



Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi

The Journal of International Social Research

Cilt: 8 Sayı: 37 Volume: 8 Issue: 37

Nisan 2015 April 2015

www.sosyalarastirmalar.com Issn: 1307-9581

BAZI KLASİK VE ÇAĞDAŞ SOSYOLOGLARIN PERSPEKTİFİNDEN KAMU DÜZENİ VE KAMU DÜZENİNİN ŞİDDET VE TERÖR İLİŞKİSİ

SOCIAL ORDER FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF SOME CLASSICAL AND CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGISTS AND ITS RELATION WITH VIOLENCE AND TERRORISM

Mustafa KAYAOĞLU*

Öz

Bu çalışma, öncelikle kamu düzenini açıklayan klasik ve çağdaş sosyoloji teorileri üzerine odaklanmıştır. Bu çalışmada Hobbes, Rousseau'nun yanı sıra Comte, Marx, Durkheim gibi klasik dönem sosyologlarının düşünceleri ve Merton, Mead, Parsons gibi çağdaş dönem sosyologlarının bakış açıları birincil kaynaklar kullanılarak ele alınmıştır. Ardından bireyin kamu düzeni içerisindeki yeri mikro düzeyde ele alınarak kamu düzeni eksikliğinin birey üzerindeki etkilerine değinilmiştir. Son olarak şiddet ve terör eylemlerinin kamu düzenine olan etkisi tartışmaya açılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kamu Düzeni, Klasik Dönem Sosyologları, Çağdaş Dönem Sosyologları, Şiddet, Terör.

Abstract

This study focuses on classical and contemporary theories explaining social order. Along with Hobbes and Rousseau, theories of classical sociologists such as Comte, Durkheim and Marx were utilized from primary sources. Also, perspectives of some contemporary sociologists such as Merton, Mead and Parsons were exploited. Later, the position of individual within the social order was handled from a micro-level perspective to explain the effect of social disorder on individual. Finally, the influence of violence and terror on individual was opened to discussion.

Keywords: Social Order, Classical Sociologists, Contemporary Sociologists, Violence, Terrorism.

Introduction

Social disorder threatens the stability of states. After the collapse of empires, global social order among societies has been maintained through states. Both global stability and order within the state limits the violence and terror acts and protects the individuals and the existing state system.

This study will not focus on global stability. Our main intention is to shed light to social order in states. It is clear that a good social system should maintain the balance between the international and national social structures such as economy, politics, education or religion. Moreover states should also provide security, wealth, and moral values. As Rotberg (2002) postulates lack of social order is open to criminality and violence due to loss of control in governing which in turn creates ethnic, linguistic, and religious hostilities. These hostilities may pave the ways to weak institutions, insufficient structures and institutions, civil wars and terror.

Social disorder in a state questions its legitimacy. The sense of being a community disappears and individuals feel alienated. The social structure shaped and the social contract that binds individuals weakens as they become illegitimate, finally anomie becomes prevalent within the social system. In spite of common values those bring society together, emerging marginal ideologies may lead to violence, vandalism and terror.

Society, Social System and Social Order

Common values, norms and laws are touchstones of states. Acting together, they ensure that members of that society, or in other words, citizens of the state should live in line with prescribed social expectations (Etzioni, 2000 & Durkheim, 1982). According to Hobbes (1996), people live in a constant fear of death in "the state of nature." Thus, to maintain social order states should be sovereign. More clearly, complete power at the center, an extremely centralized government could help to maintain the social order needed. He believes

* Dr. Sosyolog, kayaoglu97@yahoo.com

that in a society a stable social order is necessary condition for the continuation of human life and a life without fear. He claims that to form a powerful, centralized state the state of nature – human condition lack of social system or government- will urge them. The quest for social order and peace within the state demands obedience to the authority, namely leviathan-the state.

For Rousseau (1762: 1) "Man is born free; and everywhere he is in chains." Although he believes that individuals are equal in nature, as the society begins to emerge with the development of cooperation, it also creates inequalities. To explain social order he focuses on general will which is not as coercive as Hobbes' explanation of transition from "the state of nature" to a sovereign governance. Rousseau explains freedom as people's complete recognition of general will. For the good of the society rational people naturally prefer this kind of submission, namely general will. To bring social order, or to achieve a group liberty individuals have to disclaim some of their rights. For Rousseau (1762: 2), "social order is a sacred right which is the basis of all other rights."

According to Comte (1866: 196), there is a "deep and wide spread anarchy of the whole intellectual system." Although ideas of order and progress are inseparable, he believes that, order and progress were set up in radical opposition. Society will use the opportunities of human reasoning to organize itself when the proper time arrives. Comte suggests that sociology has to be studied as social statics and social dynamics. "Social Statics" is the conditions of social order which he also calls "spontaneous order." He then classifies the analysis of social statics as individual, family and society. Family is the "true social unit to study" and is "the school of social life, both for obedience and for command" (Comte, 1866: 263-270).

Even though Marx focuses on social change, a vital questions for him was the sources of political order. Why do people go along with the agenda rather than rising up against the system in unequal states? For him the question cannot be answered by alienation terminology, or the power exerted over the people as Hobbes claims.

Marx (1847) explains this question in his book Capital as the "dull compulsion of economic forces." For him, alienation creates powerlessness and a sense of isolation. He shows us how social disorganization is constructed in capitalist systems with private property. Instead of adapting or reforming society and its organizations, he prefers to remove the conditions which create alienation. For Marx, throughout the history, antagonisms and conflicts pave the ways to new economic and social systems "No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have been developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society" (Marx, 1964: 52).

For Marx, the affiliation among free traders also maintains the existing social system. This was declared to the Fraternal Democrats as "the brotherhood of the oppressors against the oppressed," in London (Marx, 1847). "In order to form an orderly society common interest should be formed through abolishing the present property relations and developing a new society without class antagonism. He believes that "the bourgeois relations of production are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production." The previous unequal social system ceases to function and finally overthrown by the workers. Harmony supersedes the conflict in the society.

According to Durkheim, society is similar to a good functioning biological organism. Working together, all parts maintain the functioning of the whole system similar to a process carried out in a human body. For example, Durkheim presents the relationship between them by claiming that "Doubtless it does not follow that the function can exist outside any organ, not even that there can ever be an absence of any kind of relationship between the two elements" (Durkheim, 1984: 275). He (Durkheim, 1984:83) also presents a concrete example of the judicial system as one of the parts of the social structure working in harmony by stating "... law plays a part analogous in society to that of the nervous system in the organism. That system, in effect has the task of regulating the various bodily functions in such a way that they work harmoniously together."

In reference to the relationship between solidarity and division of labor, Durkheim conceptualizes social bonds and social order. While traditional societies in which the division of labor is less present mechanical solidarity, modern societies present organic solidarity. For him, bringing individuals together does not make that mass a society, indeed society is more than that claiming "collective life did not arise from individual life; on the contrary, it is the latter that emerged from the former" (Durkheim, 1984:221).

Durkheim (1984:221) portrays modern societies as organic societies, but not contractual as Hobbes claims. Therefore social events should be studied as a whole due to its interrelation. The reason behind the division of labor and specialization is the requisite of happiness. "It is the need for happiness that may impel the individual to specialize more and more" (Durkheim, 1984:180).

This specialization in turn forms interdependency and cohesion between the individuals of the society. He also emphasizes that civilization does not necessitate happiness; "if we are sensitive to more pleasures, we are also sensitive to more sorrows." (Durkheim, 1984, 187) According to Durkheim "the suicide of sadness is an endemic state among civilized people" (Durkheim, 1984: 191).

According to Durkheim (1982) all social facts (even crime as a social phenomenon) play a vital role in the society. He underlines that "crime is not only observed in most societies of a particular species, but in all societies of all types" (Durkheim, 1982: 98). In fact, by binding noncriminal individuals and creating a collective conscience through sanctioning criminals, crime plays a positive role.

According to Merton (1968: 81), "not all societies that have a high degree of integration in which every culturally standardized activity or belief is functional for the society as a whole and uniformly functional for the people living in it. For we find significant variations in the degree of integration even among individual biological organisms." In other words, Merton criticizes Durkheim by claiming that harmony is not a necessary condition when all structures considered within the whole system. Some structures may be dysfunctional claiming that "although any item of culture or social structure may have functions, it is premature to hold unequivocally that every such item must be functional" (Merton, 1968: 85).

Merton believes that social structures may also play a negative role. For example, Durkheim claims that religion functions as an integrative element within the society, while Merton shows the disintegrating aspect of religion. For Merton, in Tonnies' *Gemeinschaft* like societies a single religion may generate solidarity and in turn, it may act as an integrative factor. If all individuals of the society believe in same religion and perform same rituals in a collective way solidarity will emerge among the individuals. However, in *Gesellschaft* societies, number of religions living together may function as a disintegrating factor. Thus social structures may be functional for some subgroups, but not for others (Merton, 1968). Structural conditions had to be taken into account in deviation from norms and values instead of suggesting biological explanations to social disorder (Featherstone & Deflem, 2003)

For Merton (1968), social disorder occurs when some individuals are structurally barred to access their ideals imposed in the society. Anomie and disorder occurs as a result of the struggle for success where there are no institutional means to actualize their ideals. Thus, individuals tend to search other ways, even though crime, to attain their goals.

Merton presents us five different adaptation modes. For Conformists channels of institutional means are open to actualize cultural goals which they have already internalized. In other words, social structures are functional while they are dysfunctional for some others. While individuals who face the dysfunctional aspect of the social structure embrace cultural goals they have to find different adaptation modes. Merton (1968) quotes four other adaptation modes. Innovators who try to reach their goals through any means, ritualists who reject cultural goals, retreats who rejects institutional means, cultural goals and taking action against the system, and finally rebellious who rejects goals and means, but still searches for alternative goals and means. For Merton, social order is in process if there is a balance between cultural goals and social structures which controls the adaptation modes.

Similar to Durkheim, Parsons (1968) observes society as like a human body. All organs work for the good of the entire body. For him, interdependency of the parts maintains the equilibrium among the entire system. Differentiation and integration within the system are the most important concepts for Parsons. As the society becomes bigger and more complex differentiation occurs, while integration is a necessary condition for becoming a part of the whole system. Newly integrated structures maintains the functioning of the whole system. Individuals living in the same society should act together to achieve social order and stability. Not to forget, functionalism proclaims that it is the best social state for individuals living in a society.

For Parsons (1968), within the whole system all institutions perform important roles to maintain social order. Four crucial functions, which are adaptation, goal attainment, integrity and latency can be cited for the maintenance of social fabric. Adaptation to social environment is achieved by the capitalist economy, while goal attainment is performed by the government through politics. Legal institutions such as religion or education function as integrating parts, while family as a historical basic human organization maintains and transfers values to new generations in a latent way. However, Alexander (1957) criticizes Parsons' study and claims that reduction of the contemporary society to a model overlooks to the dynamic aspect of the system as a whole.

According to Bourdieu (1972), structure and habitus mutually produce each other. Social positions and dispositions are consistent with each other in a dialectical way. Bourdieu (1972) also informs that on the negative side, habitus may limit social progress in that it defines expectations of the possible and may limit

one's aspirations. Bourdieu (1972) distinguishes *doxa* from *orthodox* and *heterodox*. For him, there is a possibility of differing antagonistic beliefs. For Bourdieu (1972) the evident conflict between the orthodoxy and the heterodoxy limits the field of potential discourse

Individual and Social Order

For Mead (1938) "the self" emerges through social control in a social process and maintains the harmony within the group. Individual "will" works in harmony through socially described and symbolized realities. Stating that "In so far as there are social acts, there are social objects, and I take it that social control is bringing the act of the individual into relation with this social object" Mead (1938: 191) explains the relation between individual and social object.

In terms of social relations he points out two consensus/conflict relation categories: The first category, "Intra-group consensus and Extra-group conflict," individuals of a group unite as a reaction to an already defined "common enemy," which is crucial in social organizations. However, in the second category, "Intra-group conflict and Extra-group consensus" individuals have conflict with their very own groups and have consensus with a superior social group (Mead, 1934).

Individuals continuously shape their physical and social environments through their behaviors and actions, as their environments shape people's self-concepts. Evaluating Mead's theory, Cronk (1973) claims that "The "me" is the internalization of roles which derive from such symbolic processes as linguistic interaction, playing, and gaming; whereas the "I" is a "creative response" to the symbolized structures of the "me" (e.g., to the generalized other)."

Yet, James (1985) has a more liberal approach. For him "a man's "Me" is the sum total of all that he can call his" (James, 1985: 44). Accordingly along with the body, self contains the physical and social environment such as identity markers or group belongings. Here we should emphasize that belief systems can be termed as identity markers which develop as a part of "the self." Through identity markers individual differentiates him/herself from others to achieve self-identity (Holstein & Gubrium, 2000). Finally individuals extend "the self" and "me versus not me" turns out to be "me and mine versus not me and not mine" (Burriss & Rempel, 2004). "

Finally individuals extend "the self" and "me versus not me" turns out to be "me and mine versus not me and not mine" (Burriss & Rempel, 2004). If individuals feel that these borders are disturbed through outside forces, their reactions may be not only unreasonable, but also powerful (Rozin, Nemeroff, Horowitz & Voet, 1995). Frustration and anxiety occur when an individual is socially excluded from his/her environment, or if he/she has weak networks (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

Terror management theory proposes that dying is the major danger that creates anxiety, knowing that living is a natural aspiration of all individuals (Solomon, Greenberg, & Pyszczynski, 1991 and Greenberg, Solomon, & Pyszczynski, 1997). Consequently human beings seek order in their social environment and look for stability. We already know that the idea of dying generates anxiety, however the discussion is when an individual loses his/her identity marker, he/she also feels a threat of losing part of his/her identity. Burriss and Rempel (2004) realized that "contemplation of death may be sufficient but not necessary to increase one's investment in a world that makes sense: Disorientations or erasures that are neither catastrophic nor total—like dust mites in one's bed— may pose a similar threat to the integrity of one's stable, familiar world" (Burriss & Rempel, 2004).

A similar perspective is also taken by Berger (1967,22); he believes that "to live in the social world is to live an ordered meaningful life. Society is the guardian of order and meaning not only objectively, but also subjectively as well." Human nature is mutually constructed through social realities. Individuals look for meaning and construct meaning all together. Therefore, social reality offers a protection against the forces of chaos. In turn this protection helps the individual to form order, meaning and security. Social order turns into the ordered structure of individual human consciousness. Institutions, languages, values, belief systems, and meanings become the parts of "the self" (Berger, 1967).

According to Berger (1967), socialization is a process in which we can find differences the environment and the individual. When these differences advance anomie becomes evident and these increased unidentified differences creates alienation. We can conclude that not only on the individual level, but also on the societal level anomie can be witnessed. While people may feel frustration and aggression on the individual level, undesirable conflicts and confrontations which may create violence can be observed on the societal level. However, according to Gotze (2004) these conflict and confrontations may lead people to look for predictable and stable environments such as closer and smaller groups. Not to forget, these groups may harbor extreme ideologies.

Violence and Terrorism as a Threat to Social Order

Violence which threatens the stability of social order is one of the important characteristics of terrorism. In turn, violent behaviors create anomie and anxiety within the society. Thus, not only absence of social order results with violence, but also violence creates the sense of normlessness and anxiety in the minds of individuals. Although it is implied earlier, it is important to emphasize Parsons' attitude toward the whole system. For him, all subsystems should function well; disruptions to any subsystem may negatively affect the social system as a whole. Therefore any disturbance may create aggression and a reason for violent behavior.

Like many other individuals experience, criminals and public protestors experience structural strains which in turn result with frustration, aggression and anger. As Merton depicts all reactions are not necessarily violent or criminal. Violence is a socially constructed word; meaning of violence can differ from individual to individual, or in other words, it has relative meanings for individuals. For example, an insulting manner can also be seen as a threat for some individuals. For Hoffman (1998) any type of action may create fear or terror "bodily harm" is not a necessary condition for violence. As it is stated earlier "the self" is not only made up of the body. His/her physical and social environments are parts of "the self." If people feel that their physical or social environments are threatened in some way, they may present irrational reactions. Thus, any threat to one's self coming from the social structure may be assumed as violent action toward the individual. In consequence, individuals may choose violent actions and terrorism as a reaction to social structure.

Although some of the academicians include fear in to their definitions of terrorism, some see it as consequence of the terrorist action, extreme violence results with fear, and anxiety. In his article, Pape groups the tactics of terrorist organizations according to violence level that they perform in terrorist acts (Pape, 2003). According to these definitions, tax revolts, non-violent protests, demonstrations and strikes are not categorized as terror actions, but they may be displays of a fragile social order in a state. As stated above, this may also be seen as result of ineffective system with subsystems less or without harmony. Terrorism can be viewed as a form of violence, however some other characteristics, such as political aim differentiates violent actions from terror actions. The goal of terrorists is to change the regime, or policies in charge. Not to forget, politics is one of the subsystem of the whole system. If it is disturbed, all society will be effected in a negative way. Thus, in reference to Parsons, terrorism is a violent action against the social system.

Conclusion

Different approaches to social order were presented above. Among all these perspectives functionalist approach seems to have more accurate arguments on the issue. Durkheim presents the subject through social change and its effects on society through anomie terminology. However, Parsons' theories on system and its subsystems where harmony and balance is necessary to maintain the social order may help us to understand violence and terror issues.

Terror activities those target the subsystems may destabilize the whole system, which in turn result with weakening of social order. Inevitably the weakening of the social order will disturb the individuals living in that society. That's why violence and terror threatens every individual, but not only people who suffer as direct targets of terrorism. Furthermore, due to any possible reason, lack of order and security may lead to anxiety among individuals. But, still we need a clear explanation of the relation between the macro and micro. In other words, an explanation between the disturbance of the social system, or call it social structure, and the individual.

Merton, in his "strain theory" effectively associates macro to micro and explains the people's response to knotty social structure which bar some people' access to their ideals. Unlike Parsons, Merton clarifies the dysfunctional aspect of the social structure for some groups by presenting five adaptation types as conformists, innovators, retreats, ritualists and rebellions. Among cited adaptation types, except conformists, all four are deviant.

People living in a society pursue stability in their daily lives. Life without an order and stability is hardly a life at all. Societies under repeated anomie offer stressful lives. Individuals can feel safe only in stable systems. In the contrary, violence and terrorism produce anxiety, fear and anger which threatens social order. The destabilization of the system may have various aims such as forming a new social order or changing the existing policies in the society. In the absence of a commonly accepted authority, or in Hobbes' terminology, sovereign, a functioning society seems to be impossible. Thus, not only terror weakens the existing social order, but also in the absence of social order frustration, aggression and in turn violence and terrorism can emerge.

REFERENCES

- ALEXANDER, J. Charles (1997). *Neofunctionalism and After*, London: Blackwell.
- BAUMEISTER, R. F., & Leary, R. Mark (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachment as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, V. 117, p. 497-529.
- BERGER, Peter (1967). *The Sacred Canopy*, New York: Anchor Books.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre (1972). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BURRIS, C. T., Rempel, J. K. (2004). It's the End of the World as We Know It': Threat and the Spatial-Symbolic Self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, V. 86(1), p. 19-42.
- COMTE, Auguste (1866). *Auguste Comte and Positivism: The Essential Writings*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- CRONK, George (1973). Symbolic Interactionism: A "Left-Median" Interpretation. *Social Theory and Practice*, V. 2(3), p. 313-333.
- DURKHEIM, Emile (1982). *The Rules of Sociological Method and Selected Texts on Sociology and Its Method*. New York: N. Y. The Free Press.
- DURKEIM, Emile (1984) *The Division of Labor in Society*. (with a foreword by L. Coser), London: Macmillan.
- ETZIONI, Amitai. (2000). Social Norms: Internalization, Persuasion, and History. *Law & Society Review*, V. 34(1), p. 157-178.
- FEATHERSTONE, Richard, Deflem M. (2003). Anomie and strain: Context and consequences of Merton's two theories. *Sociological Inquiry*, V. 73, p. 471-489.
- GOTZE, Catherine (2004). Civil society organizations in failing states: The Red Cross in Bosnia and Albania. *International Peacekeeping*, V. 11(4), p. 664-682.
- GREENBERG, J., Solomon, S., & Pyszczynski, T. (1997). Terror-management theory of self-esteem and cultural worldviews: Empirical assessments and conceptual refinements. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, V. 29, p. 61-139.
- HOBBS, Thomas (1996). *Leviathan*. J. C. A. Gaskin (Ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- HOFFMAN, Bruce (1998). *Inside Terrorism*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- HOLSTEIN James A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2000). *The self we live by: Narrative identity in a postmodern world*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- JAMES, William (1985). *Psychology: The briefer course*, Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press. (Original work published 1892).
- MARX, Karl (1847). Speech in London to the Trartrnal Democrats. Retrieved in 10.23.2014 from <http://spartacus-educational.com/TUmarx.htm>
- MARX, Karl (1847). Capital Volume 1. Part VIII: Primitive Accumulation. Chapter twenty-eight: Bloody legislation against the expropriated, from the end of the 15th century. Forcing down of wages by acts of parliament. Retrieved in 10.24.2014 from <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch28.htm>.
- MARX, Karl (1964). *Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy*, Bottomore, T.B. & Rubel, M. (Eds.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- MEAD, Herbert B. (1938). *The Philosophy of the Act*, ed. C.W. Morris et al. University of Chicago
- MEAD, Herbert B. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society*, ed. C.W. Morris (University of Chicago 1934)
- MERTON, Robert. (1968). *The Social Theory of Social Structure*, New York: N. Y. The Free Press.
- PAPE, Robert A. ((2003, August) The strategic logic of suicide terrorism. *American Political Science Review*. V. 97(3), p. 343-362.
- PARSONS, Talcott (1968). *The Structure of Social Action*, New York: Free Press.
- ROTBERG, R. I. (2002). Failed States in a World of Terror. *Foreign Affairs*, V. 81(4), p. 127-140.
- ROUSSEAU, Jean-jacques (1762). *The Social Contract*. Translated by G. D. H. Cole. Retrieved in 10.18.2006 from <http://www.constitution.org/jjr/socon.htm>.
- ROZIN, Paul, Nemeroff, C., Horowitz, M., Gordon, B., & Voet, W. (1995). The borders of the self: Contamination sensitivity and potency of the mouth, other apertures and body parts. *Journal of Research in Personality*, V. 29, p. 318-340.
- SOLOMON, Sheldon, Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (1991). A terror management theory of social behavior: The psychological functions of selfesteem and cultural worldviews. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, V. 24, p. 91-159.