
Two possible ways of the sociology development as two versions of the social dimension

Sharonova Svetlana¹, Daria Tzukanova²

1. *Dr. of the sociological sciences, professor, Faculty of the Social Sciences, St.-Tikhon's Orthodox University, Moscow, Russia, research field: socio-cultural dynamic of society.*

2. *Graduate student, Institute of World Economy and Business People's Friendship University of Russia (Moscow), research field: socio-cultural dynamic of society, communication.*

Corresponding Author email: s_sharonova@mail.ru

Received 11 October, 2015 **Accepted** 18 December, 2015 **Published** 20 February, 2016

KEY WORDS: social reality, social measurement, confessional sociology.

ABSTRACT: Born in Europe sociology immediately received a response in the minds of Russian philosophers, theologians, philosophical position which was significantly different from Western scholars. One of the main differences was the issue that means social reality. In the definition of the term E. Durkheim and M. Weber were based on the analysis and understanding of the religions and their place in society. Separate religion from culture, they got two dimensional space dimension of society. The chief justices of social change are the people themselves, which adjust their actions according to their own views and opinions. According to Russian philosophers, theologians (Solovev, Florenskiy, Berdyaev, Fedorov, Bulgakov), religion cannot be separated from the culture, the culture is only sheets on the tree of the religion. Social reality in their understanding becomes three-dimensional space, where the practice, human morality is always related to the divine commandments, laws. But the Russian sociology has been destroyed and forgotten, and world sociology began to develop along the path indicated by European sociologists. Intensification of religious extremism brings us back to the starting point. Perhaps confessional sociology will deepen their understanding of the problems within the religious community, which is not confined to any state, and should not necessarily be formally adopted standards. The purpose of this paper is an attempt to describe the perception of social reality, using the principles of Russian philosophers, theologians, and uncover opportunities measurement mechanisms that society.

Introduction

Sociology in the course of its development has gone through several crises.

The crisis of empirical sociology happened in the middle of the 20th century, when the theoretical sociology could not cope with a huge amount of research. This shaft was so powerful that it immediately received the reaction from the scientific community – the creation of new theories. However, an abundance of theories did not mean employment of stable positions for sociological knowledge. Today's situation is that sociology begins to disintegrate into many branches of the science. Historical reality demanded an explanation of the processes occurring in societies on the basis of an ideology and culture that evolved over the centuries. Theoretical concepts of Western civilization do not work in Africa, Japan and other countries, whose culture grew up not on the basis of Catholicism or Protestantism.

This new wave brought new expert voices who announced the possibility of the existence of confessional sociology - in particular of the Russian Orthodox sociology or sociology of Orthodoxy.

In the history of sociology such example of the sociological trend existed before. The movement of Social Christian has emerged and developed in the 19th century in Western Europe in the framework of Catholicism and Protestantism who were proposing certain social reforms in order to resolve social conflicts.

By the year of 1910, a group of Catholic priests returned from educational session in Germany, have brought in the United States new perspectives and methods of sociological knowledge. That time was characterized by a broad confidence in the compatibility of the Catholic faith with a sociological analysis. There was even an attempt to formulate a moral vision of human being and of the society in accordance with Catholic principles which were supposed to form Catholic sociology.

The overturn of the social, moral and religious traditions in the 1960s was accompanied by a proliferation of sociological theories, analyzing the growing secularization of society (Berger, Wilson, Turner) (Sullins, 2007).

Catholic sociologists have abandoned the project of sociology based on Catholic doctrine. Thus a transition from the “sociology of religion” to “the sociology of religion” happened.

According to Paul Sullins: “Today the relationship of the Catholic faith to sociology is equivocal. On the one hand, a faithful Catholic reading must consider inadequate any account of human life and personhood that denies or marginalizes its supernatural origins and aspirations. A full understanding of human action must include the moral

dimension, which “cannot be reduced to a body of knowledge worked out purely in the context of the so-called behavioral sciences.” (Veritatis Splendor 111) Ignorant of this full truth about persons, late 20th-century sociology has presented a picture of human life that is, at best, simplistic and distorted. Most consequential for sociology have been the rejection of the Christian doctrines of creation, incarnation and redemption respectively” (Sullins, 2007).

In Russia, the situation was Russia. The powerful movement of revival of Orthodoxy in the last decade has coincided with the radical changes in society. There was a need not just to study the Orthodox community from a formal and detached position of the sociology of religion, but also to rely on the doctrine of the Orthodox Church. On the one hand - this is a return to the history of social movements of Christianity in Russia, on the other hand – it is an attempt to return to the sources of Russian religious sociology in order to combine sociological knowledge and techniques with the principles of the Orthodox world.

The role of the Russian philosophers in the development of sociological knowledge

It is believed that the sociology as a science began with Emile Durkheim. It was him who gave the definition of social reality and determined the object of sociology study. For Durkheim social reality meant “a capacity to take a certain mental position” (Durkheim, 1995).

To answer the question: “What is the social reality?” – for the scientist was very important to understand the relationship between religion and society. Durkheim sets off the religion as a separate element of society, giving him the status of a social institution, and endowing this institution with specific functions. Thus, there was a secularization of religion, since, as P. Florensky wrote: “The ritual cult, the rite and the sacrament - and not the myths and dogmas, and especially not the rules of conduct - form the core of religion: the rest of the cult is “laminated”, serving as auxiliary moments of worship and giving independent meaning only after more or less destruction of the integrity of religion. Myth outside of the worship, dogma outside of worship, rule of conduct/behavior in itself - represent already the secularization of religion. There is already an act of hostility to religion, is already “omirschenie” (loss of sacredness)” (Solovoyov, 2011b). It represents the key moment in the theoretical views of Durkheim. According to the scientist the “social fact” (the thing that influences the individual from outside) is relied on morality of ethical life, which consists of two elements - the weal and the duty. Herewith the weal reflects the interests and the needs of the individual and has of an intimate nature, whereas the duty arises under the influence of social coercion and is mandatory.

Vladimir Solovoyov agrees with Durkheim saying that “every individual has material interests and self-love, but there are obligations or moral interests, and the person, who disregards these last and acts because of the benefits or self-love, deserves every condemnation” (Solovoyov, 2011a). Scientist has also emphasized the existence of a collective right and “People's moral” (Solovoyov, 2011a). However, the landmark of the people's morality, in his opinion, should not be “the politics of interest, the desire to enrich and enhance their inherent natural rights”, but the gradual climbing of the “humanity to the supreme model of truth and love”. In other words, it was almost impossible to separate the religion from the society: the moral imperative of Christianity is based on the principal of “the living reality of Christ”, in the Revelation of this model of a new man whereas following the collective consciousness of the interests of the individual means “return to paganism” (Solovoyov, 2011a).

Durkheim heard this warning, however, have not changed the selected position, “a society for its members, as the God for his faithful” (Bulgakov, 1994). Thus, as pointed Solovoyov, “modern consciousness recognizes the divine law for the human person, but did not give him any divine powers, or divine content, so the modern man in his life and his knowledge allows only limited conventional reality, the reality of private facts and phenomena and at this point the person has only one of these particular facts” (Solovoyov, 2011b). Western civilization is based on the moral foundations of Catholicism and Protestantism. In this regard, “rationalism and legalism” are the perception of freedom “individualistic as the individual rights protected itself from attacks of any other person and defining themselves autonomously” (Berdyayev, 1952). These fundamental principles of the Western world were peculiar to the scientific community and subsequently received a natural development of the theory and empirical research: rationalism Weber; requirements as the basis for the functioning of social institutions in the theories of R. Merton, T. Parsons - classic works of sociology, that served as the basis for the development of the science.

Positions of Russian philosophers were incomprehensible to Western scholars because their visions were based on the culture of orthodoxy, the main difference of which was the focus not on the individual achievement and material progress, reception of certain benefits, but on the spiritual ascent of the person. The spiritual element of climbing is a descent of the Divine Trinity.

Vladimir Solovoyov opposed to Durkheim's understanding of the social reality “as a single, the will is not represented by itself, there is no good, no truth, it becomes righteous only through normal relationship or agreement with the general will - and universal is not in the sense of a mechanical connection of the will of many, or all, but in the sense of will by its universal nature, that is the will of “Him” who has all the will of God. Just a single fact, a separate phenomenon obviously does not represent the truth by itself, in its' separateness, and can be recognized as true only through the normal relations in the logical connection and in the harmony with all or with “the reality of the all” - and, moreover, not in a mechanical sense, not in terms of the totality of the all phenomena or facts. Because, first of all, such a set cannot exist in our knowledge, since the number of facts or phenomena inexhaustible and, therefore, cannot represent a certain amount. And secondly, if such a set existed, it is still not accounted to itself of the truth, because if every single fact is not true, then,

obviously, the connection of all these facts, that are not the essence of truth, the truth cannot be obtained (as a set of zeros will not produce one and a lot of villains does not make one righteous). Consequently, the reality of “the all general” is the reality of Him who has everything - the reality of God. But this absolute reality itself is available only to direct perception, inner revelation, which is the subject of religious knowledge” (Berdyayev, 1952).

According to Nicholas Berdyayev as well as to Solovyov, “the foundations of human society is laid in the order of the divine world. There is a mysterious foundation of human society, just as mysterious as the basis of the all organic nature, that cannot be separated from the human social world” (Berdyayev, 2012).

Of course, such way of understanding the reality has become a kind of elusive phenomenon that doesn't and can't be studied as a simple subject for rational thinking. Berdyayev did not dispute that, on the contrary, he affirmed that “in the brotherhood of Christ there are no social external signs, and there can be no social criteria for it” (Berdyayev, 2012). Nevertheless, the history has shown that all the prophecies of Russian scientists were fulfilled:

“That the economic socialism wants to put material interest in the basis of the whole society, and positivism in the basis of all science - an empirical knowledge, thus we can predict failure of both these systems” (Solovyov, 2011b);

“The sociological distractions destroyed the historical reality as the hierarchical level of the “cosmic whole”, and reduced it to the simplest elements, offered by other sciences, previous of sociology” (Berdyayev, 2012);

“The triumph of the personal benefits would lead to the failure of the personality” (Berdyayev, 2012).

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp can confirm the failure of socialist ideas. Although in terms of world order, the experience of these countries has not passed without a trace in the historical reality. All the positive things that gave this economic system were taken into account and used by many countries, no matter to what category they belong - to the capitalist, developing countries or any other different classifications. The main conclusion of the collapse of this “large-scale social project” lies in the fact that a human being cannot anticipate the diversity of the reality and substitute God, in the hope to build the Kingdom of the Heaven on the earth.

Stealing Objectivity Of Sociological Methodology

During the study of social facts scientists dissect society on single elements. In the past, the author of the article made an attempt to understand the functions of the Institute of Education. (Sharonova, 2004) The undertaken study found a number of functions (Sharonova, 2004), which gave the impression that every self-respecting scientist thought it necessary to highlight his new function the Institute of Education, and, thus, the holistic vision of the existing social institution took a second place.

Multidimensionality and ambiguity of sociological science led to a need for a plurality of scientific approaches in the study of these phenomena. Each approach has its own specific vision of society and has a boundary beyond it there is a significant part of the object being studied. As a result of the application of the plurality of approaches to the study of a single phenomenon can be assumed that a certain sum the whole picture. However, the puzzles are not always converged, and then there is a kaleidoscope effect.

In both described cases, it becomes difficult to understand how the studying fact is actually represented at the end. And the objective is sought by sociology, dissolved in scientific illusions, and in “the hands keep only abstract tatters of reality, only smithereens of the life” (Berdyayev, 2012). Proof of this situation is the work of Ulrich Beck “Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity”, where he said: “Science's rationality claim to be able to investigate objectively the hazardousness of a risk permanently refutes itself. It is based, firstly, on a house of cards of speculative assumptions, and moves exclusively within a framework of probability Statements, whose prognoses of safety cannot even be refuted, strictly speaking, by actual accidents. Secondly, one must assume an ethical point of view in order to discuss risks meaningfully at all” (Beck, 1992).

The effect of an elusive reality is caused by the practice that is legitimized by sociology where a collective conscience dominates above God's judgment.

The degradation of public morals is caused by the fact that in the modern society the regulatory framework of values is based on the interests and needs of the person. To satisfy these needs and interests is almost impossible: a man, who is looking for material things, always wants to get more (a lot of money does not happen, success requires to raise the bar higher and higher); a man, who is centered on the personal interests, is never satisfied, so it because the craving for forbidden fruit is inexhaustible. Thus, the person concentrated on himself, falls lower and lower in their desires, hence the collective morality (conscience) is also degraded as it is aimed at those coming from people values and norms. Proof of this is the movement for the legalization of same-sex marriages. As Russian Orthodox bishop Kirill said: “it is a legitimizing sin”. If you overstep the line once, then it will be possible to legalize any fall.

Solely orientation on the interests and needs of the person leads to atomic disintegration of the society. Describing the relationship between the individual and society Norbert Elias in his book "The society of individuals" notes that the structure of the most advanced societies today is characterized by the prevalence of “I-identity” over the “We-identity” (Norbert, 2010).

Society loses its steady support that had been erected by religion: moral principles, principles of management, principles of family, etc. Thus science is a source of blurring of the reality.

Justification of the confessional sociology like another way

The scientific principles proposed by Durkheim have been reflected by Russian sociology, as well as throughout the world. Now there are a lot of different objects in the studies, but, in fact, we study the social reality as Emile Durkheim proposed it. If Russian sociology has taken the path imagined by the Russian philosophers and theologians of the early 20th century, we could have gotten the confessional sociology of Orthodoxy. In their disputes with Western sociologists and through their reflections Russian philosophers created their own model of social reality, different from Durkheim.

The main difference between this vision of social reality is not the reality of the two-dimensional: individual – society; but a three-dimensional: individual – society – God. Divine corrects the collective consciousness through the activities of the Church and through spiritual purification and ascension of the personality. According to Vladimir Solovyov “religion, speaking generally and in the abstract, represents a link between the man and the world with the absolute beginning and concentration of all existence. Obviously, if we recognize the validity of such absolute principle, we should be able to determine the interests and the content of human being, its’ consciousness which must depend on Divine and influence all significant parts of life - what the man does, learns and makes” (Solovyov, 2011b).

Russian scientist Solovyov considered that the main value-normative dimension of social fact is “the reunification” or religion. The mechanism of management of social processes “is to bring all the elements of the human being, all particular beginnings and force of the humanity into the right attitude to the unconditional central top. And through it and in it to result in a correctly according to their relation to one another” (Solovyov, 2011b). The human soul is the starting point of all the processes of social change. Nicolas Berdyaev wrote that “the human soul has an absolute value, but the earth, the empirical human life has not the absolute value for the Christian consciousness. Value, shrine, spiritual reality is more important than the earthly empirical life of people, than their benefit and satisfaction, than their lives. The triumph in terms of personal benefits would lead to the fall of a person. Only the point of view of supra-value leads to exaltation of the individual” (Berdyaev, 1952).

What Durkheim considered as morality of the life and collective conscience Russian philosophers devote to the Church because “the church is the soul of the world and the soul of the history” (Bulgakov, 1994). Russian scientists see the phenomenon of economic management in the broadest sense, which includes the economic and social focused on the people instead of social institutions. For the Russian philosophers the labor is not ideal of achieving excellence, prosperity, but it is the punishment for original sin and thus the task in economic work is to create a body of historical humanity (Bulgakov, 1993). Herewith Bulgakov emphasizes that “the economy should preserve only the resources for a worthy life, at that the religious ideal of it is the true criterion here. This ideal and related ascetic self-regulation of the economy is determined by its spirit, which, without being confined to certain forms, defines them inside by it-self” (Bulgakov, 1994). On the first place it puts no form of economic management created and offered by the human mind but the spiritual condition of man in these forms.

Thus, within the meaning of Russian philosophers and theologians, denominational sociology does not attempt to produce a violent transformation of society based on religious dogma, but it is immanent evolution of society, supported by religious morality.

Confessional sociology analyzes of Orthodoxy not like an abstract society, but like the community of believers, where many variables are defined by the dogmas of Orthodoxy. If the church is to preserve the purity of the faith, denominational sociology aims to study how the dogma of Orthodox are implemented by the believers, how a secular environment affects their worldview and life strategy, how a religious community affects the secular world, in turn.

Discussion

Of course, in the secular society where religion plays the role of a certain niche, it is difficult to measure the social processes, based on the model of Russian scientists. But when it comes to the Orthodox community, the measurement of the social processes by Durkheim logic is somewhat absurd.

The religion serves as a tool of social control in a model of Russian philosophers, it indicates the formula of social relations, which is realized through the degree of spiritual purity of each individual in society. The construction and design does not exude as the mechanism of regulation of social reality, but it is self-organization through self-purification.

References

- Beck U. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity* / Translated by Mark Ritter. London: Sage Publications.
- Berdyaev N. 1952. The truth of Orthodoxy. - Бердяев Н. Истина православия. //Вестник русского западноевропейского патриаршего экзархата/ Париж, № 11, 1952, стр. 4-11.
- Berdyaev N. 2012. The philosophy of inequality. - Бердяев Н. Философия неравенства. / авт. предисл. протоиер. В. В. Зеньковский. – М.: Ин-т русской цивилизации, 2012.
- Bulgakov SN. 1994. The philosophy of the economy. The tragedy of philosophy. - Булгаков С.Н. Сочинения в двух томах. Т. 1. Философия хозяйства. Трагедия философии. / вступительная статья, составление, подготовка текста и примечания С.С. Хоружего. – М.: Издательство Наука, 1993.
- Bulgakov SN. 1994. *Unfading Light. Contemplation and meditation.* - Булгаков С.Н. Свет невечерний. Созерцания и умозрения. - М.: Республика, 1994.
- Durkheim E. 1995. *Sociology. Its subject matter, method, purpose.* - Дюркгейм Э. Социология. Ее предмет, метод, предназначение. / Пер. с фр., составление, по-слесловие и примечания А. Б. Гофмана. - М.: Канон, 1995.

- Florensky P. 2010. The philosophy of cult. - Флоренский П. Философия культа: (опыт православной антропологии). / сост. и авт. вступ. ст.: С. Г. Антоненко ; авт. вступ. ст. и коммент.: С. М. Половинкин, Андроник (Трубачёв) ; Ин-т общественной мысли. - М.: Российская политическая энцикл. (РОССПЭН), 2010.
- German text edited by Michael Schröter. // The Collected Works of Norbert Elias. Dublin: University College Dublin Press, v. 10.
- Norbert E. 2010. Society of individuals / Translated by Edmund Jephcott,
- Sharonova SA. 2004. Universal constant of the education institutions - the mechanism of the reproduction of society. - Шаронова С.А. Универсальные константы институты образования – механизм воспроизводства общества. – М.: РУДН, 2004.
- Solovyov V. 2011a. Three Conversations on War, Progress and the end of world history. The Great Debate and Christian politics. - Соловьев В. Три разговора о войне, прогрессе и конце всемирной истории. Великий спор и христианская политика. – М.: АСТ, 2011.
- Solovyov V. 2011b. Reading about God-manhood. - Соловьев В. Чтения о богочеловечестве. – М.: Акад. Проект, 2011.
- Sullins P. 2007. Sociology: A Catholic Critique. // The Encyclopedia of Catholic Social Thought, Social Science and Social Policy / Varacalli, Krason, Myers and Coulter, eds. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.