

Social Change – A Theoretical Perspective of Classical Sociologists

Rajendran Kirushikkah, B.A.(Hons) in Sociology & Anthropology,
Eastern University, Sri Lanka, Email ID: kirushi83@gmail.com.

ABSTRACT

Sociology is the field that studies individuals, society, social institutions, and behavior. While this sociology contains various ideas, social change is also seen as an important issue. Social change refers to change in culture, behavior, social institutions and social structure. In this way, this research paper clarifies the evolution of society and social change along with the theoretical thoughts of Classical sociologists such as Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer and Emile Durkheim. In the theoretical view of Classical sociologists, it is clear that the society has passed through many stages of development and that development has caused social change. It is significant that the theoretical thoughts of the early Classical sociologists have been instrumental in the development of today's modern era and its transformation. Classical Sociologists's theories of social change have different stages of development. How society evolves and undergoes change at each stage, and how society, culture, customs, ethics, values, behavior of individuals, and the trend of social institutions are shaped at each stage by classical sociologists such as Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer and Emile Durkheim. This review also analyses theories of social change.

Keywords: Social Change, Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer, Emile Durkheim.

1. Introduction

Among the basic ideas found in sociology, social change is seen as important. Change is a universal phenomenon. Change is the Law of nature. Society is also seen as dialectical, so social change is taking place in all societies at all times. The term social change is used to describe changes in human interaction and relationships. Social change refers to changes in the pattern of social relations. Social relations are defined by the terms social processes, social interactions and social arrangements. Desirable changes in all three are called social change. Kingsley Davis refers to changes in the structure and functioning of society that is changes in social organization as social change. Social change is a new style, dress, and Fashion. It transforms or displaces the past. It transforms the old in people's lives or social activities. Social change is a continuous process. Innumerable changes are taking place in the society. To avoid these changes, society cannot be protected by confinement. Social change does not happen in a vacuum. It takes place in a geographical or physical and cultural context. So social change may be related to environment. Social change occurs as a result of the interaction of many factors. A combination of physical, biological, technological and cultural factors brings about a change. Apart from these, there are Strain & Conflicts, social problems, Revolutions and Upheavals, cultural change, political changes, industrial divisions, imbalances, economic inequality and disruptions. Social change are the causative factors. On the basis of such factors, every society has evolved in different stages according to the change of time and the theoretical thoughts of Classical sociologists point out that they are seen as social change.

The industrial revolution that took place in many continental countries in the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century also played a very important role in the development of sociology. It is in the background of these western contexts of industrial revolution, capitalism and revolutionary reactions that Classical sociologists can be seen in their emergence and development of thought. The focus of this thinker was the human suffering brought by the capitalist economic system, the urbanization resulting from the industrial revolution, the problems faced by the people in adapting their lives to the urbanization, and the changes seen in the main religious ideologies in the new revolutionary environment.

In this way, Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer and Emile Durkheim are receiving attention as basic classical sociological thinkers. Classical thinkers presented themselves as social science educators who differed from the tradition of speculative moral philosophical thought. This is the domain that unites all classical thinkers. It is also worth noting here that

they have to face internal and external obstacles in achieving this goal. They could not completely let go of moral concepts before clarity about the new goal. However, through their reliable analysis of the forces of modernization and their impact on the human environment, they sought the glory of social science. In this way, this research is based on the view of classical sociologists such as Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer and Emile Durkheim that the society has passed through each step according to the change of time and there are many stages of social development. Descriptive analysis reveals that these are seen as social change.

1.1. Statement of the Research Problem

This research article study is based on theoretical analysis of the social change and social evolution stages of Classical sociologists Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer and Emile Durkheim . When viewed from the perspective of classical sociologists such as Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer and Emile Durkheim, each one's point of view indicates that social changes took place in many steps. In particular, Auguste Comte points out that the human mind has evolved in three stages and given birth to social change along with the three law of human Progress which are the theological Stage, Metaphysical Stage, and Positive Stage is mentioned.

According to Karl Marx theory of social change, society has evolved through four stages and social change has taken place. In particular, Marx sees human history as four stages based on the system of production, namely primitive communism, ancient society, feudal society, capitalist society. He mentions that society has changed through these four stages of production.

Herbert Spencer explains the evolution of societies in terms of Spencer's theory of social evolution. Society has evolved into four categories based on dichotomies. The first type is based on degree of Composition in Simple society and complex or compound societies and the second is based on the types of social Construction in Militant Societies and Industrial Societies. so he classifies it as types and further elucidates the social change.

Emile Durkheim refers to social change with his theory of division of labor. Durkheim sees the two types of society as two nodes of the same evolution. He clarifies social change by classifying it as a mechanical solidarity or primitive society and organic solidarity or Modern society.

As mentioned above, the theoretical thoughts and classifications of four classical sociologists are viewed from different angles regarding social change. The theory of social change is constructed on the basis of various causes and circumstances. This article aims to analyze this different trend and critical style.

1.2. Objectives of the Study

This study is aimed at analyzing the different theoretical thinking of classical sociologists such as Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer and Emile Durkheim and the stages of Progress or evolution that the society has achieved. Explaining them from a sociological perspective located.

1.3. Research Methods of the study

Descriptive analysis methodology has been used for this study. For this study, data was collected based on secondary data. Secondary sources of data have been obtained from books, research-related articles, research implications, journals, and websites. Various sources, electronic sources like Google, Google scholar, Academia, JOSTR etc. So Various research information that is collected from different books, articles, research articles, research work of other researchers, published documents and electronic sources.

1.4. Limitation of the study

Although this study has several themes related to sociology, it includes a unique theme related to social change. Also, although many sociological thinkers are seen as sociologists, they are defined as classical sociologists and among them Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer and Emile Durkheim, related to define the social change of four classical sociologists theoretical Perspective.

2. Results and Discussions of the study

2.1. Auguste Comte's theoretical perspective to social change

Auguste Comte (1798 – 1857) is considered to be France's greatest thinker, social philosopher, and the first sociologist. He is considered as the father of sociology as he laid the first foundation for the field of sociology. He worked hard to ensure that sociology, the science of society, should be considered on a par with other sciences. Auguste Comte's theoretical approach to social change is based on three law of human Progress.

Auguste Comte, who believed that society should be organized on a new basis, was the scientific manifestation of his attempt to create new rules, and his theory of the three law of human Progress. Based on this he developed a theory of both social development and human progress based on historical evolution. This theory states that human progress and social development are not separate phenomena, social development occurs through human progress. Humanity, society, and sciences pass through three stages: the theological stage, the metaphysical stage, and the positive stage. Therefore, his opinion is that the society has developed and changed in three stages and has reached the present scientific level.

The Law of Three Stages - Auguste Comte's theory of the Law of Three Stages is considered to be a major contribution to the field of sociology. Sociologists point out that this theory is the result of the influence of Charles Darwin's theory of evolution on Comte's field of thought. Comte developed a theory of social development and human progress, assuming that social phenomena, like natural phenomena, operate on the basis of immutable natural laws. His theory tends to explain social development scientifically. Thus Comte named this principle the Law of the three stages. Comte mentions that human thought or knowledge development or human progress or social development pass through the three stages mentioned by this theory. This means that social development has also passed through the Successive stages through which human thought or human progress has passed. Comte believes that the mind of the individual and the mind of the human society evolve in parallel. Comte holds that social development transcends these three stages, just as an individual can be seen as a radical optimist in childhood, as a critical microanalyst in adolescence, and as a natural philosopher throughout human life.

Stage 1 : Theological Stage or Fictitious Stage

Comte believed that the theological stage prevailed in human history until 1300 AD. Primitive man's thinking was seen to be based on God. They believed that all phenomena occur on earth due to the action of supernatural forces. Unable to find the true cause of the various phenomena taking place on earth, man tried to give them imaginary explanations or fell into connection with divine powers. Similarly, early people believed that success, failure, health, diseases etc. were caused by deity or spirit. The God-centered theological standard is further divided into three levels.

When investigating the origin of natural phenomena and their causes, the human mind believes that all phenomena, be they animate or inanimate, are caused by supernatural forces called gods and spirits. The human mind believes that even social events are the result of immediate actions of gods and spirits.

a. Fetishism

Man of this age was concerned with the existence of spirit or soul and believed that spirits were responsible for every phenomenon. It was during this period that idol worship took shape as a religion. The need for religious priests as mediators between God and man was not realized in this age.

b. Polytheism

When man's mind came to a state of better order, false material worship seemed troublesome to him. He began to think of many deities when innumerable fetishes created confusion. The appearance of religious gurus took place during this period to obtain God's blessings and goodwill. The man of this age began to believe in mantra and even the actions associated with it.

c. Monotheism

Innumerable gods created various mental confusions and contradictions for the people of this age. Thus when the gods were arranged in a hierarchy it eventually led to the idea of one God. People believed in the omnipotence of a single God. A deity worship is considered the climax level of theology . Theological thinking was seen as appropriate for a Military society.

Stage 2 : Metaphysical or Abstract Stage

This position is considered as an extension of theological thinking. From 1300 to 1800 AD, the theory of particle physics prevailed. It was during this period that the belief developed that an abstract power or force determines and guides world events. During this period rationalism began to grow somewhat in place of imagination. Rationalism says that God is behind every event and does not cause it. The principle of pure reasoning states that God is an unperceived being. This theory of causality led to the discovery of certain orders occurring in the natural world. Metaphysical thinking rejects the existence of a visible God. These subtle interpretations also do not give satisfaction to the human mind. This thinking applies to a legal type of society social structure.

Stage 3 : Scientific or Positive Stage

The non-realistic state refers to scientific thinking. Comte believed that a state of unreality had prevailed since 1800 AD. Comte believed that the beginning of the 19th century marked the beginning of the stage of unreality. Observation and Classification of facts are taken as the beginning of the scientific stage. In this case, all events are viewed with the eyes of knowledge and religious beliefs and superstition are rejected. Unrealistic thinking is becoming more and more compatible with the needs of the industrial society. Reality is the perception of any phenomenon through external senses. The human mind thinks that it is an act of knowledge to find and investigate such truths.

Comte does not just explain the development of human thought in terms of three stages. In turn he explained how society or social organization has evolved over time. Comte believes that social organizations have also evolved as the human mind, human knowledge, and human thought have gradually evolved in all three stages.

Theological thinking led the society to a social organization centered on the military and monarchy. In this society, God himself was regarded as the king of all kings in a hierarchical system. God was considered as mighty Mahavira. The human class was regulated by military formations. Divine laws reigned supreme. The laws were rarely questioned or accepted without question. People were punished with harsh punishments when social rules were violated or challenged.

Metaphysical thinking gave rise to government. It is similar to legal social organization. The social arrangements seen in the Middle Ages resembled such a society. In this social organization natural rights were placed in place of divine rights. Clergy made an appearance. Society during this period was seen as legal, formal and structured. The nation-states that emerged in Europe belong to this period.

Comte says that the Positive thinking creates a society that prioritizes businessmen. In this case, Comte believes that the human mind abandons the investigation of the origin and causes of natural phenomena and instead investigates the relationships and natures occurring between them scientifically and arises based on attempts to use natural forces for human benefit. Comte also says that the non-realistic thinking creates an industrial society and the people in that society will be seen as having the power to use the resources of nature. A great deal of attention was seen in this period on the use of resources for human welfare and on production and innovation.

It can be seen that the family is the basic unit of the society in the theological level in the social structure located in these three levels. At this stage the relationship between them is a close bond based on affection. In the second stable metaphysical theoretical position, the state is the basic unit of society. Due to this, the people in this state have a terrible respect for the government and the nature of their relationship is based on it. In reality, the social structure emerges from the small, limited domain of the state and into an expansive domain of humanity. He says that the human mind does not think in terms of our house, our government but in a metaphor called mankind.

In this way, social change has evolved into three stages of the human mind and has reached the present scientific level, and in each period, the social structure has followed each social institution and has maintained social order.

2.2. Karl Marx's theoretical perspective to social change

Karl Marx was born on May 5, 1818, in Rives, Perugia, into an aristocratic family. He was the first to establish scientific commons. One of the theories presented by him is the theory of Social Change. When Marx begins his theory of social change, he begins by saying that man creates his own history. He mentions that society undergoes change through factors of production and economic factors.

The first and foremost activity of man is economic activity. Man tries to dominate nature and bring nature's economic productive forces under his control. This activity permeates human history. Animals and humans live in nature. But animals adapt themselves to their natural environment. But man alone transforms the natural environment with tools. He makes history.

In man's struggle with nature, he also struggles with others. When one tries to bring nature's economic productive forces under his control, others are engaged in the same effort. This causes a struggle. In this some have succeeded in bringing the economic productive forces of nature under their control by bringing the means of production under their control, while others stand empty without ownership of them. Thus the system of production depends on ownership. Based on this, the social status is formed with two conflicting classes, the haves and the have-nots.

Thus the economic system, i.e. the mode of production, forms the basis of the society, the infrastructure, the internal structure, and determines the social superstructure. That is the basic

reason for the division of society into two classes. Classes are established in human society at every stage of history. Economic factor is the most important factor for it.

He says that historical evolution is not monotonous. Marx is well aware of the historical situations of human history, such as the many predicaments and temporary equilibria between social classes. Just as Comte saw several stages in society, Marx saw four stages in human history based on the mode of production.

1. primitive communism
2. Ancient society
3. Feudal society
4. Capitalist society

In this case the relations of man with others vary according to the mode of production. Common ownership appears in primitive commons. But it is also known that slavery was involved in the ancient production system, farmers were exploited in the plantation system and workers were exploited in the capitalist system. In these, apart from the primordial state of communalism, in three other states, people are exploited by the people and he struggles to get rid of it. He was interested not only in exploring this situation but also in exploring the resulting classless and egalitarian society. He strongly believed that when people engage in life struggle in such a material first process, the working class will gain more strength and act with political consciousness, capitalism will be overthrown and equality will be established. In this last stage a classless society prevails. There is no personal property in it. And he says there will be no distinction between those who are bound and those who control.

Each stage of development shows a different nature of productive forces, division of labor and historical composition. Not only the relations of a nation but also its internal structure depends on the growth achieved by that nation's production and internal integration. He says that the development of a nation can be known through its division of labour. The various types of development of the working class indicate its various properties. The division of labor determines one's relations with objects, tools, and production.

He sees the undeveloped state of production in the first stable Asiatic system of society. In this the means of production were common to all as community property. People everywhere freely hunted, fished, and herded animals to gather and live. There is no privacy in anything. The class of work was at its simplest defined by the family. The community structure was based on patriarchal lines. Marx refers to this stage as national socialism.

The second type is ancient system. It was formed when the individual was born. Pasture lands were privatized for cattle grazing. The labored farm animals were retained as private property. During this period slavery also appeared in the society. The wealthy kept slaves. Slaves, like objects, became the private property of their masters.

It was during this period that antagonism arose between town and village, and between industry and other business within the town. Here the class relations between the slaves and the peasants came into full view. It was during this period that slaves were the base of all production. And it was during this period that today's right to personal death arose.

Third, once agriculture became established, it grew and expanded to become a major economic activity. Land is the main means of production. It was followed by agrarian capitalism and landed aristocracy. Lands were monopolized by landed aristocracy. The landless people joined the nobles as serfs and toiled on the land for them.

The final standard is the capitalist social state of today's modern world. Industries proliferated in modern times when the money economy and scientific and technological development took place. Agriculture lost influence and declined. As industries in the economy became available, capital, which was vital to industry, became superior. Capitalists accumulated the means of production under their control as their private property. Those who had no means of production were employed as laborers under the owners. They lost ownership and rights not only over the production equipment they work with but also over the things they produce.

Thus, the economic system has changed from time to time throughout history. But in each case the means of production come under private ownership. Depending on them, two classes are formed, the haves and the have-nots. They are in conflict with one (the have class) ruling the exploiting and mocking class and the other (the have not class) being the ruled mobile class.

Today's modern capitalist society is on the verge of destruction. It seeks its own destruction. By increasing the strength of the workers, uniting them into an autonomous class and making them class conscious through its exploitation and oppression, the capitalist class paves the way for class struggle. When the class struggle breaks out, the workers adopt co-struggle methods ranging from peaceful legalistic methods to radical methods such as armed struggle and eventually conquer the capitalist class. A new age is born in such a labor revolution. A new egalitarian economic system is emerging.

According to Marx, this egalitarian system is a temporary state. He says that the Samadharma system will evolve and become a communal system. It does not have classes. There will be no semblance of capitalism. Privacy would have been largely abolished. There will be no original struggle. Each will work according to his power. It would be an absolutely flawless system, says Marx. In his writings, Marx gave great importance to changes in society.

Marx's evolutionary principles examine society in economic terms. He also mentions that the change in the economic base causes changes in the superstructure such as religion, education, family, politics etc. Looking from these, he mentions that the economy itself causes social change in the society for many periods.

2.3. Herbert Spencer's theoretical perspective to social change

Considered as the second founding father of sociology, Herbert Spencer is regarded as the father of sociology in England. Spencer (1820-1903) was the second founding father of sociology and a great thinker who strove to develop sociology as a science that studies society along the lines of August Comte. Spencer's sociology is based on evolutionary theory. So the theory of socioevolution occupies a special place in sociology. His way of referring to social change is related to the theory of Evolution.

Spencer explains the evolution of societies in terms of two different metaphors.

1. Degree of Composition : Simple Level Society and complex Level Society
2. Types of Construction : Militant Society and Industrial Society

While explaining the first classification, simple stage society and complex society, Spencer compares society to organisms and explains social evolution. Just as an organism gradually evolves from a germ in its early stage into a full-fledged organism, society is as indistinguishable as a simple group. Society thus has an educated structure – indistinguishable from its original simple state. In the beginning, the society organizes all the work. That means every part of the society fulfills all its needs.

As life develops, its structure changes. Several elements appear. Each performs a specific task for itself. As society develops, various elements emerge in it. They are distinctly different. Their functions are also different. Each performs a specific task.

In the process of evolution, society transforms from a simple state to a homogenous state of uniform structure and function, to a complex state to a multiform state, to a multiform state of structure and function. This is what Spencer calls social evolution. Even though the society from which various elements have arisen becomes diverse and multi-layered, the structure does not disintegrate. Although society is complex, the elements interact with each other. That is, if one organ fails to do its job, another organ cannot do its job. As a result each organ is stuck with a specific task. In such a division of labor an organ becomes self-sufficient and becomes incapacitated. Hence it becomes dependent on other organs for the fulfillment of its needs. Due to such interdependence there is a cohesion in the society and the society functions in a controlled manner. While different organs in the organism are performing separate tasks, it controls them and brings about coordination between them. Similarly, in society, the government controls all the elements and makes them work in an interdependent and coordinated manner.

Social evolution occurs through the process of Aggregation .Society becomes complex as members proliferate. Evolution does not stop here. Many elements come together i.e. combine and become groups. In this way, the various groups formed by many elements combine to form a larger community. Such groups continue to coalesce to form continuous societies. In the process of evolution, society progresses from a simple stage to various levels of integration. It evolves from a simple state to an integrated society. Then from there it evolves into a doubly cooperative society and a triple cooperative society. As various societies arise in social evolution:

1. Simple Society - Family
2. Compound Societies - clans
3. Doubly Compound Societies : Traditional ethnic groups
4. Trebly Compound Societies : the great civilized nations

A society that has only families as members is a simple society. When families combine to form clans, it becomes a federated society, when clans unite into traditional ethnic groups, a federated society becomes a doubly federated society, and when traditional ethnic groups combine to form countries or independent states, a doubly federated society blossoms into a triple federated society.

As social evolution progresses through each stage, the society at each stage becomes more integrated and complex than at the previous stage. Improvements are made in terms of landscape and social control. The community lives a simple nomadic life. At that stage it does not have any leadership structure. When it comes to integration, life becomes a little more stable and nomadism becomes less extreme. Here emerges vague, unstable, nominal leadership. When society is further evolved and reaches the stage of triple integration, life becomes well-established, stable and permanent. In such a situation the leadership structure is firmly established. Thus, as society increases in each stage, the way of life and the system of leadership are gradually established.

A second classification, Militant Society and Industrial society, helps distinguish one society from another. Spencer says that initially the society is a military society and then it evolves into a trade union society.

In a military state, society is based on war. When a war is waged on other societies and an attack is made, the war activities which are defensive measures against it are the main activities of the society. In a military situation there is a strong central government that controls and directs individuals. Military society is based on the coercive co-operation of human relations. It is centrally controlled. High reliance on hierarchical society, coexistence is full of control. It appears that there is not much difference between public life and private life.

Due to the influence of evolutionary forces, the military society gradually transforms and eventually evolves into industrial society. In such a situation, the situation of war disappears and peace prevails. Industrial society has shifted from centralized state power to becoming ubiquitous, based on voluntary co-operation in society. Not under duress. The right of the individual is respected in this society. Associations and social organizations are developing. The economic entity is separated from the government authority. In such a situation, the status of the people for the government changes and the state of the government for the people occurs. Coercive cooperation in military society is gone and voluntary cooperation is flourishing. Individuals voluntarily cooperate with the government. Freedom, respect for others, resistance to coercion, individual effort, truthfulness, kindness etc. are cherished as social values and become social traits in people. Government restrictions are removed and freedom of self-initiation and peace are freely available. Therefore, economic and trade infrastructures are privately owned. Thus, it is noteworthy that Spencer's social evolution shows how social change takes place at each stage.

2.4. Emile Durkheim's theoretical perspective to social change

Emile Durkheim was a French sociologist. His contributions to the development of the fields of sociology and anthropology are very important. He is regarded as one of the founders of the field of sociology. Among the theories presented by him, he clarifies the issues related to social change in the *Division of Labour in Society* published in 1883.

Durkheim discussed the nature and consequences of social evolution in his thesis on the division of labor in society. He observed differences between primitive and modern societies. Durkheim attributed this difference to the increasing division of labor and the nature of social commitment. His main aim is to maintain unity in the society. His collective thinking and pedagogic approaches are interwoven with culture in social life.

Industrialism is a sign of a developed society. As a result of the increase in the specialization of work, people are forced to change their character and strive to become a whole by helping each other. According to Durkheim, changes in social structure or changes in structural integration can be explained by the relationship of its members to society. He believed that if a society had common beliefs and values it could establish a rule of law. Unity in developed society is a natural consequence of the working class. Durkheim sees the two types of society as two nodes in the same evolutionary chain.

1. Mechanical Solidarity

He compares this kind of unity to primitive society. The division of labor in primitive societies is very simple. Refers to a society with little or no division of labor. As a result there will be greater coherence or less divergence in the activities of social members. Violations or deviations against society or religion are considered crimes in this society. They will be severely punished. This set of rules is called the Suppression Act. Religion, communalism, determination of sameness, social morality, social integrity and Repressive law are its main features. Here unity results from common ideas, beliefs and tendencies of a similar nature among the members, then it is mechanical unity. Here the collective voice is stronger and the individual voice is weaker. As the unity in this grows, its value in the personality is reversed. This means that individual differences are minimal. And the members shall devote themselves to the common good. And here the public state of consciousness completely overshadows the private state of consciousness so that one cannot develop his personality personally. Such harmony can be seen in dynamic society.

2. Organic Solidarity

He compares this kind of unity to modern society. Individuals in modern industrialized societies have different personalities. Thus a society with more divisions of labor and greater differentiation among social members is called a biogeographical society. Restitutive law replaced repressive law in this society. This law includes business administration, constitutional and human rights laws. It was used to rehabilitate and rehabilitate offenders. Division of labor, collectivism, determination of differences, individual morality, Restitutive law, and the individual are key themes in this formulation. Here in a society, if there is a lot of differences without similarities among the members and there is harmony among those differences, more importance will be given to individual values. Organismal cohesion emerges from the involuntary differences of members. It is the result of division of labour. People are different in a biosocial society. But he will stick to the system. Here people are dependent on each other even though the commonality of the individual ingredient is reduced. Thus, although they are different, there is a need to depend on others due to necessity. And even though the members may seem lax, it is necessary to remain cooperative and united.

And in the work section Durkheim mentions two types of rule.

1. Repressive Law
2. Restitutive Law

These laws relate to his dual unity.

Repressive Law: It is an expression of traditional customs, beliefs and musical instruments followed by a society based on fear of punishment. The integration based on such a repressive law is a mechanical integration. The Repressive Act was punitive in nature. Provides severe punishment for violators of social norms. In contrast, the law of restitution is cooperative in nature. Its purpose is to try to remedy social stability when it goes wrong. This type of law and order is found in Adivasi society. In such a society men are bound by common ideas of the same kind. Durkheim notes that aboriginal peoples are firmly united not only in ideas but also in morphology. And males and females were found to be similar in body composition. All members of Adivasi society were based on a common belief and instinct. Repressive legislation was defined to punish those who violated the group will and insulted the instinctive role. Therefore, the main characteristic of a society in which mechanical integration prevails is that

individuals differ to a lesser degree. So a society with mechanical homogeneity was more cooperative.

Restitutive Law: This type of law is seen in modern Societies. The working class is well developed here. Individuals have different types of personality and work. The main purpose of restitution law is to restore the rights of individuals who have been wrongfully deprived of them. Such a law can be compared to the law of rights. It emphasizes restitution rather than punishment. In any society there is division of labor, there is biological coherence. Unity here is based on the unity of individuals with differences. In a society where biological integration prevails, the need for humans to live dependently on others is high. It is therefore the result of unity emerging from diversity. A biologically homogenous society had specialization, individualism and a labor class. The interdependence of regions held society together. And collective consciousness was seen as weak. This association appears to be due to the development of the division of labour. The division of labor and the resulting differences create more dependency.

Thus Durkheim refers to social change based on the division of labour. He refers to a society in which mechanical solidarity prevails as a primitive society, a society before the industrial revolution, and a society in which repressive law prevails. A modern society is defined as a Organic society in which prevails. This is the post industrial revolution society. He also mentions that the restitutive Law was found in this type of society.

Therefore, when looking at the summary, the theoretical approach of classical sociologists such as Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer, Emile Durkheim regarding social change is different.

Conclusion

When looking at the theoretical perspective of classical sociologists regarding social change, it is clear that everyone's opinion is seen from a different perspective. In this way, Auguste Comte mentions that society changes in three stages based on the human mind, Karl marx explains the social change in four periods according to the classes that appear based on productive forces, factors of production, and economic factors. Spencer explains the theory of social evolution in organismic terms and explains social change. Emile Durkheim points out that social change takes place on the basis of division of labour. In this way, it can be seen that this study clarifies the theoretical approach of four classical sociologists and their different

approaches to clarify the thinking related to social change and to explain the state of societies today.

References

1. Anderson, N. & Schlunke, K. (2008). *Cultural theory in Everyday Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Best, S. (2003). *A Beginner's Guide to Social Theory*. London: Sage Publication
3. Elliot, A. (2009). *Contemporary Social Theory: An Introduction*. London: Routledge. Gells,
4. Giddens Anthony. (2005). *Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
5. Hadden, R.W. (1997). *Sociological Theory*.Gunada: Broadway Press.
6. Haralambos and Holborn, (2000). *Sociology: Themes and Perspectives*. London: Harper Collins Publishers Limited.
7. Harrington, A. (2005). *Modern Social Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
8. Johnson, Harry, (1999). *Sociology: A Systematic Introduction*. New Delhi:. Aliede Publishers.
9. Krishnamoorthy.J (2000), *Samugaviyal Kodpadugal (Tamil)*, Annamalai University.
10. Mahees .M.T.M (2021), *Sociological Theory*, Excellent publication.
11. Press. Best, S. (2003). *A Beginner's Guide to Social Theory*. London: Sage Publication
12. Rao Sankar, (2007). *Sociology: Primary Principles*. New Delhi: S.Chand and Commpany Ltd.
13. Richard Levince, Ann, (1999). *Sociology: Introduction*. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
14. Shanmugalingan.N (2002), *Tholseer samookaviyal Sinthanayalar (Tamil)*, Sociological Society, Uniersity of Jaffna.
15. Shanmugalingan.N (2008), *Samookaviyal Kodpaddu Moolangal (Tamil)*, Nagalingam Noolalayam, Jaffna.
16. Wingwood, A.S. (2000). *A Short Histry of Sociological Thoughts*.USA: McMillan Press.