
**A CHARACTERISING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
MODERNITY AND SOCIOLOGY: THE UNDERSTANDINGS OF
SECULARISATION, URBANISATION, AND SOLIDARITY**

**MODERNİTE VE SOSYOLOJİ ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİNİN
SEKÜLERLEŞME, KENTLEŞME VE DAYANIŞMA BAĞLAMINDA
KARAKTERİZE EDİLMESİ**

**ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКА ОТНОШЕНИЙ МЕЖДУ
СОВРЕМЕННОСТЬЮ И СОЦИОЛОГИЕЙ В КОНТЕКСТЕ
СЕКУЛЯРИЗАЦИИ, УРБАНИЗАЦИИ И СОЛИДАРНОСТИ**

Bariş ÇAĞIRKAN*

Abstract

This paper aims to characterise the relationship between modernity and sociology in the context of secularisation, urbanisation and solidarity. The emergence of sociology as a discipline has been connected with the emergence of modernity. While modernity emphasises a different society and social structure, sociology has become the most critical part of this interpretation and its attempt to understand and explain. The study aims to explain the strong relationship between the basis of modernity and sociology by examining the work of Emile Durkheim and Max Weber which are one of the first studies to understand the new society understanding of modernism. The differences of modernity caused the social actors to be in doubt about themselves, and ontological insecurity emerged in this context. Some of the ideas have developed by sociologists about social change process will be examined in this context. Durkheim and Weber focus on the study of social order, change and social relations, which is a significant concern showing two basic methodological and theoretical ideas in the sociology tradition. Weber and Durkheim's optimistic and pessimistic attitude towards social change will be questioned in the conclusion section. The definitions of modernism and sociology will be discussed in order to determine Durkheim and Weber's long-term theoretical studies and methodological assumptions in sociology against the social change in the nineteenth century.

Keywords: Modernisation, Modernity, Secularisation, Urbanisation, Solidarity.

* ORCID: 0000-0002-0013-1831 Araştırma Görevlisi, Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, Bitlis ve Yöresi Tarih ve Kültür Uygulama ve Araştırma Merkezi (BİTAM) Yönetim Kurulu Üyesi, bcagirkan@gmail.com

Öz

Bu makale, modernite ile sosyoloji arasındaki ilişkiyi sekülerleşme, kentleşme ve dayanışma anlayışı kapsamında karakterize etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Disiplin olarak sosyolojinin ortaya çıkışı aynı zamanda modernitenin ortaya çıkışı ile paralel olmuştur. Modernite farklı bir toplum anlayışı ve toplum yapısına vurgu yaparken sosyoloji ortaya çıkan bu toplumu ve yapıyı anlama ve açıklama çabasının en önemli parçası olmuştur. Çalışma modernizmin ortaya koyduğu yeni toplum anlayışını anlamaya yönelik ilk çalışmalardan Emile Durkheim ve Max Weber'in çalışmalarını inceleyerek modernite ve sosyoloji temeli arasındaki güçlü ilişkiyi açıklamak ve bu ilişkinin farklı yönlerine vurgu yapmayı hedeflemektedir. Modernitenin ortaya koyduğu farklılıklar toplumsal aktörlerin kendileri hakkında şüpheye düşmelerine neden olmuş ve bu bağlamda bir ontolojik güvensizlik durumu ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu durum kapsamında sosyologların sosyal değişim sürecine yönelik geliştirdiği düşüncelerden bazıları çalışmada incelenecektir. Durkheim ve Weber'in toplumsal düzen, değişim ve sosyal ilişkiyi ele alırken yaptıkları çalışmalara odaklanarak, sosyoloji geleneğinde iki temel metodolojik ve teorik düşünceyi göstermesi açısından son derece önemlidir. Bu düşünürlerin bilimsel çalışmaları ve modernite ile bağlantıları, Weber ve Durkheim'in sosyal değişime karşı iyimser ve kötümser tavrı, sonuç bölümünde sorgulanacaktır. Durkheim ve Weber'in uzun soluklu teorik çalışmalarının ve sosyolojideki metodolojik varsayımların 19. yüzyıldaki sosyal değişim karşısında konumlarını belirlemesi açısından modernizm ve sosyolojinin tanımları yapılırken iki terim de birbirini kullanmasının temel nedenleri tartışılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Modernleşme, Modernite, Sekülerleşme, Kentleşme, Dayanışma.

Аннотация

Цель нижеследующей статьи, охарактеризовать отношения между современностью и социологией в контексте секуляризации, урбанизации и солидарности. Социология, как дисциплина появилась параллельно с модернизацией. В то время, как модернизация указывает на иное понимание общества и социальной структуры, социология стала наиболее важной частью попытки понятия и объяснения нового общества и его структуры. Цель исследования, на основе трудов Эмиля Дюркгейма и Макса Вебера, одних из первых исследователей модернизма в новом обществе, объяснить тесную связь между основами современности и социологией и указывать на различные аспекты этих отношений. Различия современности заставили социальных актёров усомниться в себе и в этом контексте возникла ситуация онтологической незащищенности. В исследовании будут рассмотрены некоторые идеи, разработанные социологами по поводу изменений в социальной жизни. Труды Дюркгейма и Вебера очень важны с точки зрения демонстрации методологических и теоретических идей социологической традиции. Они дают возможность на сосредоточение внимания к социальному порядку, изменений и отношениям. Основываясь на многолетнюю теоретическую работу Дюркгейма и Вебера и социольных изменений 19-го века, будет обсуждаться основной смысл терминов - модернизм и социология.

Ключевые слова: модернизация, современность, секуляризация, урбанизация, солидарность.

Introduction

Modernity and sociology are linked to each other. Definition the modernity and sociology are used each other in a sentence. The basis of sociology and the emergence of modernity exhibit one of the well-known historical links (Ashley and Orenstein, 2005). To define the modernity, sociologists ask some questions to understand the modernity and modernism that are “what does it mean to be modern? When did the modern age begin? Are we modern?” All these questions can be answered in different ways. Historically, the relationship between sociology and modernity are controversial because there are the numbers of modernity definitions. One of the significant reasons for this that modernity is accepted as a period and many social scientists describe this period different beginning time and describe different ways of understandings and interpretations.

A link between sociology and modernity might seem vague. “If sociology grew with modernity, as its mode of self-monitoring, then it could never achieve the distance to the object that every analytical endeavour requires” (Wagner, 1994: 9). Modernity is the mode of our time which means what is happening at the moment (Harrington, 2005). It is important to note that Baudelaire was the first gave a vague to the idea of modernity in his essay. His definition is a celebrated one: “modernity is that which is ephemeral, fugitive, and contingent”. Baudelaire himself understood modernity as merely the quality of contemporaneity or presentness (Sayer, 1991: 9).

By way of introduction, it is necessary to define the modernity. For Harrington, “modernity is generally thought as a period, with starting at a particular point in time” (2005: 26). The beginning of a particular point often changes according to the social scientist’s views. However, it is a general belief that modernity began in the late 18th centuries with the Industrial Revolution in Europe and the spread of the ideas of the French Revolution. Moreover, finally, this term is called Enlightenment (Swingewood, 2000). These steps “shaped modernity across a long-term historical time-span” (Hall, 2006: 9). At this point, sociology begins to make itself visible in Europe. It is not a coincidence that the classical sociologists study the issues associated with the consequences of modernity (Harriss, 2000).

On the other hand, the changes in individual and social life in Europe are understood different ways of modernism which begin with the Renaissance in Italy fifteen century. Modernity is contrasted with tradition, a traditional way of living. Industrial Revolution, the French Revolution, Renaissance and Protestant Reformation were to lead to change the society.

Moreover, these changes were tremendous that is why two different societies were distinguished between modern society and traditional society. However, it is a plausible explanation that modern society is shaped by industrialisation and advances in science and technology. Wagner (1994: 3) points out “the so-called industrial, and democratic revolutions are sometimes seen as the social phenomena constituting modernity”. The work of Harrington (2005) states “traditionalism is often associated with so-called primitive, tribal social forms or the society of the dark ages”. As it mentioned before, sociologists explain the modernity in different ways and dimensions. This essay is going to discuss the relationship between modernity and sociology the understandings of secularisation, urbanisation, and solidarity.

The foundation of sociology, all the great classical sociological theorists, were concerned, in one way or another, with the modern world and its issues. Rietzer (1996) describes “there is more continuity than discontinuity between the world today and the world that existed around the last fin de siecle.” The first understanding of sociology was a solution for all social issues which are new for the societies. There was a practical use for sociology that finds a solution and most significantly predicts the social issues before they occur. Turner

(1992: 7) notes “the discussion about modernity has raised once more the question of the exact nature of modernity. Sociology stands in a crucial relationship to this discussion because sociology arose with Saint Simon’s ideas of industrialised society as both the study and output of modernity. As the study of the social, sociology was quintessentially modern.” If we need to determine the sociology, Anthony Giddens (2001: 3) provides the following general definition: “sociology is the study of human social life, groups and societies”. Sociologists study social events, interactions, and patterns. They then state theories to demonstrate why these happen and what can result from them. Modernity causes many issues in society, and some social scientists are persuaded that thanks to modernity, sociology is considered as an independent academic discipline.

Weber and Secularisation

Max Weber is “one of the classical sociologists who focused on the modern-capitalist world by his sociological, religious and philosophical studies” (Alkin, 2014: 5-6). His interdisciplinary works are observed on today’s social scientific endeavour. Weber seeks to explain some differences component of modern European civilisation to exam legal-rational authority, bureaucratic administration, and capitalist production. Weber defines “the core components of modernisation regarding a growing rationalisation of the various spheres of society, an increasing secularisation which brought about the disenchantment of reality, an irreversible development of bureaucratisation, and a growing pluralisation of values and beliefs” (Turner, 1992: 7). Modern social institutions have been deliberately created or arranged by human beings, and that, therefore, belongs to the world of artefacts. This artificiality is to make modern social life comprehensible; sociologists can understand its systems despite their complexity because human beings have constructed them for reasons or purposes (Kronman, 1983). As it mentioned before, Weber linked modernity to rationality. Modernity changed all society that is the reason Weber argue different sort of rationality, for example, state, law, economy, music, culture rationalisation. All these are related to the society, and sociologists are to understand and explain this new social measurement.

Sociology is one of the leading scientific disciplines to understand and interpret society in different forms. The key word “scientific” makes the sociology like other disciplines such as physic, biology, chemistry etc. to provide an information scientific which means that the knowledge which is provided by sociologist need to be measurable. The rationalisation is the other key term for sociology become scientific. The term calculation has a significant role in the theme of rationalisation. Morrison (1995: 220) states that Weber used “the calculation to explain the introduction of money in the sphere of commerce brought about a form of calculation in human activities which was far more precise than any traditional method of social action and measurement”. Senigaglia (2011) indicates that Weber defines an ideal type to understand and explain bureaucratic rationalisation and modern society. The ideal type covers many sectors of society: state, private industry, political parties, and institutions. Moreover, the ideal form can be fruitfully used to understand them in different societies. Modernity is a period that is why some societies are in a different level of modernity. The ideal type formations provide different sorts of understanding of the modernity for Weber in the various societies. Kronman (1983: 166) contends that Weber asserts “the institution of modern society is distinguished by their high degree of rationality”. Moreover, Weber points out “modern occidental culture exhibits particular and peculiar rationalism.” In an article by Reckling (2001: 162), for Weber, “the most important cultural significance in western modernity culminates in the rationalisation of all spheres of living”. Rationalism could indicate very different things, but Weber

essentially used “the term rationalisation to describe the process by which an orientation increasingly masters’ nature, society and individual action to planning, technical procedure and rational action” (Morrison, 1995: 218). Weber refers to rationality to explain the differences between modern society and pre-modern society.

Kronman (1983: 168) maintains “all forms of traditional authority rest on the assumption that social norms, far from being human artefacts, belongs to a permanently fixed order and form part of an uncreated, pre-existing world in which the fateful circumstances of their birth assign individuals a place”. In this world belongs to a complete, unbroken and unalterable natural order. In contrast, wherever human turns today, he sees only himself, only the artefacts of his creative industry; today people live in a world that has been humanised and, in this sense, disenchanted (Morrison et al. 1995: 169). This humanised world can only be understood, explained, and interpreted by sociologists because the only sociologist has reliable data to analyse the society.

Weber argues the rationalisation and the human intellectual understanding “the rationalisation of the law has undoubtedly increased the control we have over our own social life.” In case of Weber’s ideas about the modernity, they all can be collected “religious asceticism and the modern ethics, the bureaucratisation of life and its standardisation, the contrasts between hedonism and discipline, the disappearance of the autonomous liberal individual in the iron cage of state regulation, the emergence of science out of the irrational religious quest, the decline of charismatic authority with the spread of the administrative machine. These developments describe modernisation” (Turner, 1992: vii). Weber thought that all the areas of society, including the economic, political and legal spheres underwent the process of rationalisation, and it was this, he believed, which led to the rise of modern society (Morrison, 1995: 218). Weber’s conception of the modern occidental form of rationality and the age-old process of disenchantment that has defined the historically unique career of Western culture (Kronman, 1983).

Durkheim: Solidarity and Urbanisation

Durkheim was the most scientific of the entire classic sociologist. Reference to Durkheim, “The essential laws of sociology show how changes in the patterns of social interaction determine variations in people’s behaviour and beliefs” (Collins, 1994: 186). The ensuring social and political changes taking place in France during this period which is the beginning of “the modernity shaped the intellectual and social climate in which Durkheim worked” (Morrison, 1995: 120). In this time, the social norms and rules were changing. The members of the societies were learning how to live these new norms and regulations — this new form of society needed to be explained by new methods and knowledge which was produced scientific discipline.

The society was changing, and these changes were making useless or meaningless previous societies’ order, values, etc. that is why the new notion of society was to be determined new sort of solidarity among the members. Durkheim explains these new social issues in Ritzer (1996: 17) “the majority of Durkheim’s work was devoted to the social order. His view was that social disorders were not a necessary part of the modern world”. Morrison (1995: 128) states “this work is first and foremost a study that developed a way of thinking about the society that was completely new and, as such, it has several key aims”. Nisbet (1965) points out that The Division of Labour was persuaded to prove that the function of the division of labour in modern society is the integration of individuals through their pursuit of complementary and symbolic specialisation, thus making possible the termination of traditional mechanisms of social constraint. The function of the division of labour is social: that is, “integration” (Nisbet, 1965: 34). The division of labour defines “the division of labour

refers to the process of dividing up labour so that different people perform different tasks” (Morrison, 1995: 144). Durkheim focuses on social solidarity in *The Division of Labour*. Durkheim used the term solidarity in several different ways.

Moreover, he identifies two different sorts of solidarity. Morrison (1995: 128) mentions some different solidarity meanings in Durkheim’s work: “the first; solidarity refers to the system of social bonds which link individuals to society, the second; to identify a system of social relations linking individuals to each other and to the society as a whole and the third; Durkheim uses solidarity to describe the degree of social integration”. Modernity, as it mentioned before, is a period, and some societies are in the different level of this stage. In this point, Durkheim turned his attention to seeking how social solidarity is expressed in different communities.

Collins (1994: 188) asserts that where there is a high social destiny, the structure changes towards a complex division of labour. When this happens, social roles become more specialised and then entire society is getting more interdependent at the same time that people are becoming more different from each other. Modernity is to key the understand the new form of society. The social life is different in modern society which means the notion of workers is different from than before. The changes in workers’ lives are to need to determine social roles for all members of society. Morrison (1995: 129) contends “solidarity can be expressed in two comprehensive and distinct ways, and the terms Durkheim used to designate these are mechanical and organic solidarity”. Durkheim interpreted the differences between modern society and traditional society which is to be considered a previous way of life. Durkheim distinguished the different sorts of solidarity for each understanding of social order. In other words, the solidarity is to key term to interpret the new social norms and regulations. According to Giddens (1972: 141), the changing in the society “Durkheim claims that it is a historical law that mechanical solidarity progressively loses ground and that organic solidarity gradually gets preponderant.

However, when the mode of solidarity becomes changed, the structure of societies becomes changing”. The changes make the difficult to accomplish the complete integration in society. Durkheim seeks the obstacles of integration which arises due to modernity. People have been getting isolated from more substantial structures of close-knit social relationship which had been the present pre-modern society (Dodd, 1999). Regarding mechanical solidarity, it refers to the pre-modern societies. Mechanical solidarity does not exist in modern society. This society is based on common roots identity and similarity. The population is often homogeneous and small. In this society, the division of labour is based on social cooperation, with little or no specialisation.

On the other hand, the significant characteristic of organic solidarity is the development of labour. This new society has new rules and norms. Organic solidarity is characterised by a rise in the destiny of society due to the expansion of population, the growth of cities, and the development of means of transportation and communication. This solidarity refers to explain the modern society which is after the industrial revolution; cities were more significant than before because in the cities there had set up many factories. This is called urbanisation, basically many people came from the country to the city and worked in factories. These newcomers who do not know before and do not have any relationship with each other have organic solidarity. However, they have a different cultural background, or more those people led a similar lifestyle the birth of mass society. Moreover, organic solidarity has increased the complexity of the division of labour (Morrison et al. 1995).

Durkheim forges correlations between organic solidarity and modernity. Modern society has organic solidarity which is more complex and problematic. Durkheim himself

concluded “modern life was revolving around functional roles. When new solidarity is not produced, it is because the relations of the organs are not regulated because they are in a state of anomie” (cited Marks, 1974: 330). During the changing from mechanical to organic solidarity, it is changing from pre-modern to modern society, and in a society, all norms are to improve. In that time, the whole society in a situation is anomie. In this anomie situation, everything is meaningless. People change organic solidarity. At the beginning of the modernity was the anomie situation because modernity changed the social rules and norms.

Conclusion

The transformation from pre-modern society to modern society is the most notable social change ever occurred in history. During that period, there are many interpretations of understanding this change. And this transition is called modernisation and is described in various ways. However, the crucial characteristic of the modern age from the seventeenth century to the twenty century is determined as modernity. As many scholars state that modernisation refers to the process emerge of modernity. Modernity and modernisation both interpreted differently, and sociology is founded as a scientific discipline in that period to understand what is modernity and how it changes the social structure. The founders of sociology are to understand and explain this process in their ways. Sociology changed the understanding of society and how to examine social issues.

Classic sociologists are first to use the new methods to provide scientific knowledge to interpret the new society which is called modern society today. Modern, modernity and modernisation have the all different notion, and also these terms emphasise the different factors such as urbanisation, secularisation, a division of labour, and solidarity. Classical sociologist Max Weber and Emile Durkheim emphasised different aspects of modernisation. Moreover, these sociologists were to use a different methodology into the sociology to describe and understand the modern issues. However, both sociologists asked the same the critical question that "what the main characteristics of modernity are?" Max Weber answered rationalisation and secularisation. Emile Durkheim indicates industrialisation. Weber states that the primary form of belief in pre-modern society was religion. Religion was to determine the community in different forms. Following the process, rationalisation is the sort of action that religion has changed the place by science. Knowledge and belief are the same in the pre-modern society, but in modern society, those are separated. Moreover, modern society is characterised by secularisation.

Religion was the key to understand the solidarity in pre-modern societies. Durkheim concluded that earlier societies were held together primarily by nonmaterial social facts. Specifically, a strong held conventional morality, or what he called a robust collective conscience. However, because of the complexities of modern society, there had been a decline in the strength of the collective conscience. Durkheim contends that in modern society, science created the reliable positivist technology. This technology is to use increasing production. Eventually, this makes the mass production to make it possible to live in big cities. Thanks to the high technology, machines are invented, and these machines are used in the big factories to supply populated cities. Due to the migration from the countryside to the cities, megacities are created. This situation made the first-time people who have different cultural, ethnic, social status background needed to live in the same society, and this was changed the structure of the society. People created an artificial environment. This society is called the industrial society that is based on the division of labour. Thanks to the division of labour, people can manage the complex organisations of work. The new social system is to bring about anomie that is defined as a confused state of mind. Durkheim points out two different solidarities which are organic and mechanic. Mechanic solidarity is to

describe the pre-modern society that people were living in rural areas and followed the traditional lifestyles.

On the contrary, organic solidarity is created by the division of labour. This new solidarity is a new integration into modern society. Thanks to the organic solidarity, anomie situation can be ended.

Reference

- Ashley, D. and Orenstein, D. M. (2005). *Sociological Theory: Classical Statements*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Collins, R. (1994). *Four Sociological Traditions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dodd, N. (1999). *Social Theory and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (1972). *Emile Durkheim: Selected Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giddens, A. (2001). *Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, S. (2006). *Introduction*. IN: Hall, S., Held, D., Hubert, D., and Thompson, K (Eds.), *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies*. Oxford, Blackwell, p.1-18.
- Harrington, A. (2005). *Classical Social Theory I: Contexts and Beginnings*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, J. (2000). *The Second Great Transformation? Capitalism at the End of the Twentieth Century*. IN: Allen, T. and Thomas, A. (Eds.), *Poverty and Development into the 21st Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 325-342.
- Kronman, A. (1983). *Max Weber*. London: Routledge.
- Marks, S. (1974) Durkheim's Theory of Anomie. *American Journal of Sociology*, 80 (2), 329-363.
- Morrison, K. (1995). *Marx, Durkheim, Weber: Formations of Modern Social Thought*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Nisbet, R. (1965). *Emile Durkheim* IN: Coser, L. (eds) *Emile Durkheim: Makers of Modern Social Science*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Reckling, F. (2001) Interpreted Modernity Weber and Taylor on Values and Modernity. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 4 (2), 153-176.
- Ritzer, G. (1996). *Modern Sociological Theory*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
- Sayer, D. (1991). *Capitalism and Modernity: An Excursus on Marx and Weber*. London: Routledge.
- Senigaglia, C. (2011) Max weber and the Parliamentary Bureaucracy of His Time. *The History of Representative and Parliamentary Institutions*, 31 April, 53-66.
- Swingewood, A. (2000). *A Short History of Sociological Thought*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Turner, B. (1992). *Max Weber: From History to Modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Wagner, P. (1994). *A Sociology of Modernity Liberty and Discipline*. London: Routledge.