

Chapter 1 : Evolutionary Theories, Social Change, Sociology Guide

The fifth edition of Contemporary Sociological Theory: Continuing the Classical Tradition has been revised to include more feminist contributions, a new chapter on Evolution and Modernity: Macrosociological Perspectives, and updated material on Rediscovering the Body.

Heather Long and Kelly Chakov Note: In the early years of anthropology, the prevailing view of anthropologists and other scholars was that culture generally develops or evolves in a uniform and progressive manner. Just as species were thought to evolve into increasing complexity, so too were cultures thought to progress from a simple to complex states. It was thought that most societies pass through the same series of stages to arrive, ultimately, at a common end. Change was thought to originate from within the culture, so development was thought to be internally determined. The evolutionary progression of societies had been accepted by some since The Enlightenment. Both French and Scottish social and moral philosophers were using evolutionary schemes during the 18th century. Among these was Montesquieu, who proposed an evolutionary scheme consisting of three stages: This division became very popular among the 19th century social theorists, with figures such as Tylor and Morgan in adopting this scheme Seymour-Smith By the middle of the nineteenth century, Europe had successfully explored, conquered and colonized many heretofore unknown and alien parts of the globe. This global movement led to products and peoples that lived quite different lifestyles than the Europeans and proved politically and scientifically problematic. The discipline of anthropology, beginning with these early social theories arose largely in response to this encounter between cultures Winthrop The notion of dividing the ethnological record into evolutionary stages ranging from primitive to civilized was fundamental to the new ideas of the nineteenth century social evolutionists. These theorists developed rival schemes of overall social and cultural progress, as well as the origins of different institutions such as religion, marriage, and the family. Tylor disagreed with the contention of some early-nineteenth-century French and English writers, led by Comte Joseph de Maistre, that groups such as the American Indians and other indigenous peoples were examples of cultural degeneration. He believed that peoples in different locations were equally capable of developing and progressing through the stages. Tylor maintained that culture evolved from the simple to the complex, and that all societies passed through the three basic stages of development suggested by Montesquieu: To account for cultural variation, Tylor and other early evolutionists postulated that different contemporary societies were at different stages of evolution. According to this view, the "simpler" peoples of the day had not yet reached "higher" stages. Thus, simpler contemporary societies were thought to resemble ancient societies. In more advanced societies one could see proof of cultural evolution through the presence of what Tylor called survivals - traces of earlier customs that survive in present-day cultures. The making of pottery is an example of a survival in the sense used by Tylor. Earlier peoples made their cooking pots out of clay; today we generally make them out of metal because it is more durable, but we still prefer dishes made out of clay. Tylor believed that there was a kind of psychic unity among all peoples that explained parallel evolutionary sequences in different cultural traditions. In other words, because of the basic similarities in the mental framework of all peoples, different societies often find the same solutions to the same problems independently. But, Tylor also noted that cultural traits may spread from one society to another by simple diffusion - the borrowing by one culture of a trait belonging to another as the result of contact between the two. Another nineteenth-century proponent of uniform and progressive cultural evolution was Lewis Henry Morgan. A lawyer in upstate New York, Morgan became interested in the local Iroquois Indians and defended their reservation in a land-grant case. In gratitude, the Iroquois adopted Morgan, who regarded them as "noble savages. But he also subdivided savagery and barbarism into upper, middle, and lower segments Morgan Each stage was distinguished by a technological development and had a correlate in patterns of subsistence, marriage, family, and political organization. In Ancient Society, Morgan commented, "As it is undeniable that portions of the human family have existed in a state of savagery, other

portions in a state of barbarism, and still others in a state of civilization, it seems equally so that these three distinct conditions are connected with each other in a natural as well as necessary sequence of progress" Morgan Morgan distinguished these stages of development in terms of technological achievement, and thus each had its identifying benchmarks. Middle savagery was marked by the acquisition of a fish diet and the discovery of fire; upper savagery by the bow and arrow; lower barbarism by pottery; middle barbarism by animal domestication and irrigated agriculture; upper barbarism by the manufacture of iron; and civilization by the phonetic alphabet Morgan For Morgan, the cultural features distinguishing these various stages arose from a "few primary germs of thought"- germs that had emerged while humans were still savages and that later developed into the "principle institutions of mankind. For example, he speculated that the family evolved through six stages. Human society began as a "horde living in promiscuity," with no sexual prohibitions and no real family structure. In the next stage a group of brothers was married to a group of sisters and brother-sister mating was permitted. In the third stage, group marriage was practiced, but brothers and sisters were not allowed to mate. The fourth stage, which supposedly evolved during barbarism, was characterized by a loosely paired male and female who lived with other people. In the next stage husband-dominant families arose in which the husband could have more than one wife simultaneously. Finally, the stage of civilization was distinguished by the monogamous family, with just one wife and one husband who were relatively equal in status. Morgan believed that family units became progressively smaller and more self-contained as human society developed. His postulated sequence for the evolution of the family, however, is not supported by the enormous amount of ethnographic data that has been collected since his time. For example, no recent society that Morgan would call savage indulges in group marriage or allows brother-sister mating. Although their works reached toward the same end, the evolutionary theorists each had very different ideas and foci for their studies. Differing from Morgan and Tylor, Sir James Frazer focused on the evolution of religion and viewed the progress of society or culture from the viewpoint of the evolution of psychological or mental systems. Among the other evolutionary theorists who put forth schemes of development of society, including different religious, kinship, and legal institution were Maine, McLellan, and Bachofen. It is important to note that all of the early evolutionary schemes were unilineal. Unilineal evolution refers to the idea that there is a set sequence of stages that all groups will pass through at some point, although progress through these stages will vary. Groups, both past and present, that are at the same level or stage of development were considered nearly identical. Thus a contemporary "primitive" group could be taken as a representative of an earlier stage of development of more advanced types. On the one hand, the uniformity which so largely pervades civilization may be ascribed, in great measure, to the uniform action of uniform causes; while on the other hand its various grades may be regarded as stages of development or evolution, each the outcome of previous history, and about to do its proper part in shaping the history of the future Tylor One debate arising from the evolutionist perspective was whether civilization had evolved from a state of savagery or had always coexisted with primitive groups. Also the degeneration theory of savagery that primitives regressed from the civilized state and that primitivism indicated the fall from grace had to be fought vigorously before social anthropology could progress. This new view proposed that evolution was a line of progression in which the lower stages were prerequisite to the upper. This idea seemed to completely contradict traditional ideas about the relationships between God and mankind and the nature of life and progress. Evolutionists criticized the Christian approach as requiring divine revelation to explain civilization. Reactions within evolutionist thought: Within the school of social evolution there were debates particularly concerning the most primitive stages of society. It was highly debated as to the order of primitive promiscuity, patriarchy, and matriarchy. Marx and his co-worker, Friedrich Engels, devised a theory in which the institutions of monogamy, private property, and the state were assumed to be chiefly responsible for the exploitation of the working classes in modern industrialized societies. Its leading opponent was Franz Boas, whose main disagreement with the evolutionists involved their assumption that universal laws governed all human culture. Boas argued that these nineteenth-century individuals lacked sufficient data as did Boas himself to formulate many useful

DOWNLOAD PDF EVOLUTION AND MODERNITY : MACROSOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

generalizations. Thus historicism and, later, functionalism were reactions to nineteenth century social evolutionism. Johann Jacob Bachofen Swiss lawyer and classicist who developed a theory of the evolution of kinship systems. He postulated that primitive promiscuity was first characterized by matriarchy and later by patrilineality. Sir James George Frazer - Educated at Cambridge, he was considered to be the last of the British classical evolutionists. Frazer was an encyclopedic collector of data although he never did any fieldwork , publishing dozens of volumes including the popular work *The Golden Bough*. Frazer went on to study the value of superstition in the evolution of culture saying that it strengthened the respect for private property, strengthened the respect for marriage, and contributed to the stricter observance of the rules of sexual morality. Botanist and antiquarian who was a staunch pupil of Darwin. He observed that there was a range of variation of stone implements from more to less crude and that deposits that lay beneath upper deposits seemed older. As Illustrated by *Ancient Remains and the Customs of Modern Savages* illustrates the evolutionists analogies to "stone age contemporaries. Sir Henry James Sumner Maine English jurist and social theorist who focused on the development of legal systems as the key to social evolution. His scheme traces society from systems based on kinship to those based on territoriality, and from status to contract and from civil to criminal law. Maine argued that the most primitive societies were patriarchal. This view contrasted with the believers in the primacy of primitive promiscuity and matriarchy. Maine also contrasted with other evolutionists in that he was not a proponent of unilinear evolution Seymour-Smith Scottish lawyer who was inspired by ethnographic accounts of bride capture. From this he built a theory of the evolution of marriage. Like others, including Bachofen, McLellan postulated an original period of primitive promiscuity followed by matriarchy. His argument began with primitive peoples practicing female infanticide because women did not hunt to support the group. The shortage of women that followed was resolved by the practice of bride capture and fraternal polyandry. These then gave rise to patrilineal descent. One of the most influential evolutionary theorists of the 19th century and has been called the father of American anthropology. An American lawyer whose interest in Iroquois Indian affairs led him to study their customs and social system, giving rise to the first modern ethnographic study of a Native American group, the League of the Iroquois in In this, he considered ceremonial, religious, and political aspects and also initiated his study of kinship and marriage which he was later to develop into a comparative theory in his work, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity*. This latter work is also a milestone in the development of anthropology, establishing kinship and marriage as central areas of anthropological inquiry and beginning an enduring preoccupation with kinship terminologies as the key to the interpretation of kinship systems. His *Ancient Society* is the most influential statement of the nineteenth-century cultural evolutionary position, to be developed by many later evolutionists and employed by Marx and Engels in their theory of social evolution. Each stage was characterized by a technological advance and was correlated with advances in subsistence patterns, family and marriage and political organization Seymour-Smith Sir Edward Burnett Tylor - Put the science of anthropology on a firm basis and discounted the degeneration theory. Tylor formulated a definition of culture: His major contributions were in the field of religion and mythology, and he cited magic, astrology, and witchcraft as clues to primitive religion. It was an impressive and well-reasoned analysis of primitive psychology and far more general in application than anything which had been earlier suggested. Tylor correlates the three levels of social evolution to types of religion:

DOWNLOAD PDF EVOLUTION AND MODERNITY : MACROSOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

Chapter 2 : Sociocultural evolution - Wikipedia

Evolution and Sociology Vol. 3, No.2 Fall - 2 - anthropology, biology, ecology, genetics, paleontology, and primatology.

Primer Science, Religion, Evolution and Creationism: Connie Bertka and Dr. It is in recognition of these broad factors that public engagement materials, events, and contributions to the Human Origins web site are being developed by the Broader Social Impacts Committee BSIC to support the exhibition in the David H. Koch Hall of Human Origins. The committee recognizes the unique opportunity the subject of human origins offers for the exploration of challenging cultural topics, which in turn can inspire greater public interest in, and understanding of, science. Thus, it is with input from the committee that the co-chairs have prepared this primer. It provides a brief introduction to issues that arise at the crossroads of science and religion, particularly in relation to the scientific accounts of evolution and human origins that are presented in the exhibit. The primer is organized around two broad topics: A question and answer format is used to highlight common concerns for each of these topics. Cultural divides in the United States over the acceptance of evolution and scientific understandings of human origins make this interchange relevant. They also offer an opportunity to inspire a positive relationship between science and religion. Science and Religion Visitors to the David H. Koch Hall of Human Origins bring with them many assumptions about science, about religion, and about their relationship. These assumptions may impact, positively or negatively, their willingness and ability to engage the scientific presentation of human origins. The questions below are offered as a guide to begin thinking about science and religion in the context of the possible interactions of religious worldviews with a scientific account of human evolution and origins. Science is a way to understand nature by developing explanations for the structures, processes and history of nature that can be tested by observations in laboratories or in the field. Sometimes such observations are direct, like measuring the chemical composition of a rock. Other times these observations are indirect, like determining the presence of an exoplanet through the wobble of its host star. An explanation of some aspect of nature that has been well supported by such observations is a theory. Well-substantiated theories are the foundations of human understanding of nature. The pursuit of such understanding is science. Religion, or more appropriately religions, are cultural phenomena comprised of social institutions, traditions of practice, literatures, sacred texts and stories, and sacred places that identify and convey an understanding of ultimate meaning. Religions are very diverse. While it is common for religions to identify the ultimate with a deity like the western monotheisms – Judaism, Christianity, Islam or deities, not all do. There are non-theistic religions, like Buddhism. What is the difference between science and religion? Although science does not provide proofs, it does provide explanations. Science depends on deliberate, explicit and formal testing in the natural world of explanations for the way the world is, for the processes that led to its present state, and for its possible future. When scientists see that a proposed explanation has been well confirmed by repeated observations, it serves the scientific community as a reliable theory. Well-supported theories guide future efforts to solve other questions about the natural world. Religions may draw upon scientific explanations of the world, in part, as a reliable way of knowing what the world is like, about which they seek to discern its ultimate meaning. Religious understanding draws from both subjective insight and traditional authority. However, this is an erroneous judgment. Virtually all of the historic religions include traditions of rational reflection. How are science and religion similar? Science and religion both have historical traditions that exhibit development over time. Each has places for individual insight and communal discernment. Analytic and synthetic reasoning can be found exhibited in both. Science and religion have been and continue to be formative elements shaping an increasingly global human society. Both science and religion have served to jeopardize and contribute to the common human good. How can science and religion be related? Typical assumptions about this relationship fall into one of three forms: A conflict approach assumes that science and religion are competitors for cultural authority. Either science sets the standard for truth to which religion must adhere or be dismissed, or religion sets the standard to which science must

conform. For example, some atheists adopt this approach and argue that science reduces religion to a merely natural phenomenon. Conversely, some religious adherents, while claiming to accept science, will identify specific points at which mainstream scientific findings must be distorted or abandoned for the sake of religious convictions. Such an adversarial approach tends to rule out any constructive engagement between science and religion. Individuals who prefer a separation approach hold that science and religion use different languages, ask different questions and have different objects of interest. By highlighting the differences between science and religion, conflict is avoided. While this approach allows a person to explore what science has learned about human origins without fear of conflict with religious beliefs, it also encourages that the science be left, so to speak, at the museum threshold so that it has no impact on other non-scientific explorations of what it means to be human. A consequence of separation is that the science of human origins can be viewed as irrelevant to what might be the deepest of human concerns. It should be noted that it is true that science is practiced without reference to religion. God may be an ultimate explanation, but God is not a scientific explanation. This approach to science is called methodological naturalism. However, this method of isolating religious interests from scientific research is not an example of the separation approach. Historically, this bracketing out of religious questions in the practice of scientific inquiry was promoted by religious thinkers in the 18th and 19th centuries as the most fruitful way to discover penultimate rather than ultimate explanations of the structures and processes of nature. A third possibility for the relationship between science and religion, one of interaction, at minimum holds that dialogue between science and religion can be valuable, more that science and religion can constructively benefit from engagement, and at maximum envisions a convergence of scientific and religious perspectives. Generally, this view encourages an effort to explore the significance of scientific understanding for religious understanding and vice versa. With this approach science remains relevant beyond the museum for many people who might otherwise ignore scientific findings. Evolution and Creationism The National Museum of Natural History of the Smithsonian Institution has a responsibility due to its charter to provide the public with an opportunity to explore for themselves the most recent scientific understandings of the natural world, including human origins. People are well aware that insights from the humanities, including the arts, literature and religious traditions, have much to say on this topic as well. For some people an evolutionary account of human origins may be greeted with skepticism because it challenges their particular religious commitments. In contrast, other people find their religious perspectives are deepened and enriched by an evolutionary understanding of human origins. Although the questions below recognize this range of perspectives, many of the questions reflect expectations that are especially characteristic of people from those religious communities that are skeptical about the science of evolution. Ironically, people in these latter communities often value science and seek scientific support for their particular religious commitments. In this sense of the word, many creationists accept an evolutionary understanding of natural history. However, at least four types of creationism can be identified, and each has a distinctive view of the evolutionary sciences and human origins. Human beings were created through a direct act of divine intervention in the order of nature. While many aspects of nature may be the consequence of direct acts of divine creation, at very least they hold that the very beginning of the universe, the origin of life and the origin of humankind are the consequence of distinct acts of divine intervention in the order of nature. Theistic evolutionists also hold that the sacred text provides an infallible account of why the universe, all life and humankind came into existence. However, they also hold that for the most part, the diversity of nature from stars to planets to living organisms, including the human body, is a consequence of the divine using processes of evolution to create indirectly. Still, for many who hold this position, the very beginning of the universe, the origin of life, and the origin of what is distinctive about humankind are the consequence of direct acts of divine intervention in the order of nature. Evolutionary theists hold that the sacred text, while giving witness to the ultimate divine source of all of nature, in no way specifies the means of creation. Further, they hold that the witness of creation itself is that the divine creates only indirectly through evolutionary processes without any intervention in the order of nature. It is intended that those Americans who do not accept evolution will experience in this exhibition an

open invitation to engage the science presented, explore the supporting materials, and participate in conversation with staff and volunteers without fear of ridicule or antagonism. Though the viewpoints of those who do not accept the scientific explanation of human origins are not affirmed in the exhibition, the personal importance of their perspectives is appreciated. What the exhibition intends to create is an environment for an enriching and respectful dialogue on human origins that currently can be found in no other venue. Scientific theories change in the light of new discoveries. Why should we believe what science has to say today about human origins when it may change tomorrow? The perception that scientists completely change their mind with each new discovery is mistaken. Although this has occurred occasionally in the history of science, it is relatively rare. What is frequently missed is the broad consensus among scientists in a field, like that of human origins research, which provides the basis for seeking new discoveries. For example, it is broadly agreed that the various characteristics that distinguish our species did not emerge all at once. Walking on two legs emerged before making stone tools, and both of these occurred well before the biggest increase in human brain size. All of these came before the origin of art and symbolic communication. Farming and the rise of civilizations occurred much later still. There is broad scientific agreement even in the light of the most recent fossil discoveries that these changes that define our species took place over a period of about 6 million years. Each visitor to the exhibition has the opportunity to explore both the latest findings of laboratory and field research as well as consider how the scientific community is using these to give a more complete account of human origins. Each visitor is also invited to consider how this account might inform their deepest religious understanding of what it means to be human. What is Intelligent Design and does the exhibit address it? Advocates of Intelligent Design ID hold that there are features of the natural world for which there are no natural explanations and that these features can be shown analytically to be the result of a designing agent. Although ID advocates seldom specify who the designer is, the logic of their argument requires that the designer be beyond nature, or supernatural. However, advocates for ID have not been able to show that their claims are genuinely scientific. While the scientific community welcomes new theoretical proposals, these must lead to active research programs that deepen our understanding of nature and that can find confirmation in either laboratory or field observations. Thus far, ID advocates have been unable to do either. As an institution of informal public education, the exhibit cannot advocate a religious position. Dover Area School District, For all of these reasons it is inappropriate for ID to be included in a scientific presentation on human origins. Still, some people believe that there is a scientific debate about evolution, and that advocates of ID represent one side of this debate.

DOWNLOAD PDF EVOLUTION AND MODERNITY : MACROSOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

Chapter 3 : Herbert Spencer's Theory of Social Evolution (Explained with Diagram)

Includes a chapter on Evolution and Modernity: Macrosociological Perspectives that discusses in depth the evolutionary theories of Karl Marx, Talcott Parsons, Jurgen Habermas, and Anthony Giddens.

Introduction[edit] Anthropologists and sociologists often assume that human beings have natural social tendencies and that particular human social behaviours have non- genetic causes and dynamics i. Societies exist in complex social environments i. It is thus inevitable that all societies change. Specific theories of social or cultural evolution often attempt to explain differences between coeval societies by positing that different societies have reached different stages of development. Although such theories typically provide models for understanding the relationship between technologies , social structure or the values of a society, they vary as to the extent to which they describe specific mechanisms of variation and change. These 19th-century unilineal evolution theories claimed that societies start out in a primitive state and gradually become more civilized over time; they equated the culture and technology of Western civilization with progress. Some forms of early sociocultural evolution theories mainly unilineal ones have led to much-criticised theories like social Darwinism and scientific racism , sometimes used in the past[by whom? Most 19th-century and some 20th-century approaches aimed to provide models for the evolution of humankind as a single entity. However, most 20th-century approaches, such as multilinear evolution , focused on changes specific to individual societies. Moreover, they rejected directional change i. Most archaeologists work within the framework of multilinear evolution. Other contemporary approaches to social change include neoevolutionism , sociobiology , dual inheritance theory , modernisation theory and postindustrial theory. In his seminal book *The Selfish Gene* , Richard Dawkins wrote that "there are some examples of cultural evolution in birds and monkeys, but While expecting humankind to show increasing development, theorists looked for what determined the course of human history. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel " , for example, saw social development as an inevitable process. While earlier authors such as Michel de Montaigne " had discussed how societies change through time, the Scottish Enlightenment of the 18th century proved key in the development of the idea of sociocultural evolution. They understood the changes Scotland was undergoing as involving transition from an agricultural to a mercantile society. In "conjectural histories" , authors such as Adam Ferguson " , John Millar " and Adam Smith " argued that societies all pass through a series of four stages: Auguste Comte " Philosophical concepts of progress , such as that of Hegel, developed as well during this period. Later thinkers such as Comte de Saint-Simon " developed these ideas. These developments took place in a context of wider processes. The first process was colonialism. Although imperial powers settled most differences of opinion with their colonial subjects through force, increased awareness of non-Western peoples raised new questions for European scholars about the nature of society and of culture. Similarly, effective colonial administration required some degree of understanding of other cultures. Emerging theories of sociocultural evolution allowed Europeans to organise their new knowledge in a way that reflected and justified their increasing political and economic domination of others: Modern civilization understood as the Western civilization , appeared the result of steady progress from a state of barbarism, and such a notion was common to many thinkers of the Enlightenment, including Voltaire " The second process was the Industrial Revolution and the rise of capitalism , which together allowed and promoted continual revolutions in the means of production. Emerging theories of sociocultural evolution reflected a belief that the changes in Europe brought by the Industrial Revolution and capitalism were improvements. Industrialisation, combined with the intense political change brought about by the French Revolution of and the U. Constitution , which paved the way for the dominance of democracy , forced European thinkers to reconsider some of their assumptions about how society was organised. Eventually, in the 19th century three major classical theories of social and historical change emerged: These theories had a common factor: Thus, each past event is not only chronologically, but causally tied to present and future events. The theories postulated that by recreating the

sequence of those events, sociology could discover the "laws" of history. Unilinear evolution While sociocultural evolutionists agree that an evolution-like process leads to social progress, classical social evolutionists have developed many different theories, known as theories of unilinear evolution. Sociocultural evolutionism became the prevailing theory of early sociocultural anthropology and social commentary, and is associated with scholars like Auguste Comte, Edward Burnett Tylor, Lewis Henry Morgan, Benjamin Kidd, L. H. Morgan and Herbert Spencer. Sociocultural evolutionism attempted to formalise social thinking along scientific lines, with the added influence from the biological theory of evolution. If organisms could develop over time according to discernible, deterministic laws, then it seemed reasonable that societies could as well. Human society was compared to a biological organism, and social science equivalents of concepts like variation, natural selection, and inheritance were introduced as factors resulting in the progress of societies. As early as the late 18th century, the Marquis de Condorcet listed ten stages, or "epochs", each advancing the rights of man and perfecting the human race. At that time, anthropology was rising as a new scientific discipline, separating from the traditional views of "primitive" cultures that was usually based on religious views. Spencer also developed and published his theories several years earlier than Darwin. They agree that the process of societal growth can be divided into certain stages, have[clarification needed] their beginning and eventual end, and that this growth is in fact social progress: Thus progressivism became one of the basic ideas underlying the theory of sociocultural evolutionism. Authors such as Edward L. Morgan and other thinkers of the gilded age all developed theories of social evolutionism as a result of their exposure to Spencer as well as to Darwin. Morgan, an anthropologist whose ideas have had much impact on sociology, differentiated between three eras: Morgan viewed technological progress as a force behind social progress, and held that any social change "in social institutions, organizations or ideologies" has its beginnings in technological change. He believed that societies were at different stages of cultural development and that the purpose of anthropology was to reconstruct the evolution of culture, from primitive beginnings to the modern state. Tylor in England and Lewis Henry Morgan in the United States worked with data from indigenous people, who they claimed represented earlier stages of cultural evolution that gave insight into the process and progression of evolution of culture. Morgan would later[when? Tylor and Morgan elaborated the theory of unilinear evolution, specifying criteria for categorising cultures according to their standing within a fixed system of growth of humanity as a whole and examining the modes and mechanisms of this growth. Theirs was often a concern with culture in general, not with individual cultures. Their analysis of cross-cultural data was based on three assumptions: These 19th-century ethnologists used these principles primarily to explain differences in religious beliefs and kinship terminologies among various societies. Ward, who was also a botanist and a paleontologist, believed that the law of evolution functioned much differently in human societies than it did in the plant and animal kingdoms, and theorized that the "law of nature" had been superseded by the "law of the mind". While Spencer believed that competition and "survival of the fittest" benefited human society and sociocultural evolution, Ward regarded competition as a destructive force, pointing out that all human institutions, traditions and laws were tools invented by the mind of man and that that mind designed them, like all tools, to "meet and checkmate" the unrestrained competition of natural forces. He believed that the evolutionary processes have four stages: First comes cosmogenesis, creation and evolution of the world. Then, when life arises, there is biogenesis.

Chapter 4 : Evolutionary psychology - Wikipedia

Contemporary Sociological Theory: Expanding the Classical Tradition, 6th Edition EVOLUTION AND MODERNITY: MACROSOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES. The Value of.

Early sociologists beginning with Auguste Comte believed that human societies evolve in a unilinear way—that is in one line of development. According to them social change meant progress toward something better. They saw change as positive and beneficial. To them the evolutionary process implied that societies would necessarily reach new and higher levels of civilization. H Morgan believed that there were three basic stages in the process: Those who were fascinated by this theory applied it to the human society and argued that societies must have evolved from the simple and primitive to that of too complex and advanced such as the western society. Herbert Spencer a British sociologist carried this analogy to its extremity. He argued that society itself is an organism. He said that society has been gradually progressing towards a better state. He argued that it has evolved from military society to the industrial society. He claimed that western races, classes or societies had survived and evolved because they were better adapted to face the conditions of life. This view known as social Darwinism got widespread popularity in the late 19th century. It survived even during the first phase of the 20th century. Durkheim viewed societies as changing in the direction of greater differentiation, interdependence and formal control under the pressure of increasing moral density. He advocated that societies have evolved from a relatively undifferentiated social structure with minimum of division of labor and with a kind of solidarity called mechanical solidarity to a more differentiated social structure with maximum division of labor giving rise to a kind of solidarity called organic solidarity. Cyclical theories of social change focus on the rise and fall of civilizations attempting to discover and account for these patterns of growth and decay. Spengler, Toynbee and Sorokin can be regarded as the champions of this theory. Spengler pointed out that the fate of civilizations was a matter of destiny. Each civilization is like a biological organism and has a similar life-cycle, birth, maturity, old-age and death. After making a study of eight major civilizations including the west he said that the modern western society is in the last stage i. He concluded that the western societies were entering a period of decay as evidenced by wars, conflicts and social breakdown that heralded their doom. Every society faces challenges at first, challenges posed by the environment and later challenges from internal and external enemies. The achievements of a civilization consist of its successful responses to the challenges; if cannot mount an effective response it dies. He does not believe that all civilizations will inevitably decay. He has pointed out that history is a series of cycles of decay and growth. But each new civilization is able to learn from the mistakes and to borrow from cultures of others. It is therefore possible for each new cycle to offer higher level of achievement. Pitirin Sorokin in his book *Social and Culture Dynamics* - has offered another explanation of social change. Instead of viewing civilization into the terms of development and decline he proposed that they alternate of fluctuate between two cultural extremes: The sensate culture stresses those things which can be perceived directly by the senses. It is practical, hedonistic, sensual and materialistic. Ideational culture emphasizes those things which can be perceived only by the mind. It is abstract, religious concerned with faith and ultimate truth. It is the opposite of the sensate culture. Both represent pure types of culture. Hence no society ever fully conforms to either type. As the culture of a society develops towards one pure type, it is countered by the opposing cultural force. Cultural development is then reversed moving towards the opposite type of culture. Too much emphasis on one type of culture leads to a reaction towards the other. Societies contain both these impulses in varying degrees and the tension between them creates long-term instability. This is a desirable blend of other two but no society ever seems to have achieved it as a stable condition. Functionalist or Dynamic theories: In the middle decades of the 20th century a number of American sociologists shifted their attention from social dynamics to social static or from social change to social stability. Talcott Parsons stressed the importance of cultural patterns in controlling the stability of a society. According to him society has the ability to absorb

DOWNLOAD PDF EVOLUTION AND MODERNITY : MACROSOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

disruptive forces while maintaining overall stability. Change is not as something that disturbs the social equilibrium but as something that alters the state of equilibrium so that a qualitatively new equilibrium results. He has stated that changes may arise from two sources. They may come from outside the society through contact with other societies. They may also come from inside the society through adjustment that must be made to resolve strains within the system. Parsons speaks of two processes that are at work in social change. In simple societies institutions are undifferentiated that is a single institution serves many functions. The family performs reproductive, educational, socializing, economic, recreational and other functions. A process of differentiation takes place when the society becomes more and more complex. Different institutions such as school, factory may take over some of the functions of a family. The new institutions must be linked together in a proper way by the process of integration. New norms must be established in order to govern the relationship between the school and the home. Further bridging institutions such as law courts must resolve conflicts between other components in the system. Whereas the equilibrium theories emphasize the stabilizing processes at work in social systems the so-called conflict theories highlight the forces producing instability, struggle and social disorganization. According to Ralf Dahrendorf the conflict theories assume that - every society is subjected at every moment to change, hence social change is ubiquitous. Every society experiences at every moment social conflict, hence social conflict is ubiquitous. Every element in society contributes to change. Every society rests on constraint of some of its members by others. Since the two major social classes the rich and poor or capitalists and the proletariat have mutually hostile interests they are at conflict. History is the story of conflict between the exploiter and the exploited. This conflict repeats itself off and on until capitalism is overthrown by the workers and a socialist state is created. What is to be stressed here is that Marx and other conflict theorists deem society as basically dynamic and not static. They consider conflict as a normal process. They also believe that the existing conditions in any society contain the seeds of future social changes. Like Karl Marx George Simmel too stressed the importance of conflict in social change. According to him conflict is a permanent feature of society and not just a temporary event. It is a process that binds people together in interaction. Further conflict encourages people of similar interests to unite together to achieve their objectives. Continuous conflict in this way keeps society dynamic and ever changing.

Chapter 5 : Models of Social Change

Sociocultural evolution is "the process by which structural reorganization is affected through time, eventually producing a form or structure which is qualitatively.

Social Movements Models of Social Change In their search to explain social change, sociologists sometimes examine historical data to better understand current changes and movements. They also rely on three basic theories of social change: According to evolutionary theory, society moves in specific directions. Therefore, early social evolutionists saw society as progressing to higher and higher levels. As a result, they concluded that their own cultural attitudes and behaviors were more advanced than those of earlier societies. He saw human societies as progressing into using scientific methods. Likewise, Emile Durkheim, one of the founders of functionalism, saw societies as moving from simple to complex social structures. Herbert Spencer compared society to a living organism with interrelated parts moving toward a common end. In short, Comte, Durkheim, and Spencer proposed unilinear evolutionary theories, which maintain that all societies pass through the same sequence of stages of evolution to reach the same destiny. Contemporary social evolutionists like Gerhard Lenski, Jr. Multilinear evolutionary theory holds that change can occur in several ways and does not inevitably lead in the same direction. Multilinear theorists observe that human societies have evolved along differing lines. Functionalist theory Functionalist sociologists emphasize what maintains society, not what changes it. Although functionalists may at first appear to have little to say about social change, sociologist Talcott Parsons holds otherwise. Parsons " , a leading functionalist, saw society in its natural state as being stable and balanced. That is, society naturally moves toward a state of homeostasis. To Parsons, significant social problems, such as union strikes, represent nothing but temporary rifts in the social order. According to his equilibrium theory, changes in one aspect of society require adjustments in other aspects. When these adjustments do not occur, equilibrium disappears, threatening social order. Although Karl Marx accepted the evolutionary argument that societies develop along a specific direction, he did not agree that each successive stage presents an improvement over the previous stage. Marx noted that history proceeds in stages in which the rich always exploit the poor and weak as a class of people. Slaves in ancient Rome and the working classes of today share the same basic exploitation. Only by socialist revolution led by the proletariat working class , explained Marx in his Das Kapital, will any society move into its final stage of development: Instead, it presents tools for individuals wishing to take control and regain their freedom. Unlike functionalism and its emphasis on stability, Marx holds that conflict is desirable and needed to initiate social change and rid society of inequality. Critics of Marx note that conflict theorists do not always realize that social upheaval does not inevitably lead to positive or expected outcomes.

Chapter 6 : Contemporary Sociological Theory: Expanding the Classical Tradition, 6th Edition

The variety of perspectives in modern psychology gives researchers and students tools to approach problems and helps them find new ways to explain and predict human behavior, leading to the development of new treatment approaches for problem behaviors.

Ibn Khaldun statue in Tunis , Tunisia “ Sociological reasoning predates the foundation of the discipline. Social analysis has origins in the common stock of Western knowledge and philosophy , and has been carried out from as far back as the time of ancient Greek philosopher Plato , if not before. There is evidence of early sociology in medieval Arab writings. Some sources consider Ibn Khaldun , a 14th-century Arab Islamic scholar from North Africa Tunisia , to have been the first sociologist and father of sociology [12] [13] [14] [15] see Branches of the early Islamic philosophy ; his Muqaddimah was perhaps the first work to advance social-scientific reasoning on social cohesion and social conflict. Comte endeavoured to unify history, psychology, and economics through the scientific understanding of the social realm. Writing shortly after the malaise of the French Revolution , he proposed that social ills could be remedied through sociological positivism , an epistemological approach outlined in *The Course in Positive Philosophy* “ and *A General View of Positivism* Comte believed a positivist stage would mark the final era, after conjectural theological and metaphysical phases, in the progression of human understanding. To say this is certainly not to claim that French sociologists such as Durkheim were devoted disciples of the high priest of positivism. But by insisting on the irreducibility of each of his basic sciences to the particular science of sciences which it presupposed in the hierarchy and by emphasizing the nature of sociology as the scientific study of social phenomena Comte put sociology on the map. Marx rejected Comtean positivism [28] but in attempting to develop a science of society nevertheless came to be recognized as a founder of sociology as the word gained wider meaning. For Isaiah Berlin , Marx may be regarded as the "true father" of modern sociology, "in so far as anyone can claim the title. The sociological treatment of historical and moral problems, which Comte and after him, Spencer and Taine , had discussed and mapped, became a precise and concrete study only when the attack of militant Marxism made its conclusions a burning issue, and so made the search for evidence more zealous and the attention to method more intense. It is estimated that he sold one million books in his lifetime, far more than any other sociologist at the time. While Marxian ideas defined one strand of sociology, Spencer was a critic of socialism as well as strong advocate for a laissez-faire style of government. His ideas were closely observed by conservative political circles, especially in the United States and England. *Suicide* is a case study of variations in suicide rates among Catholic and Protestant populations, and served to distinguish sociological analysis from psychology or philosophy. It also marked a major contribution to the theoretical concept of structural functionalism. By carefully examining suicide statistics in different police districts, he attempted to demonstrate that Catholic communities have a lower suicide rate than that of Protestants, something he attributed to social as opposed to individual or psychological causes. He developed the notion of objective sui generis "social facts" to delineate a unique empirical object for the science of sociology to study. Sociology quickly evolved as an academic response to the perceived challenges of modernity , such as industrialization , urbanization , secularization , and the process of " rationalization ". By the turn of the 20th century, however, many theorists were active in the English-speaking world. Few early sociologists were confined strictly to the subject, interacting also with economics , jurisprudence , psychology and philosophy , with theories being appropriated in a variety of different fields. Since its inception, sociological epistemology, methods, and frames of inquiry, have significantly expanded and diverged. Curricula also may include Charlotte Perkins Gilman , Marianne Weber and Friedrich Engels as founders of the feminist tradition in sociology. Each key figure is associated with a particular theoretical perspective and orientation. *Capitalism at the End of the Twentieth Century* Positivism and anti-positivism[edit] Main article: Positivism The overarching methodological principle of positivism is to conduct sociology in broadly the same manner as natural science.

An emphasis on empiricism and the scientific method is sought to provide a tested foundation for sociological research based on the assumption that the only authentic knowledge is scientific knowledge, and that such knowledge can only arrive by positive affirmation through scientific methodology. Our main goal is to extend scientific rationalism to human conduct. What has been called our positivism is but a consequence of this rationalism. The extent of antipositivist criticism has also diverged, with many rejecting the scientific method and others only seeking to amend it to reflect 20th-century developments in the philosophy of science. However, positivism broadly understood as a scientific approach to the study of society remains dominant in contemporary sociology, especially in the United States. Durkheimian, Logical, and Instrumental. Durkheim maintained that the social sciences are a logical continuation of the natural ones into the realm of human activity, and insisted that they should retain the same objectivity, rationalism, and approach to causality. This approach eschews epistemological and metaphysical concerns such as the nature of social facts in favour of methodological clarity, replicability, reliability and validity. Since it carries no explicit philosophical commitment, its practitioners may not belong to any particular school of thought. Modern sociology of this type is often credited to Paul Lazarsfeld, [34] who pioneered large-scale survey studies and developed statistical techniques for analysing them. This approach lends itself to what Robert K. Merton called middle-range theory: Anti-positivism

Reactions against social empiricism began when German philosopher Hegel voiced opposition to both empiricism, which he rejected as uncritical, and determinism, which he viewed as overly mechanistic. Various neo-Kantian philosophers, phenomenologists and human scientists further theorized how the analysis of the social world differs to that of the natural world due to the irreducibly complex aspects of human society, culture, and being. *Autocritica del sapere strategico*, Milan, Franco Angeli, p. At the turn of the 20th century the first generation of German sociologists formally introduced methodological anti-positivism, proposing that research should concentrate on human cultural norms, values, symbols, and social processes viewed from a resolutely subjective perspective. Max Weber argued that sociology may be loosely described as a science as it is able to identify causal relationships of human "social action" especially among "ideal types", or hypothetical simplifications of complex social phenomena. Relatively isolated from the sociological academy throughout his lifetime, Simmel presented idiosyncratic analyses of modernity more reminiscent of the phenomenological and existential writers than of Comte or Durkheim, paying particular concern to the forms of, and possibilities for, social individuality. The antagonism represents the most modern form of the conflict which primitive man must carry on with nature for his own bodily existence.

DOWNLOAD PDF EVOLUTION AND MODERNITY : MACROSOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

Chapter 7 : Sociology - Wikipedia

Modernity is the term used by sociologists to describe the "modern" period which began in Europe several hundred years ago. Some of the key features of modern societies are.

Organismic trait designed to solve an ancestral problem s. Shows complexity, special "design", functionality
Adaptation that has been "re-purposed" to solve a different adaptive problem. Williams suggested that an "adaptation is a special and onerous concept that should only be used where it is really necessary. Obligate and facultative adaptations[edit] A question that may be asked about an adaptation is whether it is generally obligate relatively robust in the face of typical environmental variation or facultative sensitive to typical environmental variation. By contrast, facultative adaptations are somewhat like "if-then" statements. For example, adult attachment style seems particularly sensitive to early childhood experiences. As adults, the propensity to develop close, trusting bonds with others is dependent on whether early childhood caregivers could be trusted to provide reliable assistance and attention. The adaptation for skin to tan is conditional to exposure to sunlight; this is an example of another facultative adaptation. When a psychological adaptation is facultative, evolutionary psychologists concern themselves with how developmental and environmental inputs influence the expression of the adaptation. Cultural universal Evolutionary psychologists hold that behaviors or traits that occur universally in all cultures are good candidates for evolutionary adaptations. Basic gender differences, such as greater eagerness for sex among men and greater coyness among women, [36] are explained as sexually dimorphic psychological adaptations that reflect the different reproductive strategies of males and females. Human evolution Evolutionary psychology argues that to properly understand the functions of the brain, one must understand the properties of the environment in which the brain evolved. That environment is often referred to as the "environment of evolutionary adaptedness". More specifically, the environment of evolutionary adaptedness is defined as the set of historically recurring selection pressures that formed a given adaptation, as well as those aspects of the environment that were necessary for the proper development and functioning of the adaptation. Humans, comprising the genus Homo , appeared between 1. Because the Pleistocene ended a mere 12, years ago, most human adaptations either newly evolved during the Pleistocene, or were maintained by stabilizing selection during the Pleistocene. Evolutionary psychology therefore proposes that the majority of human psychological mechanisms are adapted to reproductive problems frequently encountered in Pleistocene environments. The environment of evolutionary adaptedness is significantly different from modern society. Because humans are mostly adapted to Pleistocene environments, psychological mechanisms sometimes exhibit "mismatches" to the modern environment. One example is the fact that although about 10, people are killed with guns in the US annually, [44] whereas spiders and snakes kill only a handful, people nonetheless learn to fear spiders and snakes about as easily as they do a pointed gun, and more easily than an unpointed gun, rabbits or flowers. The term was coined by Niko Tinbergen to refer to non-human animal behavior, but psychologist Deirdre Barrett said that supernormal stimulation governs the behavior of humans as powerfully as that of other animals. She explained junk food as an exaggerated stimulus to cravings for salt, sugar, and fats, [48] and she says that television is an exaggeration of social cues of laughter, smiling faces and attention-grabbing action. The human mind still responds to personalized, charismatic leadership primarily in the context of informal, egalitarian settings. Hence the dissatisfaction and alienation that many employees experience. Salaries, bonuses and other privileges exploit instincts for relative status, which attract particularly males to senior executive positions. One of the major goals of adaptationist research is to identify which organismic traits are likely to be adaptations, and which are byproducts or random variations. As noted earlier, adaptations are expected to show evidence of complexity, functionality, and species universality, while byproducts or random variation will not. In addition, adaptations are expected to manifest as proximate mechanisms that interact with the environment in either a generally obligate or facultative fashion see above. Evolutionary psychologists are also

interested in identifying these proximate mechanisms sometimes termed "mental mechanisms" or "psychological adaptations" and what type of information they take as input, how they process that information, and their outputs. Evolutionary psychologists use several strategies to develop and test hypotheses about whether a psychological trait is likely to be an evolved adaptation. Buss [53] notes that these methods include: Characteristics that have been demonstrated to be cross cultural human universals such as smiling, crying, facial expressions are presumed to be evolved psychological adaptations. Several evolutionary psychologists have collected massive datasets from cultures around the world to assess cross-cultural universality. Function to Form or "problem to solution". The fact that males, but not females, risk potential misidentification of genetic offspring referred to as "paternity insecurity" led evolutionary psychologists to hypothesize that, compared to females, male jealousy would be more focused on sexual, rather than emotional, infidelity. Form to Function reverse-engineering or "solution to problem". Morning sickness, and associated aversions to certain types of food, during pregnancy seemed to have the characteristics of an evolved adaptation complexity and universality. Margie Profet hypothesized that the function was to avoid the ingestion of toxins during early pregnancy that could damage fetus but which are otherwise likely to be harmless to healthy non-pregnant women. Evolutionary psychology and cognitive neuropsychology are mutually compatible evolutionary psychology helps to identify psychological adaptations and their ultimate, evolutionary functions, while neuropsychology helps to identify the proximate manifestations of these adaptations. In addition to evolutionary models that suggest evolution occurs across large spans of time, recent research has demonstrated that some evolutionary shifts can be fast and dramatic. Consequently, some evolutionary psychologists have focused on the impact of psychological traits in the current environment. Such research can be used to inform estimates of the prevalence of traits over time. Such work has been informative in studying evolutionary psychopathology. Survival and individual level psychological adaptations[edit] Problems of survival are clear targets for the evolution of physical and psychological adaptations. Major problems the ancestors of present-day humans faced included food selection and acquisition; territory selection and physical shelter; and avoiding predators and other environmental threats. However, even voluntary behavior involves unconscious mechanisms. Many cognitive processes take place in the cognitive unconscious, unavailable to conscious awareness. Some behaviors are conscious when learned but then become unconscious, seemingly automatic. Learning, especially implicitly learning a skill, can take place outside of consciousness. For example, plenty of people know how to turn right when they ride a bike, but very few can accurately explain how they actually do so. Sensation psychology and perception Many experts, such as Jerry Fodor, write that the purpose of perception is knowledge, but evolutionary psychologists hold that its primary purpose is to guide action. Homing pigeons, for example, can hear very low-pitched sound infrasound that carries great distances, even though most smaller animals detect higher-pitched sounds.