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## Introduction

In the past or the Classical age, there were different sociologists who had different philosophical ideas on society, man and religion. At times their ideas were similar but on certain aspects they differed.

## Comparative Review

The different sociologists had differing views when it came to social knowledge or epistemological knowledge. Karl Marx looked at sociology in terms of the economic structures and the class struggles. He was concerned about the owners of the factors of production and the oppression of the masses. Marx was concerned with group settings such as trade unions, political parties and lobby groups. This is the setting where individual action takes place. Karl Marx viewed the society’s progress being disrupted by the necessary revolt by the working class towards the land owners due to their exploitation. After the land owners or capitalists are overthrown the society will become a socialist state where there is equal use of the factors of production.   
Karl Marx was interested in the people and the condition they were in. Unlike Weber and Durkheim, he was not abstract in his knowledge or epistemology. He was thinking of the repercussions of the rich landowners getting richer and the working class get more enslaved and their labour exploited. He felt that the society knew of its depraved economic condition and that is why religion was the opium of the masses. It was a way to escape and create illusions. If religion was stripped the people would have to deal with their condition.   
Max weber however was concerned with the individual. He advocated for empathetic understanding of the individual and understanding the meaning they attach to the different courses of action that they choose.   
Karl Marx spoke of the action of the masses to get economic liberation. He was interested in the economic influences on the land owners and the masses (Morris, 99). However Weber considered other things that would influence a man such as religion, ideas, status and bureaucracy in addition to economic factors. The main idea for Karl Marx was class struggle while for Weber it was rational bureaucracy. Weber believed that the reality was chaotic and at times not easily comprehensible. It was man’s rational thoughts that brought order to the perceptions and external communications. As man became a more rational being he would increase in his knowledge and even grow impersonal. Rationalization actually freed the men from traditional and restrictive social norms. However rationalization had its downside leading the men into bureaucracy causing them to behave like robots or as machines. In overall the rationalization of the individual and the bureaucracy of the institutions is what moved the society forward.   
Max Weber supported capitalism rather than socialism. He believed that socialism would lead to a lot of bureaucracy due to the collective forms of capital and the accumulated power of the state. He viewed capitalism as the response to the protestant religion of the people which encouraged the people to work hard and re-invest. The people were religious and they believed in predestination. They were therefore involved in accumulating wealth rather than spending it. At the time Weber was writing his articles, the Social Democratic

Party that had been influenced by the Marxist ideologies was trying to change Germany by calling for a removal of the social classes. The party wanted a social revolution which Weber did not believe. He saw socialism being a system that would remove efficiency and innovation (Kienzle, 419).   
Emile Durkheim on the other hand focused on structural functions of man. As a sociologist he believed that the only way the society would survive over time is if the people obeyed the laws of the land. He was not interested in the class struggle but the importance of every man playing the role he was supposed to be playing in life. He viewed the people who did not obey the law as dysfunctional and bringing disorder to the society. The society needed to survive and progress by the people doing what they were supposed to be doing (Randle and McKinnon, 1049). When it came to the society the individuals faced constraint on their behaviour. The society had a lot of coercive power that demanded a lot from the people. He even compared the society to a superior supernatural being that controlled the people. The people were part of the society however it controlled them and guided them.   
When it came to science and individuals, Durkheim favoured an empirical and objective approach to studying people. He was not subjective or intuitive in nature. He was not interested a lot in the individual but on the society as a whole. He believed that social science should be holistic (Rawls, 467)

## Conclusion

These sociologists have influenced the sociological and economic education in the 21st century. Experts and socialists are divided as they each support different ideologies. They are those who support capitalism while others support socialism. There are those experts who believe in understanding the motivations of man while others are more objective.
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