends upon his identification with the social group of which he is a part and the submission to the moral rules of the society. But why he should follow the moral rules

23. Moral Education, op. cit., p.52; Giddens, op. cit., p.125.

24. Moral Education, op. cit., p.64.

25. Ibid., pp.67-69.

of the society brings the third factor of morality, i.e., autonomy into discussion.

Autonomy:

Discipline and attachment to the group are not sufficient for acting morally. One should be clear enough of the reasons behind his conduct. If some rule is imposed on somebody and he is compelled to behave in a particular way it is not morality. He should freely act and voluntarily conform to the rules. Durkheim²⁶ stated, "the rule prescribing such behaviour must be freely desired, i.e., freely accepted, and this willing acceptance is nothing else than an enlightened assent." The teacher makes the child understand the virtues of conformity to the moral rules and the benefit that accrues to him and society by this. The morality becomes 'incomplete' and 'inferior' if the child is denied of the right of explanation.²⁷ The role of the teacher lies in developing in the child an understanding of the rules. In the "Evolution of educational thought", Durkheim attempted to focus on the social factors responsible for developing particular form of educational and moral ideas in different periods. The teacher has to make the child understand this for which he has to take the

26. Ibid., pp.119-20; Wallwork, op. cit., pp.126-27.

27. Moral Education, op. cit., pp.120-21.

help of sociology and history.²⁸

There are many debatable issues in Durkheim's writings on education. Important among them are, a conservative bias in his writings, the question of relativism and the criticism that education and moral ideals in a capitalist and unequal society accentuates the existing inequality in favour of some classes or groups than others. These need some further discussion.

The necessities of the use of sociology, psychology and history are clearly indicated in Durkheim's views on Pedagogy as related to education. Durkheim made a distinction between pedagogy and education. He identified two aspects of education namely the genesis and the function of education. The genesis of pedagogical institutions involves a historical analysis of how pedagogical institutions came into being. The function of education indicates its relationship with other institutions in maintaining the social order. These can be called the cause and effect of education respectively. The branch of education that deals with these things is called the science of education.²⁹

28. Giddens, op. cit., p.162.

29. Education and Sociology, op. cit., p.99.

But pedagogy involves theories of education that is neither concerned with the past nor with the present, i.e., what it was or in what form it exists now, but tells what should be the ideal of education.³⁰ But Pedagogy is not abstract theorisation. It must have some link with the practice. To show the link between pedagogy and education, Durkheim puts pedagogy in the category of practical theories. The practical theories do not discuss the nature of the existing things but they shape the action of these things. They are not actions but 'programs of action' which gives a proper direction to action.³¹ It does not make a scientific study of educational systems but brings them under the purview of reflection. For educators pedagogy is a source of ideas to guide their activities.³²

Recognising the importance of pedagogy for the practice of education at a particular period, Durkheim set about to specify what constitutes the content of the pedagogic theories. First he considers the science of education which gives necessary and important knowledge of the nature and historical laws of evolution of education. But he is not satisfied with the development of the

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid., p.102.

32. Ibid.

science of education which is only in an embryonic form. Sociology comes next which with its methods can help pedagogy in determining the end of education. Psychology also is of immense help in finding procedures for pedagogy. But Durkheim noted that, on the one hand, the science of education awaits a strong foundation and on the other, sociology and psychology are still developing.³³

The recognition of such a state of affair leads Durkheim to look for the possible options. The first, is to continue with the traditional educational practices. This implies revitalisation of the outmoded, 'discredited institutions' which no longer fits to the existing situation. Durkheim was convinced of the fact that resorting to this is bound to be unsuccessful. The second option, in favour of which Durkheim argues, is one of searching for alternatives through modifications in order to restore the social order which is disturbed. This requires a pedagogy, i.e., a reflection on the defects in the education system and the best ways of modifying it. In the words of Durkheim, "Pedagogy is the systematic application of reflection to the phenomenon of education, with the aim of regulating it"³⁴ When one is not adequately equipped

33. Ibid., pp.102-3.

34. Ibid., pp.103-4.

with the necessary materials to solve the problem, the best way to proceed is to collect all the available data, systematically interpret them. This reduces the 'chances of errors'. This involves risks which have to be anticipated with the help of science and reasoning. Pedagogy has to perform this function. This fact has given rise to the recognition of the close affinity between pedagogy and education.³⁵

The lessons which Durkheim outlines for the educators vis-a-vis this role of pedagogy is to take note of and develop the individuality lying hidden in the child. This involves the use, not of the same 'impersonal' and 'uniform set of rules' but different methods complying to the varying 'temperament' and 'intelligence'.³⁶ A pedagogic reflection is necessary to know the differences among them. New ideas, changes in opinions and customs arise out of rapid social evolution that demarcates one period from the other. Education must change accordingly and should also possess sufficient room for change.³⁷

We have so far discussed the role of pedagogy in relation to education by pointing out the differences

35. Ibid., p.104.

36. Ibid., p.105.

37. Ibid.

between Pedagogy and education and the usefulness of pedagogy for education. Now let us delineate that which comprises pedagogy. Durkheim delineated history, in particular the historical comparative method, psychology and sociology as the useful fields from which pedagogy draws its elements. The educators have to be aware of these subjects in formulating the ideals for education in a particular period of society.

The lessons of history are important in understanding the type of education prevailing in a particular society and also the necessity of developing pedagogical reflections. The Middle ages, for example, did not have to develop any pedagogical reflection because conformity was the general rule which compels everyone to think alike. There being no differences among individuals, education did not have to be oriented towards individual natures. Moreover, an unchanged belief structure hindered any rapid changes in the education system.³⁸ But Renaissance brought differences among individuals and their thinking by relatively freeing them from the collective influences. The education accordingly, has the responsibility of responding to these

38. Ibid., p.106. According to Giddens, for Durkheim the historical analysis is helpful in pointing out the "trends in education to be promoted and which elements discarded" - op. cit., p.76-7.

differences, which requires pedagogical reflection.³⁹

In order to understand the loopholes in the present educational system one has to link it to the history of its development, as education is inextricably linked with the history of a nation.⁴⁰ As the pedagogical theories of the recent past have links with the theories preceding them, one has to venture into the past to know the causes of success and failure of particular theories.⁴¹ The history of pedagogy and the history of education are inseparable, though the theories criticise and try to modify particular systems of education. Thus, one cannot discard the historical analysis as an useless endeavour of dealing with something which does not exist.⁴² According to Durkheim, "only the history of education and of pedagogy allows for the determination of the ends that education should pursue at any given time."⁴³

Durkheim made use of the comparative method in the historical analysis. The method of concomitant variation is ^a form of indirect experiment which explains the simultaneous variation of two or more phenomena. It is oriented

39. Education and Sociology, op. cit., p.106.

40. Ibid., p.107.

41. Ibid., p.108.

42. Ibid., p.109.

43. Ibid., p.110.

towards establishing a causal relationship between them. For example, he seeks to establish a direct relationship between the degree of education and the propensity for suicide. The intermediate variable which explains this is the 'weakening of religious traditionalism' that increases both the thirst for a knowledge and the 'tendency towards suicide'.⁴⁴ The comparative method implied comparison both within a society and between societies.⁴⁵ The use it can have for education, is to ascertain the causes of the rise and fall of particular educational systems as the historical analysis of Durkheim shows.

When the ends are finalised, it is important to look for the means to achieve these ends. Durkheim turned to psychology in deciding the means of the pedagogic ideals. The 'conscience' of the child has to be shaped according to the ideals. This requires the knowledge of the conscience. Also, the knowledge of the causes and nature of the activity is necessary to change them in the desired direction. The accurate knowledge of the habits, desires, emotions etc. is a precondition for developing the morality in the child. According to Durkheim, Psychology, in particular child psychology, answers the questions related to the mental

44. Durkheim, Rules of the Sociological Method, p.132.

45. Ibid., pp.132-36.

make-up of the child and helps in deciding the method. It cannot decide the end because only social conditions bring changes in the ends. Moreover, psychology is also very useful in formulating different methods, as in modern society the intelligence and character vary to a great extent.⁴⁶

Durkheim pointed out another advantage of psychology in studying the collective phenomena. This he calls the collective psychology. In the class the students interact with one another and a collective influence, what Durkheim calls class phenomena, acts upon them. The merits and demerits of this has to be known and changes can be effected accordingly. This implies a complete knowledge of the way in which collective influence works on the individual.⁴⁷

However, Psychology which gives the knowledge of the individual cannot be the source for deciding the ends of education. In this context Durkheim recognised the role of Sociology which relates education to the social conditions thereby giving the knowledge of the social ends of education. It indicates when change is necessary and also specifies what this change should consist of.⁴⁸ Even

46. Ibid., p.111.

47. Ibid., p.112.

48. Ibid., p.128.

psychology cannot fulfil its responsibility in the choice of means unless it is complemented by Sociology.⁴⁹ Sociology equips the educator with procedures to be applied to particular situations.⁵⁰ Durkheim argues that since the end is social, so should be the means. He draws a similarity between the pedagogical and social institutions with respect to the rules, the structure of rewards and punishment and the processes of communication. The social life develops out of the pedagogic life and pedagogic life is only the miniature form of the social life. Therefore, the understanding of society enables the comprehension of the school life. By highlighting the social institutions, Sociology broadens our understanding of the existing pedagogical institutions or the ideal type of it that is aspired.⁵¹

While psychology shows the best method in which the principles can be applied to the child, Sociology undertakes the responsibility of discovering them. It guides action by providing necessary ideas, tries to give stability

49. Ibid., p.130.

50. Ibid., p.129; According to Raymond Aron, for Durkheim Sociology provides solutions to social problems and can be substitute for socialism - Main Currents in Sociological Thought, p.89.

51. Rules of the Sociological Method, op. cit., pp.130-34.

to the process and ensures the attachment of individuals to the process. Without these actions are bound to be futile.⁵² Durkheim urged the educators to take note of these influences in deciding the goals and methods of education.

Conservatism:

Conservatism implies a stress on the role of education as maintaining social stability or the existing status-quo than viewing it as an instrument of change. Durkheim is criticised for seeking the reproduction of the society through education. According to Blackledge and Hunt the conservative overtones in Durkheim's writings on moral education are clear in his arguments of a 'structured class and school' that clarifies the students of the moral values and makes them conform to these.⁵³ The individual has to surrender his individual interest before society and punishments in various forms (though not physical) must be meted out to ensure this. Moreover, all education including the scientific education should contain moral elements directed towards maintaining this interest of the society.

52. Ibid., p.134. See Giddens, for Durkheim's faith in Sociology, op. cit., pp.112-13.

53. D. Blackledge and B. Hunt, Sociological Interpretations of Education, p.18.

Coser also points out the conservative bias in the writings of Durkheim on various aspects of society, particularly in the writings on education - "the effects of Durkheim's conservative bias can be more clearly perceived in his writings on education than elsewhere in his work."⁵⁴ He criticizes Durkheim for conceiving the teacher as a kind of 'priest' who mediates between the child and the society, enlightening the former of the moral rules. He has got the authority and must maintain discipline. Durkheim does not envisage an education that encourages maximum 'individual-interest', 'free-initiative' and 'co-operation'. According to Coser, Durkheim neglects 'the importance of contending sub-groups and conflicts within the social system' concentrating more on the dichotomy between individual and society. Moreover, the reflection of Durkheim's general conservative stance in education is marked in a failure to explain the 'educational co-operation' and also the 'complex network of social relation between the peers'.⁵⁵

There are counter-claims that Durkheim's views on education should not be regarded as conservative. Thompson

54. Coser, L.A., "Durkheim's conservatism and its implications for his Sociological Theory" in Essays on Sociology and Social Philosophy, (eds.) Emile Durkheim, Kurt H. Wolff et. al., p.228.

55. Ibid.

feels that, Durkheim does not mean the task of the teacher as one of reproducing the existing society, which he himself clarifies by stating, "a society without conflict and change would be a stagnant and mediocre society."⁵⁶ However, Durkheim does not consider education alone could bring about radical social changes. It functions more to reproduce society than change it, because it does not have adequate powers to be a panacea for 'suicide and other social ills'. Therefore, he is not in favour of giving workers more literary kind of education to meet the undesirable effects of division of labour.⁵⁷

Fenton argues that, though Durkheim's views on education might appear to be conservative, but it is only a 'general' and 'ideal' view that considers society to be 'normal' or 'healthy'. But Durkheim knew this state of affair was not prevailing. This is clear from his recognition of the fact that in advanced societies though economic activities developed profoundly but they lacked proper organisation and regulation.⁵⁸ Education, he stressed, must fill up

-
56. Education and Society, op. cit., "A Society... legitimate ambition", pp.13-14; also see Thompson, Emile Durkheim, p.162.
57. Durkheim, op. cit., p.163; also see Moral Education, op. cit., p.372.
58. Fenton, Steve, Durkheim and Modern Sociology, p.144; also see Education and Sociology, op. cit., p.134.

the lackings of modern societies by developing in the individual "a reflective ability, a comprehension of the forces underlying social facts, especially when social development is encumbered by pathological forms, and when moral certainty is so deeply undermined."⁵⁹ Fenton seems to argue that, Durkheim views education as a means to achieve a particular ideal which derives from his general view of society. He could not have simply stressed the reproduction of society, the ills of which he identified and sought to eliminate.

Relativism:



The point of relativism centres around the question, whether Durkheim views the moral ideals and moral education to be absolute irrespective of any particular society, or it differs according to time and space.

According to Thompson, Durkheim maintains a social relativism of morals. He writes, "Durkheim's first task was to show that there was nothing absolute about systems of morals, because they were socially relative, and, therefore, the formulation of an appropriate morality for modern society could only proceed after the lessons had been learned about how morality had functioned in relation to previous social structures."⁶⁰

59. Fenton, op. cit.

60. Thompson, op. cit., p.161.

Pickering upholds the view that, Durkheim maintains a relativistic notion with regard to education and morality. He quotes Durkheim to show that the latter meant a variation of morality according to social types. A failure to understand such variation only amounts to posing him as 'fixed', 'static' and 'denaturing' him. There cannot be any evaluation of superiority and inferiority of ethical system as there is no universal standard to measure them.⁶¹

According to Pickering, Durkheim answers the question as to why one should follow a moral system in the absence of a universal standard through his discussion on education by taking the plea that, since societies are constantly 'changing' and 'evolving' it is the moralists who act as the main agents of such changes. Changes come about when there is a change in the sphere of reasons where the prevailing moral actions and commands are repudiated because of their inadequacy.⁶²

This only implies that Durkheim's framework of analysis is on a different plane and Pickering rightly points out that Durkheim 'failed to produce an adequate theory of social change'. For this he refers to the various

61. The quotation from Durkheim - "It can no longer be... social types", *Moral Education*, op. cit., p. Pickering, W.S.F., Durkheim: Essays on Morals and Education (ed.), pp.12-13.

62. Pickering, op. cit., p.14.

forms of Marxism that grew after the death of Durkheim.⁶³

Wallwork also supports the claim of relativism in the writings of Durkheim. He writes "far from there being one universally accepted goal of education, there are different goals in different societies."⁶⁴ But Giddens feels otherwise when he writes, "Probably Durkheim never held such a view, which would imply not just a cultural, but a moral relativism."⁶⁵ He argues that by the middle part of his career Durkheim was trying to formulate 'general conditions of social existence' cutting across major variations in moral codes among societies. In his writings on religion he attempted to take up the problem of morality from 'a philosophical as well as a sociological level.'⁶⁶

According to Fenton, although Durkheim does not support any 'universal principles of education' true for all time, but he also 'does not support a purely relativistic notion'. This is clear when he calls upon the teachers to inculcate in the child certain 'fundamental moral principles' that are good for all societies in all times. These are related to

63. Ibid.

64. Wallwork, op. cit., p.129; See also, "Where the State of the Social Milieu... Prescribes for him" in Education and Sociology, op. cit., pp.127-28.

65. Giddens, op. cit., p.64.

66. Ibid.

the values of, 'a faith in individual dignity', in the need for justice and liberty. A school system, therefore, must engender in the child a 'respect for the individual' and an 'understanding of civic duty and morality'.⁶⁷

Neglect of the role of Ideology:

The moral and educational ideas forming the complex whole of ideology is a crucial factor that may suit the position of some classes in society and negatively affect that of some others. Durkheim's writings on education does not take note of this aspect of ideology.⁶⁸

But Thompson argues that a careful study of the nexus between 'social classes and educational ideas and practices' as brought out by the 'Evolution of educational thought' simply points to the contrary. Durkheim, for example, points out the aristocratic nature of education during the Renaissance that sought to spread the ideas of Humanism. In fact, the middle class after accumulating wealth only became a "leisured-class" trying to follow the life-styles of the aristocracy. In this process the educational needs of the masses were neglected.⁶⁹ Modern

67. Fenton, op. cit., p.145.

68. Lukes, Steven, Emile Durkheim, His Life and Work, p.133.

69. Thompson, op. cit., p.164; Wallwork, op. cit., p.138.

education, that followed Renaissance from eighteenth century and continuing till today, while retaining the humanistic ideals and values put a premium upon scientific knowledge. The scientific education must prepare individuals for various positions created by the social division of labour.

But, as it is already pointed out in the first chapter, the inequalities of wealth, property etc. should not continue because they are external to the division of labour and are not moral. The child should not be thought of as being destined to a particular function by virtue of heredity. Because of someone's birth one should not be debarred from the particular education to perform the specialised function in his milieu.⁷⁰ As Fenton correctly indicates, Durkheim does not envisage a stratified education system facilitating intellectual pursuit for any particular group and depriving some others.⁷¹

In consonance with his general sociology of the role of the state, Durkheim outlines its duty to be the 'intellectual and moral development' of the child who has to be prepared for the social milieu he lives in. Though the state should not be so powerful as to monopolise instruction, but it should also intervene at certain points.

70. Education and Sociology, op. cit., pp.117-18.

71. Fenton, op. cit., p.148.

This gives the power to the state to guide those schools which are not under direct state control, so that they maintain certain standards. Though, those holding the position of authority should not be allowed to impose their belief on the students without proving their validity, but the state should look into the fact that the school system tries to develop in the child the universal principles like respect for reason, for science, for ideas and sentiments etc., in an attempt to build up the democratic morality.⁷²

According to Fenton, this view of the state does not pose Durkheim to be an advocate of a strong state that functions to give rise to a 'powerful collective conscience'. This is because, he recognises the fact that it is impossible for the state to 'create and impose' a collective conscience when the public opinion is divided.⁷³

Mannheim on Education:

In the previous chapter it has been highlighted that Mannheim was concerned about the social disintegration arising out of the rapidity of social changes due to industrialization and in his search for a democratic consensus

72. Education and Sociology, op. cit., pp.80-81;
Fenton, op. cit., p.149.

73. Fenton, op. cit., p.149.

he envisaged education to play an integrating role.

Mannheim emphasizes the creation of a democratic elite through education who can give proper direction to the rapidly changing society. In his approach to society it has been dealt at length how he views the elite to occupy the key positions from which they carry out the democratic planning. Definitely he visualises education as a form of social control. The questions then which will be taken up, are: the end to which education is directed? What are the main functions of education and whether his theoretical analysis successfully combined the elite theory with the democratic planning to which he gave so much importance?

Mannheim considers school as a transitional society, an intermediary between the family and the state performing the vital function of preparing the youth for the adult social life. In this, he expresses the influences of Lloyd Warner and E.J. Hiller upon him. By preparing the youth for secondary group interactions the social experiences are 'intensified' and 'systematized' thus paving the way for social life. This function, the schools can effectively perform, when they instead of being conceived of as placed of temporary stay, are considered as institutions serving the adult life and the social system as a whole. There should be continuity in learning extending into the adult life.⁷⁴

74. Mannheim, Introduction to the Sociology of Education, p.34.

Mannheim attempts to show, how the process and aims of education have changed over time and place. Mannheim showed how different educational ideals were entrenched in Western-European societies. The Greek ideal of education encouraged the political, military and literary virtues, a sense of 'noble pride' and freedom of the independent man. Moral goodness as a part of education consisted, 'the harmonious functioning of all the elements in human-personality'.⁷⁵

The growth of the medieval universities that set the trend for higher education which continues even today in Europe carried the imprints of medieval Christianity's 'loyalty to the guilds' and 'the ideals of craftsmanship and self-respect'.⁷⁶

Renaissance which succeeded the medieval christianity, differed from the latter in a decreasing influence of the church and a sense of self-confidence fostered through education. The individualism that developed was reflected in the nobility, who carried with them the ideals of a 'Gentleman' and a tradition of chivalry, the two important elements of the following educational practices in England.⁷⁷

75. Ibid.

76. Ibid., p.37.

77. Ibid., pp.37-38.

For Mannheim, commercial success led them to strive for social standing through the recognition of the king. They disliked any type of manual labour. Though increasing trade and commerce and growth of learned professional minimised the differences between gentlemen and others, but the ideal of the gentleman continued to influence the educational system in a marked way till the beginning of nineteenth century and has got its reminiscence even today.⁷⁸

Through this analysis in a historical perspective, Mannheim emphasises the need of the present time. This is to comprehend what the educational ideal should be and the result it produces so that education can be planned according to the needs of the society.⁷⁹ In this way he relates education to planning and to the democratic society he had in mind.

Mannheim calls it to be the 'narrow view of education' one which is considered only as the influence of the older generation on the youth that includes ideas, knowledge and attitudes etc. This he contrasts with the broader definition of education which includes both the development of the individual and also the ability of education to comprehend

78. Ibid., pp.40-41.

79. Ibid., pp.45, 160.

the forces of a changing and developing society.⁸⁰ It recognises that, instruction is not only the vital function of the school, but to link the individuals to the society through the education they receive.

This is clear in the distinction which Mannheim makes between the formal education given through the schools and the social education, i.e., the influence of the education felt through the community influence. Education has to be related to the wider society. Mannheim intends the social education to embrace spheres beyond the formal education - "that is to say that education has to be considered as one and indivisible in which formal schooling, vitally important as it is, must in all parts be related to other factors in society."⁸¹

There are two perspectives regarding the role of education. The first one is of the 'individualists', who view education as serving individual ends separately. Education serves the individual by bringing a change in his knowledge and attitudes. The collectivists on the other hand, are primarily concerned about the society. Disregarding the factors of individual mobility, it only wants to prepare the new members in different functions

80. Ibid., pp.16-18.

81. Ibid., pp.20, 151-52.

according to the needs of the society. Mannheim points out a third Way, that combines the good aspects of these two seemingly contradictory views.⁸²

This third approach wants to bring the best out of the individual and convert him into a 'social self'. The society assigns him functions according to his 'talent' and 'potentialities' and an individual makes individual and co-operative contributions. He does not try to use the society but feels his own self to be built from materials drawn from the society. This approach which Mannheim favours placed emphasis on the spontaneity and creative potentials of the individual and also the importance of the environment. The interaction between these two helps in developing the self of the individual.⁸³

According to Mannheim the creativity of the child develops when he becomes active on his own. The task of creative education is to understand the direction towards which his spontaneous energy is directed. The adults should not check this spontaneity by checking his expressions in movement, in speaking etc.⁸⁴ He writes, "creative education comes about, when children are active of their

82. Ibid., p.48.

83. Ibid., p.49.

84. Ibid., p.102.

own volition whether it be in the simple skills of working, talking or playing, or in the spontaneous, unstylized achievement of child art, or in physical effort, or in individual intellectual success."⁸⁵

Social Education:

Mannheim's social education attempts to orient the individual to the society. The need of such orientation arises out of the fact that education does not end with the formal education, it continues in the individual throughout his life. The whole life he has to learn how to adjust to the society.

Mannheim recognises education to be a social fact which is directed towards a social end.⁸⁶ Mannheim's social education attempts to reduce and do away with the conflicts between individual and society and draw a balance between them. Mannheim writes, "social education does not seek to create a gregarious social animal, but aims at creating a balanced personality in the spirit of real democracy; individuality should not develop at the

85. Ibid., p.106.

86. The concept of social fact for Durkheim contains three criterion; external to the individual, more powerful than the individual and exercising a constraint over him. In this light Mannheim's view of education vis-a-vis society has been analysed. For this, see Mannheim, Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning, p.175.

expense of community sentiment."⁸⁷

Mannheim seeks to resolve the conflict between the interest of the individual and the interest of that of the collectivity or society. He advocates a balance between these two. He views 'ego-security' and 'social-rootedness' as the two components of democratic personality and the test of a successful educational process lies in maintaining a proper balance between these two aspects.⁸⁸

In Mannheim's analysis the disintegration of modern society through its constituent elements like primary groups, community life, excessive bureaucratization and the centralization of power etc. have reduced the role of the controlling elite and have generated a process of massification that gives rise to mass irrationalities. The positions of authority being open to masses, can lead to a totalitarian situation that cannot be checked by the liberal-democratic methods. Also, he discusses about various modes of thinking evolving in various epochs. The final stage of planning entrusts education to help the democratic elites to replace the masses from the key-position.⁸⁹ The position Mannheim assigns to the elites

87. Mannheim, op. cit.

88. Ibid., pp.244-45; Remmling, G., op. cit., p.131.

89. Man and Society in an age of Reconstruction, op. cit., pp.152-53.

is derived from his sociology of knowledge which has been discussed in the previous chapter.

Mannheim recognises the social origins of the categories of thought. According to Mannheim, thought depends on the socio-existential conditions of a particular historical period. Again, there is a penetration of the social process into the perspective of thought. Thus, for Mannheim, the sociology of knowledge is the theory of the social or existential determination of actual thinking.⁹⁰

According to Remmling, the equation of reality with social existence indicates, the primary importance that Mannheim gave to social life which determines the 'meaning, content, validity and structure of mental products' apart from conditioning the temporal realization of ideas.⁹¹ Had Mannheim only maintained that thoughts are conditioned by social positions or social positions carry with them certain social meanings, he would have fallen into the charge of 'relativism' which he avoided by resorting to the concept of 'relationism'. Relationism allowed him to take into consideration the subjective experience of the observer, the values and position of the subject and the

90. Ideology and Utopia, op. cit., p.239.

91. Remmling, op. cit., p.50.

social content. Whereas 'relativism' only allows the subject to have the knowledge within the limits of his own position in the social structure, relationism allows him to transcend his existential barriers and have a 'total perspective'.⁹²

The implication of the concept of relationism is seen in its application to the category of free floating intelligentsia, a category of newly formed elites who, as they are not from any particular class (a category whose membership is recruited from all classes) can have a total perspective. This category of intellectuals are blessed with the 'substantial rationality' because of their intellectual cultural and other achievements. They can see the interrelation between different spheres and carry forward the task of planning for the whole society.⁹³

Though Mannheim later identifies intellectuals siding with one class or the other in the power struggle, but he maintains the view that intellectuals are in a better position to synthesise the fragments of reality, despite their alignment with any class, than any other class.⁹⁴

92. Ideology and Utopia, pp.70-77; Mannheim, Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge, pp.274-75; Remmling, op. cit., p.60; Eric Hoyle, op. cit., p.58.

93. Man and Society in an age of Reconstruction, op. cit., p.74.

94. Essays in the Sociology of Culture, op. cit., pp.96-106; also see Heeren, John, "Karl Mannheim and the Intellectual Elite" in British Journal of Sociology, vol.22, 1971, pp.6-8.

The task of education was to train and select this elite, which will be on the basis of the principle of meritocracy.

According to Mannheim, intelligence and meritocratic performance place the ablest members at the top who therefore should be entrusted with the task of planning.⁹⁵ Like the functionists, Mannheim also champions the values of brotherly help, co-operation etc. The planners have to educate the masses to organise their social life and relationships around these values. This forms the essence of the concept of social education.⁹⁶ Mannheim, unlike Durkheim, does not advocate equal start chances for all, but stresses, first, the selection of the future elite and then their undergoing a form of education that develops substantial rationality in them. It also creates a common background and the subsequent sense of unity in them.⁹⁷

But the principle of meritocracy is perhaps not sufficient to control the mass-irrationality that is an offshoot of the process of negative democratization. Therefore,

95. Man and Society in an age of Reconstruction, op. cit., p.351

96. Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning, op. cit., pp.173-75; Man and Society..., op.cit., p.351; Gunter Remmling, op. cit., p.100.

97. Man and Society, op. cit., p.91; Hoyle, E., op. cit., p.59; Introduction to the Sociology of Education, op. cit., p.22.

Mannheim combines the principle of meritocracy with the selection of the elite from the traditional ruling class on the basis of blood and wealth.⁹⁸ These elites have to be educated in the experimental schools that mainly aims at developing a rationality necessary for planning for the entire society.

Mannheim's vision of the elite is that of a group which can transcend the various narrow aspects of the reality and have a comprehensive view of it. He views the total situation and formulates his actions accordingly. In 'Ideology and Utopia' he describes it to be a sort of 'broad perspective' that the elite must possess to counter the irrational forces. In 'Man and Society in an age of Reconstruction' he identifies this awareness with the 'principle media' that enables the elites to understand the interplay of forces giving rise to a particular situation. The awareness is again linked to the concept of 'substantial rationality' which enables the elite to comprehend the

98. Man and Society...op. cit.; Hoyle, op. cit.; Remmling, op. cit., p.99.
 However, Mannheim views in a democratic society there will be free communication between the different social strata. Education helps the talented and deserving members of the lower classes in getting into the category of elites. The methods of social selection must lead to differences among masses without which the culture cannot be preserved - Introduction to the Sociology of Education, op. cit., pp.164-66.

whole situation.⁹⁹

This awareness that leads to the comprehension of the total situation is possible by a system of education that stresses a synthetic approach instead of the existing over-specialization in the universities. Neither traditional humanism nor a narrow scientific education could help develop this awareness. The traditional form of humanism creates a distance between the elites and the daily life. The elite thus fails to understand the true reality.¹⁰⁰ The over-specialised nature of scientific education also lacks the necessary cultural background to grapple the wider issues. Education with a primacy of social sciences could in his view lead to the development of the ruling elite he had in mind.¹⁰¹

Mannheim discards the older authoritarian methods in which the teacher relies on exercising his authority on the subject. The teacher now has to act as a 'guide' who creates an emotional rapport between him and the student. In this environment true initiative of the

99. Mannheim, Diagnosis of Our Time, p.61; Man and Society, op. cit., p.351; Hoyle, E., op. cit., p.61; Coser, Masters of Sociological Thought, pp.438, 461.

100. Essays in the Sociology of Culture, op. cit., pp.229-31 - "The humanism creates a distance... of one's everyday situation", p.231.

101. Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning, op. cit., p.115.

child can take place and it facilitates the intellectual learning of a better quality. It therefore needs a new thinking about the relationship between the teacher and the student, which takes into their interaction and the teacher not viewed solely a person carrying authority but someone trying to develop the personality of the student.¹⁰²

The reevaluation of the education and school system not only emphasises the teacher-student relationship but also the method of teaching according to the 'subjects', 'learning situations' and 'depth of understanding' required and also the examination pattern in favour of one that enriches the psychological make-up of the child. Greater participation of the student has to be ensured and the external rewards like 'marks', 'prizes', 'ranking' etc. have to be replaced by 'mobilization of the interest' of the pupil. Therefore, the teacher has to be prepared in a new way.¹⁰³

-
102. Introduction to the Sociology of Education, op. cit., p.28; also see Loader, Colin, The Intellectual Development of Karl Mannheim, p.167. Mannheim's faith in the capability of the teacher arises out of his conviction that the teacher has the complete authority to structure his class room. His predispositions towards his job, his psychological and personality structure affect the education and experience of the pupils. Introduction to the Sociology of Education, op. cit., p.141.
103. Introduction to the Sociology of Education, op. cit., pp.32, 153; Loader, op. cit., p.167. Mannheim stresses the failure of older authoritarian methods in developing the necessary spontaneity and experimentation and drawing a balance between spontaneity and continuation in education.

Mannheim views education to act as an agent of social change. According to him, now the education and school have to be considered as agencies of social change. It can no more be thought of as merely 'imitative adjustment' or "introduction of someone to an already dynamic society, but an agency of social change."¹⁰⁴ The function of schools is not merely to impart knowledge but to guide all phases of life in a democratically planned society in terms of democratic experience.¹⁰⁵

We have already noted Mannheim's preference for the primacy of the social sciences in comparison to the over-specialisation of scientific education. In this he gives a special place to the sociologists, who are not only instrumental in creating a new system of education but also make the people understand the operation of various social forces by raising their consciousness. When people have a relatively accurate picture of the social reality their adjustment to the rapid structural changes and intense social conflict becomes easier. The process of fundamental democratisation requires the education of the people for raising their awareness.¹⁰⁶

104. Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning, op. cit., p.248; also see Loader, Colin, op. cit., p.164; also see Introduction to the Sociology of Education, pp.17-18, 50.

105. Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning, op. cit., pp.249-50; Man and Society...op. cit., p.195.

106. Diagnosis of Our Time, op. cit., p.164.

The systematic sociology which Mannheim attempts to develop aimed at a synthesis between theory and practice or experiment. The social forces to which we have already referred explain the social grouping of individuals. Sociology unravels the forms and processes that facilitate the living together of human beings. Moreover, it explains the historical changes taking place in the same social grouping, e.g., family. Apart from these, sociology focusses on the interaction among various social institutions. Mannheim discusses the major social forces of 'distancing', 'industrialisation', 'integration' and 'competition' in his systematic sociology, in addition to the aspects of 'social conflict', 'social control' and 'social value' etc. His systematic sociology visualises a social unity that facilitates the living together of people.¹⁰⁷

The implications of systematic sociology for education is to prepare the student for respecting the basic values of society, the needs and interests of the collectivity and above all to train them for facing the challenges of a changing situation. The democratic planning requires that masses should be flexible enough to adjust to the changing

107. Bogardus, Emorys, "Mannheim and Systematic Sociology," Sociology and Social Research, vol. 43, No. 3, Jan.-Feb. 1959, pp. 213-17.

situation. Therefore, Mannheim argues in favour of group analysis as a form of educational technique that shows how masses interact in the group situation. In this he points out the usefulness of psychological and psychoanalytical methods that apply to the multitude at the same time. Both sociologists and psychologists who concern themselves with the question of adjustment of people to a changing situation argue in favour of this group analysis. The merit of group analysis lies in its exposition of the way in which social harmony is maintained and restored in case of any disturbance. Mannheim recognises collective adjustment as equally important as individual adjustment which justifies the use of group analysis.¹⁰⁸

In a lecture addressed to the German sociologists, Mannheim expresses his liking for Sociology. He identifies three important aspects of sociology. These are: first, 'general Sociology' that deals with the social forces as a whole. The methodology which general sociology appoints are of three types: 'comparative-typological', 'historiographic' and 'ahistorical-axiomatic'. The 'special sociologies' belong to the second category that establishes

108. Diagnosis of Our Time, op. cit., p.87; Also see, Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology, for the contribution of psychological knowledge in the personality formation, pp.267-78.

a link between the social processes and the vital areas of intellectual pursuits like education, language, knowledge, art etc. The third category includes the 'Sociology of culture' that deals with experiences in cultural and historical settings and also reveals the institutional and social interdependence.¹⁰⁹

Mannheim visualises the important place that Sociology can have for raising the mass awareness in the planning process. Its vital function consists of objectively bringing in time to the public the issues of crucial concern. For these goals of education to be achieved, he proposes the inclusion of 'Sociography and statics', 'current studies' etc. to the teachings of Sociology. This can replace the 'classical cultural studies' by one suitable for the industrial society.¹¹⁰

The sociological approach to education consists of bringing a synthesis between the individualist and collectivist approaches to education. The individualist thinks success in term of changes in individual 'knowledge' and 'attitudes' whereas the collectivist emphasises social change

109. Remmling, Gunter, op. cit., p.79.

110. Ibid.; also see Mannheim, K., Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology, pp.279-80, for the application of sociological factors in personality formation.

and progress. But Mannheim argues that the progress of the society on the one hand needs the growth of 'differentiated personalities', the recognition of their aptitude for particular functions on the basis of talent and on the other hand the individuals must contribute their best to the society. The 'discipline' which society brings upon the individual has to be coupled with the 'spontaneity' of the individual.¹¹¹

Mannheim envisages the educational knowledge to have a balanced view of the sociological, psychological and historical knowledge. Man is a product of history having a psychological make-up and sociological setting.¹¹² His self and personality grow out of social interaction which dispels the misconceptions about the innate Constitutions of the behaviour. This leads Mannheim to consider the effects of social conditioning on human nature and the social and cultural concepts of personality.¹¹³

Mannheim calls upon the educators to be aware of these influences. The psychology of education by pointing out

111. Introduction to the Sociology of Education, op. cit., pp.48-49.

112. Ibid., p.112. Mannheim recognises the growing interdependence of these subjects, see Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology, op. cit., p.200.

113. Introduction to the Sociology of Education, op. cit.

the effects of the experiences of early childhood on maturity can be useful in taking care of young children. Though this does not hold the promise of being accurate with which one can predict the behaviour, but this knowledge is certainly of immense help in having a general idea of the human behaviour.¹¹⁴ Sociology enlightens the educator of how a society functions. For example, it enables him to know the 'difference between revolution and reform', the handling of 'conflict', doubt and the promotion of freedom in a democracy. It also conveys the idea apart from voluntary political action or compromise. The influence of cultural elements also bring changes through education at various levels, advertisements of various sorts and also through the products of modern technology.¹¹⁵

However, the co-operation of various disciplines is needed ⁱⁿ reaching an overall view of what the aim of education should be and in what way this can be attained. However, in this interdisciplinary framework, sociology occupies an important place as 'basic' to all these fields.¹¹⁶ The educator should be aware of these diverse influences and accordingly fix the goal and methods of education. We have already

114. Ibid., p.112.

115. Ibid., p.151.

116. Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology, op. cit., p.203.

discussed his views on psychoanalysis. So far as behaviourism is concerned he criticises it for neglecting the elements of the 'human personality' that can be comprehended by 'sympathetic understanding'. But he credits it for giving the knowledge of 'external individual behaviour'. A planning process must take note of the contributions of these fields which as we have shown has got implications for the goals of education.¹¹⁷

A critical analysis:

Thus, while Mannheim considers education as a form of social control, he has a definite vision regarding the type of society it must encourage. According to Mannheim, its primary function should not be the inculcation of Fascism nor the laissez-faire policy giving rise to complete anarchy. Its primary function is to generate the democratic consensus through the creation of democratic personality.¹¹⁸

Mannheim discusses in detail the characteristics of the democratic personality, the nature of the democratic

117. Kettler, David, Volker Meja and Nico Stehr, Karl Mannheim, p.88.

118. Introduction to the Sociology of Education, op. cit., p.165; Education, for Mannheim, is considered to be a form of power which can be used for the purpose of social control in line with the principles of democratic consensus. Diagnosis of Our Time, op. cit., pp.2-3; Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning, op. cit., pp.6-8; Man and Society, op. cit., p.271; Loader, op. cit., p.163.

consensus etc. His democratic interpretation of life intended to avoid both the ends of liberal, laissez-faire type and the totalitarian systems. The liberal system leaves the individual to think about his self and situation and tackle his difficulties by himself. The apathetic attitude of the masses towards things that decide their everyday existence leads to a Fascist system. The democratic interpretation is the third possible way which does not leave the individual to his own, and education provides correct interpretations of life and the current problems to the people. Secondly, by actively associating the masses in the democratic process it breaks their apathy and averts the danger of a Fascist rule.¹¹⁹ For him, it is a democratic system in which the democratic elite rules the society with a comprehensive planning.

Mannheim maintains a relativism in the relationship between education and society. In his analysis of 'the historical character of educational aims' he shows how various ideals of education developed in different epochs. This has already been discussed. Through education man has to face the problems that arise in the course of development of the society, to which he belongs, at a particular period of time. The values that he takes as

119. Ibid., p.251.

his guidelines must encourage him to transform the society to a higher level. In the selection of these values education plays a crucial role particularly when it is related to the society in a broader sense.¹²⁰

Mannheim's concept of planning and democratic consensus in which education is a key-factor can be criticised as performing the function of social reproduction. His views on education do not aim at doing away with the economic inequality or in raising a consciousness about the nature of the ruling class. Instead, he seems to be justifying some form of inequality as the necessary condition of the survival of the society.

Mannheim's concept of meritocracy is too rigid because of the inclusion of the criterion of race and blood. The pre-selection of future elites on the basis of race and blood from the traditional ruling class only helps education to be confined to a few which is against the idea of equality of opportunity. When education is geared to safeguard the interests of the ruling elites, "social gate-keeping functions are paramount and learning becomes coincidental."¹²¹

120. Ibid., p.50.

121. Remmling, op. cit., p.100 - This view is also held by C. Wright Mills in The Power Elite, pp.62-8, quoted by Remmling, op. cit., p.100.

Though Mannheim shows some concern for education of the masses, but ultimately he left education in the hands of the democratic elite to use as a form of social control.¹²² Differences of opinion exist in whether Mannheim really favoured a social change or his writings suffer from a static bias. Those who want to identify him with a 'static bias' maintain that his concept of planning was not a revolutionary method of bringing change, rather one that aims at a readjustment of society by correcting the disintegrative elements. In this, elites ensure social consensus with the help of a 'propagandistic' education.¹²³

But others repudiate such a charge on Mannheim. Loader holds the view that, although Mannheim does not favour a revolutionary change but ^{he} also does not favour maintenance of the status-quo. Rather, he believes, the democratic pressure acting upon the education system helps in reducing the distance between the elites and the masses.¹²⁴ But the exclusion of the masses from the planning process and the entire charge of planning resting in the hands of the elites

122. Hoyle, op. cit., p.62.

123. Ibid., p.67 - Floud also criticised Mannheim from this angle - in A.V. Judges (ed.), The Function of Teaching, pp.42-3, quoted by Hoyle, op. cit., p.67; Coser, op. cit., p.447.

124. Loader, op. cit., pp.175-76.

lead some to comment that, it may be 'planning for democracy' but not 'democratic planning'.¹²⁵ Also, his 'lack of political commitment' is responsible for his failure to answer the political question of 'who shall actually do the planning'? There are also difficulties with regard to 'who plans the means of social reconstruction? and who plans the goals of social change? Though Mannheim employs education for controlling the self or in building up the democratic personality, but there are no specific 'known social groups' to which he intends to leave this responsibility.¹²⁶

According to Remmling, the failure to take note of the revolutionary changes, Mannheim's views of education does not properly explain the spheres of 'socio-economic' and 'political power'. That is why there is nothing regarding the 'traditional upper-class domination' and why there is a need of shifting the responsibility and control of education from the traditional ruling class to the new elite.¹²⁷

The views of Durkheim and Mannheim on education reflect their concern for the society. The individual

125. Lindsay of Birker, 'Review of Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning' in British Journal of Sociology, vol. 3, 1952, p. 86.

126. Remmling, op. cit., p. 136.

127. Ibid., p. 144 - Remmling used the word 'representatives of the old order' and 'men committed to the ideal of fundamental democratisation', for traditional ruling class and the new democratic elite.

has to be oriented towards the group or the collectivity. But the rapidity of the changes brought about by an industrial society generates problems of adjustment and excessive individualism. This threatens the social order and the growth of various irrational forces or abnormal conditions. Therefore various control mechanisms are necessary to counter the effects of disintegration.

Education, as one such control mechanism, not only performs the function of social selection but is also instrumental in developing a morality in the individual. It explains to him the advantages of protecting the collective or the social interests. In the previous chapter we have shown the usefulness of the division of labour in a complex, industrial society. Both Durkheim and Mannheim relate education to the division of labour. The division of labour requires specialisation and expertise which come through education. For this they justified the application of meritocratic principles in schools. But while Durkheim, in line with his general view of equality of opportunity argues in favour of equal start chances for all, Mannheim maintains a dualistic view of education. This is clear in his advocacy for mass education on the one hand and special education for elites on the other. This is in accordance with his general view of the division

of society into elites and masses in which the elites are supposed to possess a holistic view of the society. This is why they must be given the responsibility of planning for the masses.

Both Durkheim and Mannheim undertook historical analysis of the growth of education to show the social ends pursued by education in every epoch. Therefore, in modern society the aims and practice of education must be a different one than the preceding ages. Also, the nature of relationship of education to other institutions have changed. They are not against the development of individuality which favours creativity, invention etc. but they are against the type of individualism which does not care much for the social obligations and concentrates on furthering individual self-interest. Moreover, they recognised that the nature of morality and solidarity has changed in the contemporary context which calls for an alternative, appropriate morality to be established. Durkheim's ideas of relating education to the organic solidarity are echoed in Mannheim's views of relating education to planning for a democratic consensus. Both of them worked in an integrational model in which education played a crucial part in realising that integration.

They called upon the educator to take note of the social factors acting upon the individual and make them

aware of this. In this the educators should also take insights mainly from the lessons of history, psychology and sociology among other disciplines of the social sciences. Both Durkheim and Mannheim considered history to be important in drawing lessons that not only guides the present practice of education but also helps in determining the ideal of what future education should be. Psychology is helpful in providing the knowledge about the individual without which the modification of their behaviour for social ends is quite difficult. Sociology is crucial among all these disciplines of the social sciences because by showing the interrelation among the social forces and the relationship of individual to the society it performs the important function of determining the social ends of education.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

I

The works of Durkheim and Mannheim can be linked to the dominant concerns of their general sociology. Both of them had faith in the analytical power of sociology in identifying the factors that lead to the disintegration of society. The analyses of sociology, they hold, will be different from other social sciences and complement them in reaching a holistic view of society.

Besides its allocative function of placing individuals into different positions for which they are fit on the basis of their merit, talent, etc. Durkheim argued, education has the vital function like other institutions of society of developing the necessary morality in the individual. This morality is different from the traditional form based on family and church which used to be the integrating force. They have been replaced by specialisation and mutual interdependence of functions. In the absence of alternative moral order abnormal and pathological forms emerge like anomie and social conflict etc. Therefore, he stressed on the development of secondary institutions all having a moral purpose to fill the vacuum caused by the declining influence of family and church. Lukes has correctly pointed out how education forms a part of Durkheim's

moral and political framework.¹

Mannheim's concern for education forms a part of his elite theory and planning. Like Durkheim, he also views the rapidity of the changes brought about by industrialisation without giving masses sufficient time to adjust, as one of the causes of social disorder. Secondly, another cause of social disorder he traces in the breakdown of the control of traditional elites as a result of mass democracy. In this changed circumstances, education has to train the elites, who have to be selected beforehand on some ascriptive criteria like race, blood etc. to assume the role of planning for the whole society. Moreover, education has to inculcate in the masses the qualities necessary for a democratic consensus which is a precondition for democratic planning.²

Opposing any universalistic view of education they hold that the form of education changes according to the

-
1. These things have been discussed in chapter II on Durkheim's approach to society and in the context of moral education in chapter III. Lukes described that for Durkheim the relationship of sociology to education is one of 'theory' to 'practice'. See Lukes, S., op. cit., p.359.
 2. These things have been discussed in chapter II in the context of the principles of selection of elites and in chapter III with regard to the function of education.

types of society and social organisation. But there are certain common elements which education promotes in the individual. These are the feelings of attachment to society, brotherly help, co-operation etc. Durkheim's sociology of knowledge can be linked to his views on education, as education promotes that knowledge which is socially determined. Mannheim made it clear when, like Durkheim, he considered knowledge as socially rooted. For example, he argues that the assumption of the teacher influences the schooling and experience of the pupil.

Sharp has correctly pointed out that both Mannheim and Durkheim analyse the ills of capitalism and industrialization in moral and cultural terms. They offer a middle way between capitalism based on laissez-faire policies and any form of collectivism or totalitarianism. The third way consists in a welfare state extending certain basic amenities like education, health services etc. to the people and teach them through education the basic values needed for social order and cohesion.⁴ It has already been pointed out that Durkheim argued in favour of abolition

3. Discussed in chapter III.

4. Sharp, op. cit., p.39; In chapter II we have already noted that Durkheim offered a quasi-Syndicalist solution whereas Mannheim put forward an elitist solution to the social problems. See Hoyle, E., op. cit., p.55.

of the private property, but according to Sharp, Mannheim instead of considering private property as a factor that perpetuates unjust inequality, considered following Weber, the private entrepreneurial business preparing leaders to guard against the excesses of bureaucratisation.⁵

Education is viewed as a control mechanism by both of them. This control is not of a physical kind but the development of morality among the masses. The essence of moral education of Durkheim and social education of Mannheim converge on this point. In this context Mannheim takes a dualistic view of education. He argues that it educates the masses along democratic lines with a morality that binds society together on the one hand, and that it is restricted to the future elites in special type of schools designed to develop the necessary qualities of planning and governance on the other. Increasing opportunities made available through education, he argues, are responsible for the infiltration of the elite positions. Durkheim, however, is in favour of providing equal opportunities for education to all, but the education of various social functions after that should be strictly on the basis of merit, abilities and function for which someone is fit.

5. Sharp, op. cit.

Education realises to the maximum someone's potentialities.⁶

There are differences of opinion regarding a conservative bias in Durkheim's works on sociology in general and education in particular. This has been pointed out in chapter III on education. But he is both - a progressive and a conservative - a position which Lukes correctly points out by identifying Durkheim as both a moralistic conservative and a radical social reformer. The same is true of Mannheim also as evident from his dualistic view of education mentioned in the previous paragraph.⁷

It has already been pointed out in chapter II that they are against any revolutionary solution to the social problems of modern, industrial society. The overemphasis on consensus co-operation etc. between individuals, groups and classes led them to neglect the conflict aspect of social relations. A critical or Marxist analysis of modern, capitalist society emphasises the existence of social conflict on the basis of a relationship of superordination and subordination and differing interest of various social classes. The maintenance of this relationship is carried out through the social institutions that

-
6. See chapter II for Mannheim's ideas on selection of elites and chapter III on function of education in bringing a democratic consensus. For Durkheim's view on equality of opportunity, see chap.III.
 7. The debate on Durkheim's conservatism has been discussed in chap.III. See Lukes, op. cit., p.546.
 8. See chap.II on their approach to understanding society.

include education also. According to Sharp, they were "bourgeoisie social scientists" who identify the problem of order at the non-economic, social level, e.g., religion etc., rather than in the economic inequality in the social relations. Therefore, they do not favour abolition of all classes but offer "gradualist" and "reformist" solutions. This is also reflected in their views on education.⁹

Despite the neglect of a critical or class analysis of education and society, their works wield considerable influences on succeeding generations. Now let us look at some instances of their influence in sociology of education. This is reflected in the use of concepts, ideas or themes of these two sociologists by the later writers on education.

ii

Mannheim's contributions to the sociology of knowledge and democratic planning earned wide recognitions for him but he could not create a distinct school of followers because of his changes in the area of interest. The changes in the areas of interest is pointed out by Remmling who shows four changes in Mannheim's thinking. This he calls 'four phases of his intellectual development'. The first phase (1918-32) includes philosophy and sociology of knowledge as the major areas of interest; the second phase

9. Sharp, op. cit., p.33.

(1933-38) concentrates on the sociology of planning; the third phase (1939-44) includes sociology of religion, sociology of values, sociology of education; and the fourth phase (1945-47) took up the areas of political sociology and the sociology of power.¹⁰ It seems that Mannheim has not clearly brought out the links between these areas and his contribution to some of these, as pointed out above, are more discussed than the others. There seems to be few who have discussed Mannheim's concepts or ideas on education in their analysis.

Paulo Freire quotes Mannheim regarding the role of education in shaping the direction of change in the context of transitional Brazilian society. Mannheim stressed "collective deliberation" as a method in bringing important changes. He argued for creating a new education system that not only develops the intellectual powers but also prepares one mentally to cope with 'scepticism' and passing away of many thought habits. The collective deliberation entails a reevaluation based upon 'intellectual insight' and 'consent'.¹¹

10. The changes in the area of interest have been discussed by Remmling, op. cit. Perhaps the change of interest with change of place is responsible.

11. Freire, Paulo, Education for critical consciousness, 1973, p.33.

Freire like Mannheim is against the different forms of irrationality and thinks collective deliberations to be the main process of change. Moreover, like Mannheim's democratic consensus through participation, he holds participation to be the key to true democracy. But participation becomes naive and emotional when people are not properly guided in the new situation of rapid changes, an aspect which Mannheim also emphasises. This results in rebellion, as people have only naive consciousness of their participation.¹²

Freire urges education to help people transcend this naive consciousness and develop a critical consciousness of the whole situation. An education that does not offer the scope for debate and discussion on problems and real participation in national activities, and instead of supporting the process of democratization strengthens the 'lack of democratic experience'; cannot properly guide the new-born emergence of the people. This, he was convinced, cannot help in the development of a critical consciousness.¹³

T.S. Eliot, though not a sociologist, has discussed in detail the merits and limitations of Mannheim's elite

12. Ibid., pp. 34-35.

13. Ibid., pp. 35-36.

theory.¹⁴ He accepts to be useful the view of Mannheim, that 'culture could only ever be enjoyed by a minority'.¹⁵ In this essay he differentiates between elites and classes transformation of elites into classes and the class-perspective of culture which Mannheim neglects. According to Eliot, Mannheim successfully presented the hope of getting over the crisis through his concept of planning. In this, he even discards the achievement principle that opens the elite positions to the masses. Eliot agreed with him in this respect in considering the danger resulting from such a process rather than the merits of achievement principle.¹⁶

According to Sharp, Mannheim's influences continued in the two succeeding decades (1950s and 1960s) in the sociology of education, till the question of equality of opportunity became the dominant theme.¹⁷

III

According to Fenton, Durkheim's chair in Education and Sociology helped him profoundly in deciding the curriculum and its implementation apart from influencing

14. Eliot, T.S., "The Classes and the Elite" in Cosin, B.R. (ed.), op. cit., pp.188-93.

15. Ibid., p.188.

16. Ibid., p.190.

17. Sharp, op. cit.

teachers, administrators and policy-makers. The popularity of his educational ideas are reflected in the educational reforms undertaken separating the control of church from 'public instruction', and the secular-scientific spirit substituting for 'moral influence' of traditional religion. The contributions of Durkheim have inspired sociological work all over the world.¹⁸ Now let us see the influence of Durkheim on some notable sociologists like Parsons, Hargreaves and Basil Bernstein.

Talcott Parsons considers school-class as a miniature society that differentially evaluates students for various roles in society. It elicits an obedience to impersonal norms that ultimately helps the student to participate in the role-structure of wider society. Society cannot function without a value-consensus which fixes the standard for individual activity. Education has a vital role for the maintenance of such a value-consensus.¹⁹

This clearly reflects Durkheim's idea of the recreation or survival of society. Moreover, Parsons agreed with Durkheim regarding the function of education in developing the 'physical', 'intellectual' and 'moral states' that the

18. Fenton, op. cit., p.162.

19. Parsons, T., "The School class as a social system" in Shukla, S. and K. Kumar (eds.), Sociological Perspectives in education, 1985, pp.50-77.

political society demands of him and in preparing him for the milieu he is destined.²⁰

According to Parsons, beyond family the school-class is the major socialising agency. Like Durkheim, he also stresses the socialisation and selection functions of education. The socialisation is concerned with inculcating the commitments and capacities for the performance of the future roles. These imply not only commitment to one's own roles but also commitment to the 'broad values' of society and not only capacities in terms of skills etc. for one's role but also to come up to the expectation of others, in his interaction with them, according to the ethics of his profession.²¹ These are reminiscent of Durkheim's ideas of moral education and the development of professional ethics discussed in chapter III and chapter II respectively.

Parsons agreed with Durkheim regarding the selection function of education in locating the trained manpower into various positions in the role structure. He also favoured

20. See Robinson, P., op. cit., p.19.

21. See Shukla, S. and K. Kumar (eds.), op. cit., p.51; also Demaine, op. cit. on Parsons' functionalist approach to education, p.21; Robinson - Socialisation for Parsons takes place according to the AGIL Paradigm of the functionalism of Parsons, op. cit., p.34.

the achievement criteria and meritocratic principles operating in schools.²²

David Hargreaves follows a more or less Durkheimian framework in analysing the threat to social solidarity in modern society. For this, he examined the deviance among students in schools. He starts with the conviction that the insights and inspirations contained in Durkheim's works have not been given serious attention, perhaps because of a wrong understanding of his work.²³

Hargreaves is concerned about the sense of a loss of dignity in the working class children, resulting from the breakdown of traditional working class community in the face of the growth of modern industrial society. The social function of education lies in restoring this sense of dignity. Unfortunately, the present day education has become too individualistic ignoring its social function of balancing the two extremes, of social needs and individual development. Hargreaves agrees with Durkheim on the danger posed by egoism and anomie to the social solidarity in modern society. Moreover, he has no difference with Durkheim in viewing the crucial role of the school and

22. Shukla, S. and K. Kumar (eds.), op. cit., pp.53-54; Demaine, op. cit., pp.22-27.

23. For details, see Fenton, op. cit., p.19.

the teacher in developing a 'group' or 'corporate' life.²⁴

In his analysis of deviance in schools, he found some difficulties to operationalise the notions of anomie and egoism, i.e., going by their definition the deviants are found not to be suffering from these, rather they seem to be applicable to indifferent persons, who mostly like to remain lonely having weak bonds with family and friends, and instrumental types who can sever attachment with the group to further their own interests. Hargreaves also argued for a redefinition of meritocratic principles etc., if unrestrained striving is to be considered as pathological or undesirable.²⁵

Hargreaves appears to be supporting a non-egoistic form of individualism but like Durkheim he does not clarify the difference between egoism which is pathological and individualism which is desirable for the healthy development of modern societies. Moreover, despite his stress on human dignity, he shares with Durkheim the necessity of social constraint as the precondition for human freedom and self-realisation.²⁶

24. Blackledge and Hunt, op. cit., pp.27-28.

25. Fenton, op. cit., p.172.

26. Blackledge and Hunt, op. cit., p.31; Fenton, op. cit., p.173.

Bernstein made use of the Durkheimian concepts of mechanical and organic solidarity.²⁷ He believed, a distinct change to have taken place in 'education from depth' to 'education in breadth', implying a shift in emphasis from compartmentalisation of subjects to an interdisciplinary approach. A corresponding change in the authority structure has also taken place because now it depends less on subject specialisation than on the co-operation of teachers to teach around a particular theme. In analysing such a change, Bernstein reversed the essence of Durkheim's scheme of transition from mechanical to organic. It is now from organic to mechanical, i.e., from subject-specialisation to an inter-disciplinary type which he termed, from 'collection code' to 'integrated code'. The 'classification' or relationship of contents can be measured against such a transition.²⁸

Bernstein agreed with Durkheim on preventing the growth of excessive individualism and the need for developing appropriate ethical systems for professional and occupational groups. However, Blackledge and Hunt pointed out

27. In the open-school-open-society? Bernstein makes use of these concepts. See Blackledge and Hunt, op. cit., p.46; Fenton, op. cit., pp.168-69.

28. Blackledge and Hunt, op. cit., p.50; Robinson, op. cit., p.117. Fenton, op. cit., p.168.

the differences between them as, firstly, whereas Durkheim asked for a clear-cut specification of the rules, norms and disciplines of the school, Bernstein argues these to be implicit rather than explicit.²⁹ Secondly, Durkheim starts with the macro-system, i.e., society and considers the parts or institutions of the micro-system like education, politics etc. as evidences of his general view, but Bernstein starts with the micro-system like education and fails to connect it to the macro-system.³⁰ Lastly, he ignores the fact that though interdisciplinary approach upto a certain level exists but specialisation takes place at higher levels.³¹

Depicting the incongruence between the school culture and the family-class background of the child,³² Bernstein concludes that the schools in the modern societies no longer bring a 'homogenous cultural and moral order'. This is because of the conflicting demands that are being made upon the school and the changes in the means of achievement of social status. Some amount of 'flexibility' and 'ambivalence' characterise the modern society. Bernstein agreed

29. Blackledge and Hunt, op. cit., p.56.

30. Ibid., p.45; also see Fenton, op. cit., p.171.

31. Blackledge and Hunt, op. cit., p.48.

32. See Fenton, op. cit., p.167; Blackledge and Hunt, op. cit., p.45; Demaine, J., op. cit., p.35; and Robinson, op. cit., p.57.

with Durkheim in recognising the fact that schools have to make room for these ambivalences.³³

Bernstein is not only influenced by Durkheim but he admits of the influence of Marx on him. The influence of the former consisted of the definition of the 'social', 'the relationship between symbolic orders', 'social relationships' and the 'structuring of experiences'. But Marx, he argued, has shown the way to understand the institutionalisation and change of symbolic systems with his analysis of the mode of production and the power relationship adjacent to it. The power relationships determine 'the access to control over, and changes in critical symbolic systems' as they form a part of the class structure. Bernstein does not take capital only in the economic sense but points out a 'cultural capital' that helps man to extend the horizons of his experience.³⁴

The use of both Marxian and Durkheimian categories by Bernstein has led many to infer that he was attempting to make a synthesis between the two writers.³⁵ But Sharp

33. Fenton, op. cit., p.168.

34. Sharp, R., op. cit., p.45.

35. For example, Karabel, J. and Halsey, A.H., Power and Ideology in education, 1977, p.71; Whitty, Geoff, Sociology and School knowledge - Curriculum theory, Research and Politics, Methuen, London, 1985, p.32.

considers Bernstein's use of Marxian categories does not however make his work a Marxian one because he was more concerned with social control, social order working mainly in a structural-functional framework and drawing his inspirations mainly from Durkheim.³⁶

Bernstein highlighted the principles governing the existing social order that are internalised by the individual. This is related to the economic and political structure of the society giving it the 'social and ideological stability'.³⁷ Thus, Bernstein points out the role of education in social and cultural reproduction. Apart from education, he underlines other social institutions like family, work etc. through which the principles of social order are legitimised. The 'class structure', 'the polity', 'the division of labour', 'the dominant cultural principles or codes' are important determinants of the transmission process.³⁸

Bernstein's position that education leads to the formation of individual's mental structures, i.e., categories of thought, language etc., which results from the

36. Sharp, op. cit., pp.46-51.

37. Apple, M.W., Ideology and Curriculum, 1979, p.32.

38. Sharp, op. cit., p.44.

social division of labour places him in the category of reproduction theorists. The reproduction theorists like Bowles and Gintis, Bourdieu, Bernstein and others point out the complementarity of the reproduction of 'socialisation' or the 'hidden curriculum' to the 'formal corpus of school knowledge', each of these being linked to the economic inequality.³⁹

We have already noted Bernstein's attempt to provide a synthesis drawing elements both from Durkheimian and Marxian traditions. Also, we find, as Sharp points out, his use of Marxian categories and the emphasis upon the social and cultural reproduction still does not fulfill the conditions of a Marxist analysis. Therefore, we will examine the critical and Marxian analysis of education vis-a-vis society. For this we will discuss some of the noted critical and Marxist theorists like Althusser, Bowles and Gintis, Gramsci, Ivan-Illich, Paulo-Freire, and Pierre Bourdieu.

IV

Louis Althusser uses the general Marxian perspective in analysing the role of education in the capitalist society. According to him, though the elements of the superstructure may have some autonomy at a particular moment, they are

39. Apple, op. cit., pp. 35, 40.

ultimately determined by the economic infrastructure.⁴⁰ In this sense, education is linked to the economic or class-structure of society. Education is entrusted with the vital function of reproducing the labour power. This has got two interrelated aspects; the reproduction of skills necessary for the performance of various functions, and the reproduction of ideology which socialises workers to be submissive and obedient.

According to Althusser, the state possesses two forms of apparatus to perpetuate its rule. These are the ideological state apparatus like the mass-media, the law, religion and education and the repressive state apparatus like the police, army etc. Ideological state apparatus, in which education occupies a prominent place, are responsible for the maintenance of the class rule by reproducing the ruling class ideology. He correctly points out that to the extent the state depends on the ideological state apparatus, to that extent the need of repressive apparatus does not arise. In concrete situations of course a state resorts to both these apparatuses. Althusser's work presented a pessimistic view of man who is more determined

40. Althusser, L., "Education, Structure and Society" in B.R. Cosin (ed.), School and Society - A Sociological Reader, 2nd Edn.; also see Robinson, P., op. cit., p.28.

than determining or who can intervene in the flow of events and give them direction.⁴¹

In the American context a similar work has been conducted by Bowles and Gintis. They also argue that schooling and education reproduces a submissive and obedient labour force and helps in the perpetuation of ruling class ideology. In a comprehensive study of education, class and occupational spheres in America, they relate education to the economy and the type of workforce required in capitalism. Schools possess the same hierarchical structure as in the workplace and through education the claim that inequalities based on merit, talent are just is spread.⁴² They criticise the myth of meritocracy and relate the educational achievement to the social and economic factors which are more important than individual abilities. Moreover, the problem of unemployment and excessive skilled manpower takes away the bargaining power of the workers and leaves them at the mercy of employers. They lose the power to resist. School is thus related to the requirements of an unjust society.

41. Cosin, op. cit.; Robinson, op. cit., pp.28-29; also see Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus" from his Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays, in Shukla and Krishna Kumar, op. cit., pp.112-20.

42. Bowles, S. and Gintis, H., Schooling in Capitalist America, 1976; for the use of Marxian framework, see Demaine, J., op. cit., p.99.

Bowles and Gintis reject, the solutions can ever be reached through reforms, rather a revolutionary transformation of the economic life can only lead to purge the educational system of the ill, of encouraging inequality and class rule.⁴³

According to Robinson, both Althusser and Bowles and Gintis take a pessimistic view of the nature of man. But Gramsci, who also wrote in a Marxist framework, recognises the power of man in bringing changes. Gramsci also views the ruling class dominance, which he called 'hegemony', is established through ideas and culture. The masses are convinced of their subordinate position as natural. In developing such an attitude, education plays an important role, which led Gramsci to view all relations of hegemony in terms of pedagogic relationship. From this also sprang his faith in the potentials of intellectuals and intellectual activity.⁴⁴

43. Bowles and Gintis, op. cit. The criticism of meritocracy judged through IQ, p.8 see chap.III of this work for the need of capitalist reproduction and also the 'major role of education in capitalist society'; also see Demaine, op. cit., pp.100-4 for the function of education in capitalist society, pp.108-18 for the discussion on IQism and pp.118-20 on his emphasis on the need for a socialist transformation.

44. Robinson, op. cit., p.28.

It is through intellectuals that social change is effected. Though they are the agents of the sustenance of the established order, they are also vehicles through which the dominant rule can be challenged and a better one established. Gramsci calls upon the intellectuals not to be divorced from reality and the masses. Also, he urges the masses to engage in intellectual endeavour which needs no theoretical framework but understanding of the concrete reality on the basis of their experience. Masses can be their own masters by possessing not only an appropriate moral conduct but the necessary technical knowledge.⁴⁵ This faith in the masses and the optimism of giving appropriate direction to change, distinguishes Gramsci's work from the orthodox Marxists who simply believe in the economic determinism theory.

Ivan Illich criticises the functionalist and liberal views on education and diagnoses the ideological function of education with much similarity with the Marxian views. According to him education moulds individuals according to the demands of a consumerist society by inculcating in them conformity and obedience for the system and developing in them excessive dependence on those who are in positions of authority to decide what is good for them. The qualities

45. Ibid., pp. 28-29.

of conformity and obedience are mainly developed in schools because the amount of rewards depends upon the degree of possession of these qualities. Schools actually confuse grade advancement with learning, diploma with competence. Actual learning takes place through experience and total involvement with the learning process.⁴⁶

According to Illich, the ideological function of education is continued through the hidden curriculum which is not easily comprehensible. These, as pointed out, help in developing the conformity and obedience and creates over-dependence on those in positions of authority. Therefore, one has to understand this function of education. As the solution, Illich offers the deschooling of society or to do away with formal education which reproduces the existing order. Creative learning depends on the initiative of the people. Skills can be learned by participation of people on the basis of their interest on some problem. In this the skill exchange has to take place under the supervision of instructors. He thinks this can lead to the liberation of man. However, his overemphasis on school led him to neglect the fact that not the restructuring of the school system but the economic system should be the main concern, as without the achievement of the latter the former cannot

46. Demaine, op. cit., p.93; Robinson, op. cit., p.195.

be achieved.⁴⁷

Paulo Freire, in a more or less Marxist framework, conceives of society as being divided into oppressor and oppressed. The oppressor, in addition to having the economic dominance also have the cultural dominance. The oppressed are incomplete human beings, because the 'cultural action' of the oppressors do not let them to be so. They have got the vital task, not only in liberating themselves but also the oppressors. In this the solution to the alienation, which they experience, is related to the end of the 'cultural hegemony' of the oppressors. The cultural action of the oppressors is 'anti-dialogical' that favours the creation of an 'oppressive reality' with the help of the educational process.⁴⁸

Freire argues that the educational process inheres a 'banking-concept' in which information is deposited in the minds of those being educated. The students function as depositories, the teachers as depositors and the process of depositing takes place through education.⁴⁹ Thus, among many other forms, education is a form of cultural action

47. Demaine, op. cit., pp. 94, 96-98; Robinson, op. cit., p. 196.

48. Demaine, op. cit., pp. 86-87.

49. Ibid., p. 88.

that creates a form of consciousness in the oppressed favouring their inclusion in the oppressive reality. The characteristic mark of the oppressive reality is the 'cultural silence' that prevails (a state of submission to the cultural hegemony).⁵⁰

In order to avoid the staticness and pessimism involved in such a description Freire advances a theory of transition from the condition of alienation to that of freedom, from naive to critical consciousness. He emphasises the need for a cultural revolution in which education's role is vital in substituting a form of 'dialogical cultural action' to the anti-dialogical cultural action. The revolutionary leaders have the responsibility of leading this 'cultural struggle' because they possess the cultural action needed to challenge the cultural hegemony of the oppressors, threatening also the prevailing culture of silence through their pedagogic practice. They make ways for debates and discussion on problems which are the pre-conditions of a critical consciousness and liberation of man. Among many criticisms to his ideas important is Young's allegation that Freire brings down politics to the cultural action of radicals which devalues the 'effectivity of political struggle'.⁵¹

50. Ibid.

51. Ibid., p.89.

Bourdieu points out, education's most hidden function lies in hiding its relationship with the class structure of society. The contribution which education makes to the perpetuation of the class structure cannot be understood without examining the 'relative autonomy' it enjoys by performing its essential function.⁵² Capital, he argues to be having different forms, e.g., economic, social and cultural. The way they are reproduced can be grasped by looking into the 'relative autonomy' that these forms possess. The relative autonomy of the educational system and its dependence on the class-structure cannot be comprehended by a simplistic reduction of its relation to the interest of the dominant classes but how it helps in the reproduction of the structure of class relations. Durkheim, he credits of at least pointing out the way educational system maintains its relative autonomy by fulfilling the external demands of society and taking advantage of the historical opportunities to fulfill its essential functions. In this context, it becomes more conservative than the church by resisting any drastic change in it or its ideal.⁵³

52. Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J., "The ideological function of the Educational system from their Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture", in Shukla and K. Kumar, op. cit., pp.121-35.

53. Ibid., pp.122-24.

The established order, Bourdieu claims, sustains itself not by physical force but by a 'symbolic violence'. The symbols like language, status, artefacts and customs help the legitimation of their ways of thought which is the dominant pattern or 'habitus', possessed by the dominant class.⁵⁴

For Bourdieu the degrees, diplomas etc. given in the school only create a myth of increasing opportunities but actually they legitimate the existing social inequalities as natural and the cultural capital of the dominant classes. Those experiencing an upward mobility in and through education are drifted away from their own culture and are absorbed in the habitus of the dominant classes.⁵⁵

Mannheim and Durkheim consider the reproduction function of education to be useful giving some stability to the social system. It helps in maintaining the social equilibrium and bringing social order by developing and sustaining the necessary moral values. But they have not analysed the antagonistic relationship existing between different classes and the use of education in perpetuating such a relationship. Jean Floud has correctly pointed out that their dominant concerns are rooted in a 'sense of social disorder and crisis' to which they offer solutions

54. Robinson, op. cit., p.30.

55. Ibid., pp.31-32.

which ultimately lead to social consensus. He calls Mannheim as a 'utopia of the right' for his preoccupation with an 'integrated society', to be secured through a 'common morality' developed through education. This was also the preoccupation of Durkheim.⁵⁶

V

According to the trend report on Sociology of education compiled by Suma Chitnis on behalf of ICSSR, in the sixties the works in this field focussed upon six basic themes.⁵⁷ These are the study of the social backgrounds, attitudes and values of school and college students and teachers, education's function of socialisation, the expansion and growth of education in Indian society, education equality, mobility and social stratification, the organisation and structure of education, and roles in education.

In the chapter on education it has been pointed out that both Durkheim and Mannheim stressed on the socialising function of education. They undertook a historical analysis

-
56. Sharp, R., op. cit., p.40. According to Coser, Mannheim's British works were under the influence of Durkheim. He quotes Jean Floud for the criticism of Mannheim and the influence of Durkheim upon him as discussed above. Coser, op. cit., p.447.
57. Chitnis, Suma, "Sociology of Education", Trend Report in the ICSSR, A Survey of research in Sociology and Social Anthropology, vol.II, ICSSR, 1974, pp.156-69.

of education with relation to its expansion and growth through different periods. They also discussed the role of teachers and students in the context of education. The relationship between education, mobility and stratification is implicit in their writings on education.

Suma Chitnis notes that the works in the seventies can be divided into two broad areas: (i) "the manifest and latent functions of education in a given society, and its relationship with other institutions like economy, polity, the stratification system etc., i.e., the objectives of education as an institution and its relationship with other social institutions"; (ii) "The analysis of the structure and functioning of the education system per se, involving issues of its expansion and growth, innovation, change and problems within the system". The themes mainly taken up under these two areas are a systemic analysis of education in the country, the study of specific structural features such as management, planning, policy-making and financing of education, the structural changes in education, the role of teachers, education, equality, and mobility, the study of non-formal education.⁵⁸

58. Chitnis, Suma, "Sociology of Education" in the ICSSR, Survey of Research in Sociology and Social Anthropology, 1969-79, vol.II, 1985, pp.209-51.

Though Durkheim and Mannheim do not make the manifest and latent functions of educations explicit in their writings but an analysis of their works shows that they discussed both the manifest and latent functions of education. The manifest function is the preparation for future occupational roles in the society but the latent function is the development of morality which for Durkheim leads to solidarity and for Mannheim to a democratic consensus. They also discussed the structure and functioning of the education system in itself when they made a historical analysis of the growth of education in different periods. Durkheim wrote on the themes of the role of teachers as moral agent and education related to the question of equality. Mannheim also wrote about the role of teachers in the context of a planned society where the role of teacher changes from an authoritarian type to that of a guide. Mannheim also wrote on planning and policy-making in education.

The writings of Durkheim and Mannheim are important in analysing the role of education in contemporary Indian society. They were against a socialist transformation of society in economic terms and postulated a welfare state that extends the basic civic amenities to the people. These function in a democratic manner.⁵⁹ After independence, India

59. Discussed in chap.II and also earlier in this chapter.

has adopted this framework. It would be interesting to see, to what extent the state of Indian education reflects their views on education.

The concept of equality of opportunity has not yet been realised in India. Durkheim talked of equal start chances for all. The allocation of functions according to merit, talent will be fair if all have equal chances for getting education.⁶⁰ Despite the provision for universalisation of education in Indian Constitution, even after forty years since independence this remains as an illusion. The widespread illiteracy existing among the masses has helped in the maintenance of traditional beliefs and superstitions which have become the bottlenecks for creating a scientific and technical ethos. The development of the society depends on mass education, which has not yet been fully realised in spite of the phenomenal growth in educational facilities.

Mannheim, as has already been pointed out, is not an egalitarian. But he agrees on the usefulness of mass-education. The education which masses get is different from that of the elites who are educated in special type of schools. In short, he visualised the existence of different types of schools.⁶¹ This situation also prevails

60. See chap.II on 'education'.

61. See chap.III, Mannheim's ideas on meritocracy.

in India where there are both state and privately controlled educational institutions. The privately controlled institutions have had a mushrooming growth both because the state has not been able to cover the whole country with educational institutions and/or secondly, the facilities and standards of teaching in these institutions are better than their counterparts.

Some of these educational institutions in the private sector also uphold values and life-styles that are different from the masses. These may be either westernized or an aristocratic one reminiscent of the British rule in India. Mannheim would have liked the elites to be selected from this category. But the situation is a complex one. The elites who plan for the masses come from diverse social, economic and educational backgrounds. But certainly there is a tilt in favour of those who were traditionally better-off in having access to the policy-making positions.

Durkheim's idea of the power of the state to have some control of the privately-run educational institutions is useful in the Indian context.⁶² More or less these institutions enjoy an autonomy particularly with respect to the admission of students and appointment of teachers. The privately-run medical, engineering and management

62. Discussed in chap.III.

institutions etc. have commercialised these educations by taking exorbitant capitation fees that has restricted entry into these only for the wealthy and powerful sections of the society. This also has resulted in a degradation of standard as not merit but money counts in getting admissions into these institutions. The state also should intervene in the formulation of curriculum to make education in a particular field equal for all the students reading that subject.

The concept of mass education is very important in the context of India for ameliorating the condition of the weaker sections. The Scheduled castes, Scheduled tribes, women and other economically disadvantaged groups who constitute the weaker sections have been suffering inhuman miseries for centuries together. Since independence, education has been officially recognised as an instrument of social change. Education is believed to change the conditions of the weaker sections by helping them participate and take advantage of the welfare or developmental measures being undertaken by the government. Mannheim wished mass education to educate the masses along democratic lines so that they participate in the planning activities undertaken for their betterment by the elites.⁶³ As the

63. Mannheim viewed education to break the apathetic attitude of the masses and make them participate in the process of democratic planning undertaken by the elites for the betterment of the whole society. See chap.II.

policies for development are decided by the elites at the top excluding the involvement of the masses who have to accept these decisions and participate in the process, there is no scope for a two-way flow in which the feedbacks given by the masses become the main basis for planning. The elites will decide what is good for the masses. In India such a situation prevails. There exists a wide gap between the masses and their needs, and those who formulate policies for them. This has not only created an atmosphere of mistrust even for the genuine policies but also has made the task of implementation difficult due to lack of interest among the masses for participation. This, apart from other reasons, has been a main factor for the failure of the programmes. Education in India must develop the sense of participation because without participating the masses cannot decide what is good or bad for them.

Mannheim correctly distinguished social disintegration from social change.⁶⁴ In course of its change every society faces some problems like poverty, unemployment etc. but when these assume a mass-scale so as to threaten the integration of the society, the symptoms of disintegration are clear. Indian society is today plagued with the problems of

64. Discussed in chap.II.

poverty, illiteracy, unemployment and various forms of corruption that cannot be ignored simply as minor byproducts of social change but major obstacles for progress and national integration. The national questions were taken up by both of them in giving primacy to the society against the interest of the individual or that of a group of individuals.

For Durkheim the collective conscience has weakened in the modern, organic set-up making room for some freedom of the individual that helps in realizing his creative potential. Yet some form of consensus, mainly of an organic nature, is necessary if the atomistic, egoistic drives have to be checked from threatening the survival of the society.⁶⁵ He correctly pointed out the dependence of individual on the society for his well-being. Mannheim also resorted to this framework and the consensus he stressed upon was a democratic consensus.⁶⁶

Today, Indian society is lacking such a consensus and the symptoms of disintegration are manifested along caste, regional or communal lines. It has given rise to the question of national integration. Apart from problems of a

65. Discussed in chap.II in the context of Durkheim's views on evolutionary social change.

66. See Mannheim's ideas on the evolution of society in chap.II.

purely economic nature like wage, salary, employment and fast escalating prices, the disrupting effects of these issues have to be reckoned with. There may be economic and political interpretation of these issues, but the susceptibility of the masses to be carried away along caste, communal or regional lines shows the lack of a moral order, that is conducive for scientific and technological change and a harmony to be established in the caste, region, language, religion etc. The role of education in developing such a morality has been mostly neglected in India. The feelings of brotherly help, co-operation etc. that binds people together which both Durkheim and Mannheim stressed are lacking in Indian education.

Education is primarily viewed by the students and the parents as a means for getting into some occupation. The socialising function of education is neglected in this process. Durkheim's stress upon attachment to social groups as a source of psychological security for the individual has meaning for such developments. The concern for one's own-self has also affected the professional and occupational spheres where the ethics of the profession are given a secondary place against the individual interest.

The over-emphasis on the selection function of education and the neglect of its socialising function has resulted in greater individual strivings for his own

betterment in finding an occupation, promotion and other facilities. In this many ascriptive criteria are still resorted to that runs contrary to the notion of social justice. Attachment to social groups requires shouldering some responsibility, which the individual striving only for his well-being does not like to take-up. In this process he develops a lack of concern for others. The dominance of the mercenary spirit is responsible for the rampant corruption, nepotism, bungling etc. and also the brain-drain of scientific and technical talent from India. Durkheim's stress upon appropriate ethics to be developed in professional and occupational spheres is applicable for the Indian situation also.

Durkheim was in favour of some form of discipline (though not physical) to act as constraint upon the behaviour of the pupil.⁶⁷ In India the futility of the use of physical constraints has been more or less recognised and it is gradually being abolished from the schools now. Durkheim stressed discipline that orients the child to the moral principles and norms of the society. To this he added the notion of 'autonomy' which explains to the child the necessity of the rules and the usefulness of the punishments. The child comes to the position of

67. Durkheim's application of morality to education. See chap.III.

accepting the authority of the teacher who adheres to the moral principles himself. The gap between the teacher and the student seems to be rapidly increasing in India, resulting in much mistrust for each other and often the adoption of disciplinary measures that further aggravates this climate of mistrust. This may be one of the causes of the student unrest prevailing in the schools, colleges and universities in India.

The effective method of ventilation of the grievances of the students is yet to be found out that leads to a climate of what Mannheim called 'collective deliberation'. Education and school should provide the opportunities of debate and discussion with the teacher and among themselves. This would more or less help in reaching consensus on issues and prevent much of the violence and student unrest in the educational premises. The status of the teacher, both Mannheim and Durkheim argued to be changed in the context of the modern, industrial society. The teacher, for Durkheim has to be regarded as an agent of moral and social change, who therefore occupies a place of reverence in the society. Mannheim was aware of the fact that the assumptions of the teachers influence the schooling and experience of the pupil. The role of the teacher in the democratic context has to be changed from an 'authoritarian instructor' to that of a guide who shapes the personality of the pupil.

The precondition for this is an 'emotional respect' between them.⁶⁸

In India the teachers have not been given this recognition. Teaching as a profession is held in low esteem compared to many other professions, particularly the technical and administrative ones. This has affected the psyche of the teachers. Moreover, other existential problems of the teachers are not properly taken care of which is evident in the recurrent demands for increase of salary, job security and other facilities like housing etc. In short, there has been a decrease in the interest of teachers in fulfilling the requirements of their profession which has affected the moral and educational standard of the students.

Both Durkheim and Mannheim discussed the conservative character of educational institutions, i.e., their resistance to social change, in the past. Durkheim stressed on the fact that there will be changes in the educational institutions according to the type of society or the needs of the society.⁶⁹ Mannheim considered the contemporary

68. See chap.III regarding their views on student-teacher relationship.

69. In the Evolution of Educational Thought in France Durkheim traced the history of evolution of education in their response to the cultural and structural changes taking place in society. The same is also discussed in Education and Sociology. See chap.III.

schools as agents of social change when they teach the student not an 'adjustment to the established society', but to confront the challenges of a dynamic society.⁷⁰

Though education cannot be taken as the sole agent of social change and there is a reciprocal relationship between these two, but Mannheim and Durkheim have rightly pointed out the role of education in helping one cope with the changes taking place in the society. Mannheim's view is more relevant for Indian society because for him changes are in a continuous flux and education has to teach how to face the challenges of such a dynamic society. Indian education has failed in this respect. The examples are many. To illustrate a few, though there has been phenomenal growth in the scientific and technological sphere but a scientific ethos has not yet been established, the frequent cases of role-conflict when one is supposed to be impersonal but adheres to some form of favouritism, instead of conforming to achievement criteria resorts to ascriptive factors. The contribution of education to this is very limited. Education cannot also be said to have contributed much to the economic development of the country.

70. Mannheim makes the historical analysis to show the change in goals and priorities in education as set by society, discussed in chap.III.

The role of education in the process of redistribution of income is not encouraging. It has certainly helped the upper and middle strata to get into the better-off positions of the bureaucracy and other occupations but for the lower classes the chances of improving their positions through education have been very little. This indicates the equality of opportunity in education which Durkheim talked of, has not been achieved in the Indian context, despite the tall slogans of universalisation and free, compulsory education etc.

Even if equality of opportunity is provided by giving compulsory education to all children, their existential problems lying outside the school will defeat the justifications for the meritocratic principles, which both Mannheim and Durkheim unequivocally championed.⁷¹ Mannheim argued that the best talent must go to the top. For Durkheim, various social functions need specialisation and talent. This stratification is just when equality of opportunity in education is added to it. It cannot be just when inequalities in social and economic spheres exist in the society which are vital for the access and achievements in education. Durkheim wanted to keep this variable of access constant but the variable of achievement depends not only on factors like access but also on factors like the family background,

71. See their views on meritocratic principles in chap. III.

economic condition of the family, education of the parents etc. The economic condition is the major determinant of all these factors.

Though both Mannheim and Durkheim do not give much importance to this economic aspect, but Durkheim at least recognised the inequalities at the time of birth as responsible for an unjust division of labour.⁷² Therefore, he stressed the development of secondary institutions like corporations which take care of the property after the death of the individual. He also expected family to go away. But family and inheritance of property still exist in India. Nor the secondary institutions been developed to an extent that these assume an intermediary place between the state and the people.⁷³

There exists a wide gap between the income of the rich and the poor. This gap is continuously increasing with the opening up of the business opportunities for the private enterprises. Though the public sector has improved its position over the years but it still lags far behind the private sector and has not yet been able to adequately

72. See chap. II regarding Durkheim's views on conditions external to the division of labour that make it unjust.

73. Discussed in chap. II.

distribute the national resources or the profits of development among the population, particularly those who are deprived of it. Class collaboration, co-operation, consensus, the framework in which Mannheim and Durkheim analysed society, cannot be reached, when we find the existence of a multiplicity of classes on the basis of differential incomes, ownership/non-ownership of means of production, and class interests.

In India the growing instances of demands for land, increase in wages, salaries etc. by agricultural and industrial labourers, peasants and other low-income employees shows the need for a just national economic order, like the one demanded by the third world developing countries for a just international economic order at the global level. Morality cannot be divorced from the recognition by the economically better-off of the needs of the downtrodden, which were not given due recognition by Mannheim and Durkheim.

The struggle along economic lines will continue to exist that calls for the application of the sociology of knowledge to the analysis of education in India. It implies whose ideas and values are perpetrated through education, who decide what type of education to be given and to what end education is directed? This gives an idea of the real beneficiaries of the education system. In this context Mannheim's notion of planning of education for reconstruction is very important, though one may disagree with him regarding

the nature of planning.

In the Indian context the planning of education must incorporate both the material and ideational components. The ideational components include the promotion of the basic values of secularism, nationalism, a scientific temper etc. The recurrences of caste feuds, communal riots, language conflicts, separatist tendencies and various forms of religious revivalism like Sati, dowry death and other forms of ill-treatment to women etc., indicate that education now faces a challenging task than ever before in countering these disintegrating factors. Political and other forms of settlements are temporary solutions. Only education can have a lasting effect on these by changing the consciousness of people. People have to be educated. Both Durkheim and Mannheim considered education to be a life-long process. Mannheim's stress on 'adult education' is now considered to be an integral part of the poverty alleviation programmes in India, because literacy helps people to know and take advantage of the various developmental measures undertaken for them and, also brings to their notice the various avenues open for them in the service sector.

On the material side education must be planned to take note of the needs of the people according to the vast differences in towns and countryside, income etc.

People have to be allocated to various positions and greater opportunities have to be created for income generation. In this context more vocationalisation of education is needed. Unless education fulfills this responsibility and generates a general sense of security among the people, its task of changes in the ideational sphere becomes difficult. This connection is lacking in both Durkheim and Mannheim's writings. However, they should be credited for recognising the potentials of education for national reconstruction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Althusser, L., "Education, Structure and Society" in Collin, B.P. et. al. (eds.), 1980.
- _____, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus" in Shukla, S. and K. Kumar (eds.), 1985.
- Apple, Michael W., Ideology and Curriculum. (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1979).
- Aron, Raymond, Main Currents in Sociological Thought, vol.2 (Penguin Books, USA, 1967).
- Ascoli, Max, "On Mannheim's Ideology and Utopia", Social Research, vol.5, No.1, February, 1938, pp.101-6.
- Banks, Olive, The Sociology of Education, 1968.
- Bernstein, B., "Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning" in Halsey, Floud and Anderson (eds.), 1961.
- Blackledge, D. and Berry Hunt, Sociological Interpretations (Croom Helm, London, 1985).
- Bogardus, Emory, "Mannheim and Social Reconstruction", Sociology and Social Research, vol.32, 1947, pp.548-57.
- _____, "Mannheim and Systematic Sociology", Sociology and Social Research, vol.43, 1958-59, pp.213-17.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J., "The Ideological function of the Educational System: from their Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture" in Shukla, S. and K. Kumar (eds.), 1985, pp.121-35.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H., Schooling in Capitalist America (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1976).
- Bramstedt, Ernest K. and Gerth Hans, "A Note on the work of Karl Mannheim" in Mannheim, Karl, Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning, pp.vii-xv.

Chitnis, Suma, "Sociology of Education", A Trend Report in the ICSSR, A Survey of Research in Sociology and Social Anthropology, vol.II, ICSSR, 1974, pp.166-69.

_____, "Sociology of Education" in the ICSSR, A Survey of Research in Sociology and Social Anthropology, 1969-79, vol.II, 1985, pp.209-51.

Coser, Lewis A., Masters of Sociological Thought, Ideas in Historical and Sociological Context, 11nd edition, 1977.

_____, "Durkheim's conservatism and its implications for his sociological theory" in Kurt H., Wolff (ed.), Essays on Sociology and Social Philosophy.

Cosin, B.R. et. al. (eds.), School and Society - A Sociological Reader, 11nd edition (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1980).

Davis, Brian, Social Control and Education.

Demaine, Jack, Contemporary Theories in the Sociology of Education (Macmillan, London, 1983).

Durkheim, E., The Rules of Sociological Method (The Free Press, New York, 1938).

_____, The Division of Labour in Society (The Free Press, New York, 1947).

_____, Education and Sociology (The Free Press, Glencoe, 1956).

_____, Professional Ethics and Civic Morals (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1957).

_____, Essays on Sociology and Philosophy, ed. by Wolff, K. (Ohio State University Press, Columbus, 1960).

_____, Moral Education (The Free Press, Glencoe, 1961).

_____, The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life (Collier Books, New York, 1961).

- _____, Suicide: A Study in Sociology (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1970).
- _____, The Evolution of Educational Thought (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1977).
- _____, Pragmatism and Sociology, ed. by Allock, J.B., translated by J.C. Whitehouse (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1983).
- _____ and Mauss, Marcel, Primitive classification, translated with an Introduction by Needham, R. (Cohen and West, London, 1963).
- Eliot, T.S., "The Classes and the Elite" in Cosin, B.R. et. al. (eds.), 1980.
- Eros, J.S. and Stewart, W.A.C., "Editorial Preface" to Systematic Sociology (ed.), 1957, pp.xi-xxx.
- Fenton, Steve, Durkheim and modern Sociology (Cambridge University Press, 1984).
- Floud, Jean, "Karl Mannheim" in A.V. Judges (ed.), The Function of Teaching (London, 1959), pp.40-66.
- _____, "Karl Mannheim", New Society, no.222, Dec. 29, 1966, pp.969-71.
- _____ and A.H. Halsey, "The Sociology of Education", Current Sociology, vol.7, 1958, pp.165-93.
- Freire, Paulo, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, 1972.
- _____, Education for Critical Consciousness, 1973.
- Giddens, Anthony (ed.), Emile Durkheim - Selected Writings (Cambridge University Press, 1972).
- _____, Capitalism and modern social theory - an analysis of the writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber (Cambridge University Press, 1971).
- _____, Durkheim, ed. Frank Kerm, 1978.
- Halsey, A.H., Jean Floud and C. Arnold Anderson (eds.), Education, Economy and Society (The Free Press, New York, 1969).

- Heeren, John, "Karl Mannheim and the Intellectual Elite", British Journal of Sociology, vol.22, 1971, pp.1-15.
- Hoyle, Eric, "The Elite Concept in Karl Mannheim's Sociology of Education", Sociological Review, vol.12, 1964, pp.55-71.
- Judges, A.V., "Education in a Changing Society", Yearbook of Education, 1950, pp.184-99.
- Karabel, J. and Halsey, A.H., Power and Ideology in Education (Oxford University Press, 1977).
- Kettler, David, Volker, Meja, Nico, Stehr, Karl Mannheim, Key Sociologists Series, Peter Hamilton (ed.), 1984.
- _____, "Karl Mannheim and Conservatism: The Ancestry of Historical thinking", American Sociological Review, vol.49, 1984, pp.71-85.
- La Capra, Dominick, Emile Durkheim - Sociologist and Philosopher (Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1972).
- Lindsay, A.D., "Review of Karl Mannheim's Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning", British Journal of Sociology, vol.3, 1952, pp.85-86.
- Loader, Colin, The Intellectual Developments of Karl Mannheim (Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- Lukes, Steven, Emile Durkheim. His life and work: A historical and critical study, 1973.
- Mannheim, Ernest, "Karl Mannheim, 1893-1947", American Journal of Sociology, vol.II, No.6, May, 1947, pp.471-74.
- Mannheim, Karl, Ideology and Utopia (Harcourt Brace and World, New York, 1936).
- _____, Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction (Harcourt Brace, New York, 1950).
- _____, Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning, ed. by Ernest K. Bramstedt and Hans Gerth, Foreword by Adolphe Lowe, New York, Oxford University Press, 1950; London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1951.

- , Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1952).
- , Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology, ed. by Paul Kecskemeti, editorial note by Adolph Lowe, Introduction by Paul Kecskemeti, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, New York: Oxford University Press, 1952).
- , Essays on the Sociology of Culture, ed. by Ernest Mannheim in co-operation with Paul Kecskemeti, Introduction by Ernest Mannheim, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, New York: Oxford University Press, 1956).
- , Diagnosis of our Time: Wartime Essays of a Sociologist, (London: Kegan Paul Trench, Trubner, 1943; New York: Oxford University Press, 1944).
- and W.A.C. Stewart, An Introduction to the Sociology of Education (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; New York: Humanities Press, 1962).
- Merton, R.K., Social Theory and Social Structure (Amerind Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., 1958).
- Mills, C. Wright, The Power Elite (New York, 1952).
- , "Review of Karl Mannheim's Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction", American Sociological Review, vol.4, No.6, Dec. 1940, pp. 65-69.
- Parsons, Talcott, "Durkheim's Contribution to the theory of integration of Social systems" in Kurt H. Wolff (ed.), Essays on Sociology and Social Philosophy.
- , "The School class as a Social system" in Shukla, P. and K. Kumar (eds.), Sociological Perspectives in education, 1985.
- Pyere, Henri, "Durkheim: The Man, his time, and his intellectual background" in Kurt H. Wolff (ed.), Essays on Sociological and Social Philosophy.

- Pierce, Albert, "Durkheim and Functionalism" in Kurt H. Wolff (ed.), Essays on Sociology and Philosophy.
- Remmling, Gunter W., The Sociology of Karl Mannheim (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975).
- _____, "Karl Mannheim: revision of an intellectual portrait", Social Forces, vol.40, No.1, October, 1961, pp.23-30.
- _____, "Philosophical parameters of Karl Mannheim's Sociology of Knowledge", Sociological Quarterly, vol.12, No.4, Autumn 1971, pp.531-47.
- Robinson, Phillip, Perspectives on the Sociology of Education - An Introduction (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987).
- Salomon, Albert, "Karl Mannheim, 1893-1947", Social Research, vol.14, No.3, Sept. 1947, pp.350-64.
- Schelting, Alexander Von, "Review of Karl Mannheim's Ideology and Utopia", American Sociological Review, vol.1, No.4, August 1936, pp.564-74.
- Sharp, Rachel, Knowledge, Ideology and the Politics of of Schooling: Towards a Marxist analysis of education (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1980).
- shils, Edward, "Mannheim Karl", International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, vol.9, 1968, pp.557-62.
- shukla, Suresh Chandra and K. Kumar (eds.), Sociological Perspectives in Education, 1985.
- simpson, George, Emile Durkheim, 1963.
- Stewart, W.A.C., "Introduction" to Karl Mannheim's An Introduction to the Sociology of Education, pp.vii-xvii.
- Thompson, Kenneth, Emile Durkheim, Key Sociologists Series, Peter Hamilton (ed.), 1982.
- Wallwork, Ernest, Durkheim: Moralitty and Milieu (Harvard University Press, 1972).

- Whitty, Geoff, Sociology and School knowledge - Curriculum theory, research and politics (Methuen, London, 1985).
- Wirth, Louis, "Preface" to Karl Mannheim's Ideology and Utopia, pp.i-xxxi.
- _____, "Karl Mannheim, 1893-1947", American Sociological Review, vol.12, No.3, June, 1947, pp.356-57.
- Wolff, Kurt H. (ed.), Essays on Sociology and Social Philosophy: Emile Durkheim et. al.
- Zeitlin, Erving M., "Karl Mannheim, 1893-1947" in Zeitlin Irving M. (ed.), Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory, pp.281-319.