

Chapter 1 : Download Essays In Sociology And Social Philosophy Peregrine Books PDF – PDF Search

Sociology is comparatively a new science, hence its scope is yet to be determined clearly and scholars differ about its definition too. Sociology is the science of social science. It includes all the aspects of society. Thus, in fact, sociology includes all the subjects which are studied.

Political philosophy is also to be distinguished within practical philosophy from both empirical elements and from virtue proper. The separation from virtue is treated later in this section. Yet Kant also included the more pragmatic, impure, empirical study of human behavior as part of practical philosophy. Practical philosophy provided rules to govern human deliberative action. In its Preface, he notes that the Groundwork is to be a preparatory book for a future Metaphysics of Morals. The book Metaphysics of Morals has two distinct parts: Kant sought to separate political rights and duties from what we might call morals in the narrow sense. He limits right by stating three conditions 6: As an example of the latter he considers trade, which for right must have the form of being freely agreed by both parties but can have any matter or purpose the agents want. While Kant must include consideration of beneficent action as part of right, he does not conclude that beneficent actions are required by right but only that most are permitted by right and others violate right. In addition to these three conditions for right, Kant also offers direct contrasts between right and virtue. He thinks both relate to freedom but in different ways: Right concerns acts themselves independent of the motive an agent may have for performing them, virtue concerns the proper motive for dutiful actions 6: In another formulation 6: In yet another he says that right concerns narrow duties and virtue wide duties 6: In the Feyerabend lectures, Kant notes that right is the subset of morally correct actions that are also coercible Kant rejects any other basis for the state, in particular arguing that the welfare of citizens cannot be the basis of state power. He argues that a state cannot legitimately impose any particular conception of happiness upon its citizens 8: To do so would be for the ruler to treat citizens as children, assuming that they are unable to understand what is truly useful or harmful to themselves. In the Groundwork Kant contrasts an ethics of autonomy, in which the will Wille, or practical reason itself is the basis of its own law, from the ethics of heteronomy, in which something independent of the will, such as happiness, is the basis of moral law 4: Further, even were there any universal desires among human beings, those desires would, as empirical, be merely contingent and thus unworthy of being the basis of any pure moral law 5: No particular conception of happiness can be the basis of the pure principle of the state, and the general conception of happiness is too vague to serve as the basis of a law. This explains why happiness is not universal, but not why freedom is universal. Still, the universality of political freedom is linked to transcendental freedom. Since every human being does enjoy transcendental freedom by virtue of being rational, freedom of choice is a universal human attribute. And this freedom of choice is to be respected and promoted, even when this choice is not exercised in rational or virtuous activity. One might still object that this freedom of choice is incapable of being the basis of a pure principle of right for the same reason that happiness was incapable of being its basis, namely, that it is too vague in itself and that when specified by the particular decisions individuals make with their free choice, it loses its universality. Kant holds that this problem does not arise for freedom, since freedom of choice can be understood both in terms of its content the particular decisions individuals make and its form the free, unconstrained nature of choice of any possible particular end 6: Freedom is universal in the proper sense because, unlike happiness, it can be understood in such a way that it is susceptible to specification without losing its universality. Right will be based on the form of free choice. The very existence of a state might seem to some as a limitation of freedom, since a state possesses power to control the external freedom of individual citizens through force. This is the basic claim of anarchism. Kant holds in contrast that the state is not an impediment to freedom but is the means for freedom. State action that is a hindrance to freedom can, when properly directed, support and maintain freedom if the state action is aimed at hindering actions that themselves would hinder the freedom of others. Such state coercion is compatible with the maximal freedom demanded in the principle of right because it does not reduce freedom but instead provides the necessary background conditions needed to secure freedom. The amount of freedom lost by the first subject through

direct state coercion is equal to the amount gained by the second subject through lifting the hindrance to actions. State action sustains the maximal amount of freedom consistent with identical freedom for all without reducing it. Freedom is not the only basis for principles underlying the state. The freedom of every member of the state as a human being. The equality of each with every other as a subject. The independence of every member of a commonwealth as a citizen. The direct link to action comes when pursuing that autonomously chosen conception of happiness. Equality is not substantive but formal. Each member of the state is equal to every other member of the state before the law. Kant exempts the head of state from this equality, since the head of state cannot be coerced by anyone else. This formal equality is perfectly compatible with the inequality of members of the state in income, physical power, mental ability, possessions, etc. Further, this equality supports an equality of opportunity: Independence concerns citizens as subject to laws they give themselves, i. While this principle appears to require universal democratic decision making for particular laws, Kant instead understands this principle on two levels, one of which is not universal and the other of which is not for particular laws. At one level, that of participation in determination of particular laws, citizenship does not extend to all. Kant excludes women and children, weakly claiming that their exclusion is natural, as well as anyone who lacks economic self-sufficiency. Hence decision making is not universal. At the second level, he claims that all members of the state, as subjects of the law, must be able to will the basic law that governs them. Hence decision making at this level is not for particular laws. Particular laws, in contrast, are to be determined by a majority of the citizens with voting rights, as will be discussed in section 4. Social Contract Kant provides two distinct discussions of social contract. One concerns property and will be treated in more detail in section 5 below. This original contract, Kant stresses, is only an idea of reason and not a historical event. Any rights and duties stemming from an original contract do so not because of any particular historical provenance, but because of the rightful relations embodied in the original contract. No empirical act, as a historical act would be, could be the foundation of any rightful duties or rights. The idea of an original contract limits the sovereign as legislator. The consent at issue, however, is also not an empirical consent based upon any actual act. The set of actual particular desires of citizens is not the basis of determining whether they could possibly consent to a law. Rather, the kind of possibility at issue is one of rational possible unanimity based upon fair distributions of burdens and rights in abstraction from empirical facts or desires. His first example is a law that would provide hereditary privileges to members of a certain class of subjects. This law would be unjust because it would be irrational for those who would not be members of this class to agree to accept fewer privileges than members of the class. One might say that no possible empirical information could cause all individuals to agree to this law. If the tax is administered fairly, it would not be unjust. Kant adds that even if the actual citizens opposed the war, the war tax would be just because it is possible that the war is being waged for legitimate reasons that the state but not the citizens know about. Here possible empirical information might cause all citizens to approve the law. The possible consent is not based upon a hypothetical vote given actual preferences but is based on a rational conception of agreement given any possible empirical information. The social contract is not a historical document and does not involve a historical act. In fact it can be dangerous to the stability of the state to even search history for such empirical justification of state power 6: The current state must be understood, regardless of its origin, to embody the social contract. The social contract is a rational justification for state power, not a result of actual deal-making among individuals or between them and a government. Another link to Hobbes is that the social contract is not voluntary. Individuals may be forced into the civil condition against their consent 6: Social contract is not based on any actual consent such as a voluntary choice to form a civil society along with others. Since the social contract reflects reason, each human being as a rational being already contains the basis for rational agreement to the state. Are individuals then coerced to recognize their subjection to state power against their will? A substantial difference between Kant and Hobbes is that Hobbes bases his argument on the individual benefit for each party to the contract, whereas Kant bases his argument on Right itself, understood as freedom for all persons in general, not just for the individual benefit that the parties to the contract obtain in their own particular freedom. Republics, Enlightenment, and Democracy Kant was a central figure in the philosophy of the Enlightenment. The private use of reason is, for government officials, the use of reason they must utilize in

their official positions. The public use of reason is the use an individual makes of reason as a scholar reaching the public world of readers. For example, the same member of the clergy could, as a scholar, present perceived shortcomings in that very same doctrine. Similarly, military officers can, using public reason, question the value or appropriateness of the orders they receive, but in their functions as military officers, using private reason, they are obliged to obey the same orders. Since the sovereign might err, and individual citizens have the right to attempt to correct the error under the assumption that the sovereign does not intend to err: One might expect from this emphasis that Kant would insist that the proper political system is one that not only allows individuals to think for themselves about political issues, but also contains a mechanism such as voting to translate those well reasoned opinions into government policy. One would be wrong. Kant does not stress self-government. Despotism is their unity such that the same ruler both gives and enforces laws, in essence making an individual private will into the public will. Republics require representation in order to ensure that the executive power only enforces the public will by insisting that the executive enforce only laws that representatives of the people, not the executive itself, make. Kant does, nonetheless, think that an elected representative legislator is the best form of a republic 8: Whether elected or unelected, the moral person who holds legislative power is representative of the people united as a whole, and is thus sovereign. When Kant discusses voting for representatives, he adheres to many prevailing prejudices of the time 8: He holds that a single individual or small group can themselves adequately represent the people at large simply by adopting the point of view of the people. Insistence on a representative system 8: Nonetheless it is clear that Kant holds that such an elective representative system is ideal. Republican constitutions, he claims, are prone to avoid war because, when the consent of the people is needed, they will consider the costs they must endure in a war fighting, taxes, destruction of property, etc , whereas a non-republican ruler may be insulated from such concerns.

Chapter 2 : Essays In Sociology And Social Philosophy Peregrine Books – Download PDF Now

The essays here collected fall into three groups. The first gives an account of the principal problems and methods of sociology and an analysis of the work of some outstanding sociological thinkers. The second is devoted to a study of national character and the causes of antagonism between nations.

In an empirical science the generalizations concerning a specified field of inquiry are drawn from facts observed in that field or in closely related fields these generalizations are drawn. Without assuming any knowledge on a level of higher abstraction concerning reality as a whole. All propositions that constitute an empirical science from a self-sufficient system. No propositions are allowed to play a role in the system if it contains knowledge which is not empirical. In other words it is not formulated under the limitations just stated. On the contrary philosophy is primarily an attempt to understand reality in its totality. From a multitude of observed facts the philosopher proceeds to certain ultimate principles which have taken together attempt to explain reality as a whole. Thus whereas the sociologist explains society in terms of acts observed in society and eventually in related fields of empirical knowledge, the social philosopher explains society in terms of the explanation he gives to total reality. The latter can speak of the first causes, supreme values and ultimate ends the sociologist is not entitled to do so. Modern philosophy and sociology came into existence during one time period to explain the social crisis of Europe in the 19th century. Sociology aimed to be in with to provide a social doctrine that would guide social policy. This aim has now been abandoned. There exist some links between sociology and philosophy. There is a philosophy of sociology in the same sense as a philosophy of science that is an examination of the methods, concepts and arguments used in sociology. There is a close relationship between sociology and moral and social philosophy the subject matter of sociology is human social behavior as guided by values: On occasions the sociologist is made to distinguish between fact and value. It is only by some training that social philosophy becomes competent to distinguish between fact and value. It can be said that the study of sociology leads to philosophical quest. Durkheim thought that sociology has to necessarily contribute to a renewal of philosophical questions. This made him indulge in some epistemological discussions a branch of philosophy. Karl Mannheim argued that sociology of knowledge had implications for epistemology. Both of them thought that sociology can make a direct contribution to philosophy. While sociology leads to philosophical reflections much of it also begins there. Sociological research will become trivial if it ignores the larger problems of social life which are coordinated in philosophical world-views and in social doctrines.

Chapter 3 : Sample essay on Sociology and Social Philosophy

Philosophy Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer - no Kindle device required.

Sociology is comparatively a new science, hence its scope is yet to be determined clearly and scholars differ about its definition too. Sociology is the science of social science. It includes all the aspects of society. Thus, infact, sociology includes all the subjects which are studied sociologically. It studies social traditions, process and behaviour, forms of social events and their interrelation impact of social forces on social relations, etc. The preceding analysis of the scope of sociology clarifies its relation with social philosophy. The two study the same problems from different angles and with different methodology. Social philosophy is a normative science, while sociology is prescriptive one. But both facts and values, deals and ideals are important in human life. Sociology studies the society within the limitation of time and place, but social philosophy studies human society as a part of universe value without facts are empty ideals, facts without valves are meaningless. Thus social philosophy and sociology are interdependent. Social philosophy takes the facts from sociology and examines them in the light of the supreme goal of human life. The following are the fundamental differences between sociology and social philosophy: The subjects of study in sociology and social philosophy are different whereas social philosophy studies human values, sociology examines social relations, processes, events and the facts related there to. If at all sociology considers values, it considers them as facts. The approach of sociology is factual while that of social philosophy is exillogical. Sociology describes social relations as they are, but social philosophy evaluates them in the light of supreme human ideals and values. The method of sociology is scientific, but that of social philosophy is philosophical. Social Philosophy looks at every event as a part of the whole from a synoptic view point based on direct perception, intutional, learning and logic. Hence it is critical not merely descriptive.

Chapter 4 : Kant's Social and Political Philosophy (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Philosophy, Ideology, and Social Science: Essays in Negation and Affirmation. István Mészáros - - St. Martin's Press. The Sociology of Karl Mannheim: With a Bibliographical Guide to the Sociology of Knowledge, Ideological Analysis, and Social Planning.

Essay on Social Welfare and Social Security! Social welfare is a very old concept. Its origin is in the spontaneous and neighbourly assistance extended to persons in distress. People used to help others in times of calamity and need—financial and physical. In this sense, it is as old a concept as the community life itself. Early social welfare philosophy was mainly dominated by religious and moralistic motives rather than the selfless desire to assist them materially. It was closely related with the religious ideas of philanthropy and alms giving. And, this idea is still continuing. Charity gets over into the mores and it used to have powerful religious sanction. Most of these activities are performed individually or in the form of a trust. But, in recent decades, social welfare has taken an institutional character as has been defined by Kuid and Roller. Before industrialization either these problems were non-existent or their amount was not so large that they could attract the attention of the people. After the development of science and technology, it was felt that the problems caused by industrialization may be solved with the use of scientific methods and thus the concept of social welfare came into existence. He argued that sociology should contribute to the welfare of the humanity by using science to understand and control human behaviour. Comte believed that sociology was the means by which a more just rational social order can be established and society can be reconstructed. In this connection, it will not be out of place to mention that the early sociologist W. Sumner and many others were against all state-directed welfare schemes. He believed that an unfit has no right for support. They have to leave the planet. It is also an important instrument for the well-being of workers of organized and unorganized sectors both and their family members as well as too young and old people who are unable to earn their living to sustain their life for a variety of reasons. The protection and assistance traditionally afforded by kin and community to the young, elders and other disabled members of the family is now dwindling after industrialisation due to the breakdown of joint family. The Beveridge Plan may be said as the first planned effort, directed to integrate social welfare and security programmes. Its attack on five giants, namely, want, disease, ignorance, squalor and idleness, was the beginning of the modern social security programmes. A comprehensive social security programme, launched to provide a national minimum standard of living for every citizen, is thus understood as a distinguishing feature of a welfare state. A welfare state is responsible for providing the means whereby all its members can reach minimum standard of health, economic security and civilized living and can share according to their capacity in the social and cultural heritage. On the other hand, social welfare programmes seek to supplement the statutory social security programmes and meet the particular individual needs which do not fit into the common pattern. It was said that welfare without security or vice versa is not possible. Social welfare and social security are thus intimately linked up but they are pursuing different ends. Social security refers to a state of mind as well as an objective fact. It is mainly directed towards providing income security as a preliminary to a state of social and psychological well-being. Social welfare, on the other hand, is broadly understood as the end product of possession of goods, positions in life and supply of services to help a person live in wholesome contentment and communication with others in the group.

Chapter 5 : Heidegger death philosophy essay

Social Philosophy seems to be the meeting point of sociology and philosophy. Its role in the social sciences is "the study of the fundamental principles and concepts of social life in their epistemological and axiological aspects".

Chapter 6 : Sociology and Philosophy Critical Essays - blog.quintoapp.com

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Chapter 7 : Social Philosophy Essays Examples For College & High School Students in PDF | EliteEssayW

Sociology doesn't necessarily have a philosophy, it is a branch of the social sciences that concerns itself with studying human societies (both past and present.) Its focus ranges from the minute.

Chapter 8 : Weber's Sociology. The Ideal-Type Explaining Social Phenomena Essay

'History and the Social Sciences', in the Institute of Sociology, The Social Sciences Review of L. Strauss, The Political Philosophy of Hobbes, in Cambridge Review, 58 . Review of M. Ginsberg, Reason and Unreason in Society, in English Historical.

Chapter 9 : What Is Sociology? - Essay

Social Reconstructinism: An Effective Philosophy Essay - According to Sadker and Zittleman social reconstructinism encourages, "schools, teachers, and students to focus their studies and energies on alleviating pervasive social inequalities and, as the name implies, reconstruct society into a new and more just social order".