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ABSTRACT
The paper attempts to reexamine the issues captured in the title of this paper given the current and protracted world recession and economic crisis. In undertaking this complex task the work of Anthony Giddens is used to crystallize the thought processes of the authors in terms of a brief analysis of the writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber. The paper therefore bears relevance in respect to Business Management and attempts to exemplify and discuss the salient, but vexing issues that permeate capitalism and social theory. It also attempts to discuss and analyze the issue of the division of labour and the problems of the bureaucracy. It does not in any way pretend to exhaust the issues that encompass this debate but adds to the conversation that has surrounded these issues historically. The paper discusses some of the misconceptions of the conventional views on the subject as captured in the title of this paper.
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INTRODUCTION
Anthony Giddens is the most widely used and authoritative author for those seeking to understand the thinkers who established the basic framework of modern sociology. The feeling of the authors is that social theory requires some radical revision. The most striking characteristic of social thought over the hundred years from 1820 to 1920 is the very plethora of diverse forms of theory which were developed over that period. Social context must be understood clearly and deeply understood by business, society as a whole, politicians and the bureaucracy. Giddens (1971: XI) states that “traditional society in Europe as outlined by Acton ‘was the source of the development of historical science and looks back into the past, and the past is its present.” This has in many ways is a burden from which men seek to be freed and therefore men attempt to bend the future into shape which conforms to their desires.

DISCUSSION
A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE WRITINGS OF MARX, DURKHEIM AND MAX WEBER
In understanding the subject matter of this paper, it is essential that the reader understands those writers who established the principal frames of reference of modern sociology. In this connection Giddens (1971) points out that Karl Marx’s works obviously are the “primary source of the various forms of contemporary neo-Marxism; Durkheim’s writings may be identified as the dominant inspiration lying behind ‘structural functionalism’; and at least some of the modern variants of phenomenology derive, directly or indirectly, from the writings of Max Weber. Moreover, within more specific fields of sociology, such as in the study of social stratification, religion and so on, the influence of Marx, Durkheim and Weber has been fundamental. Apart from Marx himself, there can be few social thinkers whose fate has been to be so persistently misunderstood as Durkheim. Durkheim always emphasized the crucial significance of the historical dimension in sociology because he was not primarily concerned with the ‘problem of order,’ but with the problem of ‘the changing nature of order’ in the context of a definite conception of social development.

Weber’s writings are perhaps the most complex of those analyzed and they defy easy treatment upon a general level. This has led to a failure in some secondary accounts to grasp essential consistency in Weber’s work. It is therefore, only an apparent paradox to state that the very diversity of Weber’s contributions express the epistemological principles which unify them as a single corpus of writings. Marx’s theory was formulated at an early stage of capitalist development, and that the subsequent experience of the leading countries of Western Europe helped to fashion a version of ‘Marxism’ which differed substantially from that originally framed by Marx. In other words Marx’s writings even today, given the economic crisis and more importantly the problems being experienced by capitalism in the 21st century, still offer a conception of society and history which is most valuable to contemporary debate and discussion.

Traditional society, by definition, continually looks back into the past, and the past is its present. The existence of “a science of history, therefore, presupposes a world in which change is ubiquitous, and, more especially, one in which the past has become, in some degree, a burden from which men seek to be freed. In the modern era, men no longer accept the conditions of life into which they are born as necessarily given for all time, but attempt to impose their will upon reality in order to bend the future into a shape which conforms to their desires” (Giddens, 1971: XI). It could be said that the French Revolution of 1789 was the catalyst between two enormously complex set of events. Britain was, according to the usual measures, the first country to acquire some degree of democratic government; but, in spite of the fact that this was not obtained without political revolution, the process of social and economic change which transformed society in Britain from the seventeenth century onwards was relatively progressive in nature and character.

The revolution in France on the other hand and by contrast, dramatically set off the privileged, aristocratic order of the ancient regime against the vision of a new society which would realize general principles of freedom and justice. The Declaration of Human Rights, adopted in 1789 proposed that “ignorance, disregard or contempt of the rights of man is the sole cause of public misfortune” (Giddens, 1971: XII). The political changes instituted by the 1789 Revolution in fact expressed and signaled the occurrence of a more deeply – rooted reorganization of society and in this, once again Britain assumed the leading role. The transformation and transition from agrarian production to an industrial economy founded upon the factory and the machine was one which began in Britain towards the end of the eighteen century. The full effects of these changes
were felt in the nineteenth century, both in Britain and in other major countries of Western Europe. For each of the three major countries of Western Europe, Britain, France and Germany, the closing decades of the eighteenth century were years of advancing economic prosperity. The pace of economic development in Britain in the late eighteenth century far outstripped that of the others; and during these years a number of profound technological innovations affected a metamorphosis in the organization of manufacturing services and production, which in turn initiated the rapid spread of mechanization and factory production. “But at the turn of the nineteenth century, only a relatively confined sector of the British economy had been directly affected by the Industrial Revolution. Even two decades later, the picture was little different, save to say that cotton of minor significance in the economy had assumed the role of Britain’s leading manufacturing industry” (Deane, 1969: 182: 92). “The situation in France and Germany was very different from this. It would be wrong to call these countries, as in the common parlance of today “underdeveloped” (Landes, 1969: 125). From the middle of the eighteen century Germany, France and other Western countries clearly lagged behind Britain in its level of economic development, and it was not until well over a century later that either France or Germany succeeded in recapturing in substantial degree the lead which had been ceded to the former country “ (Cronzet in Hartwell (1967: 139: 174). Regarding Britain as the measure, neither Germany nor France in the early part of the nineteenth century could match the internal political stability of a state in which the liberal bourgeoisie had achieved strong position in government. Of importance is the all embracing fact that the social and political cleavages which had been exposed by the Revolution were aggravated rather than resolved by the events of 1789 and their immediate aftermath. “Germany as Marx noted in his earlier analysis only shared in the restoration of modern nations without ever sharing in their revolutions” (Giddens, 1971: XIII). In politics, Marx and Engels (1958) wrote “the Germans have thought what other nations have done and if had to advance further, it would have to be complimented by knowledge of the material forces which are always at work in change which does not remain merely on the levels of ideas”. Many writers have laid great stress, correctly, upon the threefold set of influences which were combined in Marx’s writings (Lenin (1969: 20 -32). Marx effected a powerful synthesis of the streams of thought which had developed in conjunction with the social, economic and political differences between the three Western European countries. Political economy, closely interconnected with the philosophy of utilitarianism, remained effectively the only significant form of social theory in Britain throughout most of the nineteenth century. Marx accepted several of the key propositions developed by Adam Smith and Ricardo, but merged them with certain perspectives upon the finite character of bourgeois society contained in various currents of French socialism. In this regard Giddens (1971: XIV) points out that “in this way the historical dimension integrating political economy and socialism was provided by the Hegelian dialectic and thus Marx’s works reunited, in a coherent fashion, the intellectual consciousness of the diverse experience of Britain, France and Germany, and yet at the same time offered a basis for the theoretical interpretation of these differences in social, economic and political structure.” When Marx died in 1883, Durkheim and Weber were young men standing at the threshold of their academic careers. By this date however, the social structures of all of the three major countries of Western Europe had changed considerably from the time at which Marx had developed his basic views. In both France and Germany, in contrast to Britain, working class
movements of potentially revolutionary nature came to play a leading role in the political system. However, the influence of these movements was counterbalanced by a growing surge of nationalism and, especially in Germany, which did not experience a successful bourgeois revolution because the bourgeoisie was kept subordinate by a powerful autocratic order, operating through control of the state bureaucracy, the army, and the established hierarchy (Reminds us of Apartheid South Africa and in many ways democratic South Africa, post 1994). Giddens (1971: XV) further points out that “the philosophical materialism under the influence of Engels, came to be universally identified as ‘Marxism,’ offered a theoretical framework of Social Democracy, which allowed a substantial divergence between theory and practice.” The problem of the influence of ideas in social development, which so dominated the polemical interchanges between Marxists and their critics at around the turn of the 20th century, has to be understood against this backdrop. 

Both Durkheim and Weber accepted the philosophical materialism disseminated by Engels, Kautsky, Labriola, and others as the object of their critical evaluations of the claims of Marxism, Liberals and Marxists alike and, thus structured their debate around the classical dichotomy between idealism and materialism. The question arose about Marx’s work, as a controversy in terms of its validity because it primarily concerned itself with or not the ideas of mere ‘epiphenomena,’ which in reality have no independent part to play in social development (This is a complex issue that goes beyond this narrative). However, given the current economic recession and global economic crisis in the 21st century, it once again assumes significance to the world economy and in respect the utopian nature of the acceptance of capitalism as a panacea to world development and peace.

The discussion was necessary in order to introduce the reader to some salient issues in respect to the propositions and theories enunciated by Marx, Durkheim and Weber given the economic crisis that the world confronts in the 21st century. It now sets the pace for a discussion and analysis in respect to the bureaucracy and the issues that confront labour in respect of its social differentiation, its future and the problem of bureaucracy in the modern world.

SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION AND THE DIVISION OF LABOUR

Giddens (1971: 224) states that “the writings of Marx, Weber and Durkheim, in their varying ways, fuse together an analysis and a moral critique of modern society. Weber’s insistence upon the absolute logical dichotomy between empirical or scientific knowledge, and value directed action, should not be allowed to obscure his equally emphatic affirmation of the relevance of historical and sociological analysis of active involvement in politics and social criticism. Giddens (1971) further adds that Durkheim maintained a lifelong commitment to the formulation of a scientific foundation for the diagnostic interpretation of the ‘pathological’ features of the advanced societies whilst, on the other hand Marx’s work and political actions are produced upon the argument that ‘man must prove the truth, that is, the actuality and power, the this – sidedness of his thinking, in praxis.”

What then is the historical nature of man? Horton ((1967: 134 – 156) expresses Durkheim on this issue as follows: “the present opposes itself to the past, yet derives from and perpetuates it. It separates abstract philosophy, which stands outside of history. It is clear through purposeful reading that “egoism is also in large part a product of society, the impulse to economic self – advancement, for instance, is as much a creation of modern society for Durkheim as it is for Marx.” In modern societies, where individuality is highly developed, egoism presents a concomitantly greater threat to social unity. (In many developed countries and an increasing
phenomenon in Asian and African societies in the 21st century because of the accumulation of wealth and education). Individualism is not the same as egoism, but its growth expands the range of egoistic inclinations. Both Marx and Durkheim emphasize the fact that human qualities, needs and motives are in large part the product of social development. Both perceive a primary flaw in the theory of political economy, which treats egoism as the foundation of a theory of social order. As Marx comments “the division of labour and exchange are the two phenomena which lead the economist to vaunt the social character of this science, while in the same breath he unconsciously expresses the contradictory nature of his science, the establishment of society through unsocial, particular interests” (Stirner, 1962).

The activity of individuals in forming contracts expresses a broad network of social ties in the division of labour; and this is in fact the foundation of the state. Marx makes almost exactly the same point in a different polemical context. (Holy Family, (1967: 157) states that “The individual in civil society is not comparable to an atom, because an atom ‘has no needs’ and ‘is self sufficient’. The fallacy of the conception of the atomic individual, adopted by the economists, is that the member of civil society is bound to others by relationships of interdependence. If these unacknowledged relationships which are the real foundation of the state – in reality it is the state which ‘is held together by civil life.” The integrative character of the growth of the division of labour in bourgeois society is in fact one pole of Marx’s critique of political economy – the expansion of capitalism destroys the autonomous local community, and brings men within the framework of an interdependence which is enormously more inclusive, although according to Marx, this occurs only at the expense of a ramification of alienation (This is the state of play in the world economy today). It must be understood that freedom is not the exercise of egoism, but is in fact opposed to it. A course of action is arbitrary rather than free if it simply involves irrational choice among alternative courses of action with which the individual is confronted.

To be free is to be autonomous, and thus not impelled by either external or internal forces beyond rationale control; this is why freedom is a human prerogative, because only man, through his membership of society, is able to control, not only the form, but also the content of volition. According to Giddens (1971: 227 – 28) “Durkheim is emphatic that the individual personality is overwhelmingly influenced by the characteristics of the form of society in which he exists and into which he is socialized. However, he does not accept a complete historical relativism in this respect – every man, no matter whether ‘primitive’ or ‘civilized,’ is a homo duplex, in the sense that there is an opposition in every individual between egoistic impulses and those which have a ‘moral’ connotation. Marx does not adopt such a psychological model; in Marx’s conception, there is no asocial basis for such an implicit antagonism between the individual and society. The egoistic opposition between the individual and society which is found in a particularly marked form in bourgeois society is an outcome of the development of the division of labour. In a specific way, this is manifest in the proposition that those needs connected with physical survival in the material world are not assimilated to those impulses which are rooted in social commitments. Both Marx and Durkheim stress the historical dimension in the conditioning of human needs. For Durkheim, egoism becomes a threat to social unity only within the context of a form of society in which human sensibilities have become greatly expanded.

THE FUTURE OF THE DIVISION OF LABOUR
In Marx’s analysis of bourgeois society, there are two directly related but partially separable sources of alienation rooted in the capitalist mode of production. The first of these is alienation
in the labour process. This is termed ‘technological alienation’ and ‘market alienation’ respectively. Both of these derive from the division of labour involved in capitalist production. The latter expresses the fact that the organization of productive relationships constitutes a class system resting upon an exploitative dominance of one class by another; the former identifies occupational specialization as the source of the fragmentation of work into routine and undemanding tasks. For Marx, both types of alienation are integral to the expansion of the division of labour. The emergence of class societies in history is dependent upon the growth of the specialization of tasks made possible by the existence of surplus production. The formation of a classless society will thus lead to the abolition of the division of labour, as it is known under capitalism. Thus, in Marx’s conception both market and technological alienation are thus inseparable from the division of labour – the division of labour is nothing but the alienated form of human activity. The overcoming of market alienation through the revolutionary reorganization of society will lead to the reversal of the fragmenting effects of specialization which, by channeling the activities of the individual within the confines of a limited task, provides no opportunity for him to realize the full range of his talents and capacities in his labour.

Durkheim’s theory of the division of labour leads him in quite a different direction. For Durkheim, the growth of the division of labour is portrayed in terms of the integrating consequences of specialization rather than in terms of the formation of class systems. It is the question of moral coordination of different occupational groups within the division of labour that Durkheim is concerned about. Marx concerns himself with the regulation of the market, the socialization of production, whilst Durkheim opposes this because of the dominance of economic relationships, consequent upon the destruction of the traditional institutions which were the moral backbone of prior forms of society is precisely the main cause of the modern ‘crisis.’ In fact, Durkheim is mistaken in supposing that the regulation of the market (the elimination of market alienation) is the sole focus of Marx’s interest.

Marx is from the outset concerned more fundamentally with just the same issue as Durkheim – the amoral domination of modern society by economic relationships, and conceives the socialization of production as a means to the elimination of the conditions of labour (technological alienation) which, by subordinating man to economic production, ‘dehumanize him. Durkheim’s proposals for the reduction or eradication of this dehumanization of the worker are based upon the moral consideration of specialization of labour, Marx’s hope and expectation is that this division of labour will itself be radically changed. It is only through moral acceptance in his particular role in the division of labour that the individual is able to achieve a high degree of autonomy as a self – conscious being, and can escape both the tyranny of the rigid moral conformity demanded in undifferentiated societies on the one hand, and the tyranny of unrealizable desires on the other.

Not the moral integration of the individual within a differentiated division of labour, but the effective dissolution of the division of labour as an organizing principle of human social intercourse, is the premise of Marx’s conception. Marx nowhere specifies in detail how this future society would be organized socially, but, at any rate, this perspective differs decisively from that of Durkheim. The vision of a highly differentiated division of labour, integrated upon the basis of moral norms of individual obligation and corporate solidarity, is quite at variance with Marx’s anticipation of the future form of society. According to Durkheim’s standpoint, the criteria underlying Marx’s hopes for the elimination of technological alienation represent a reversion to moral principles which are no longer appropriate to the modern form of society. This
is exactly the problem which Durkheim poses at the opening of The Division of Labour: “it is our duty to seek to become a thorough and complete human being, one quite sufficient unto himself; or, on the contrary, to be only part of a whole, the organ of an organism” (Giddens, 1971: 231). The analysis contained in the work, in Durkheim’s view, demonstrates conclusively that organic solidarity is the ‘normal’ type of modern societies, and consequently that the era of the ‘universal man’ is finished. “The latter ideal, which predominated up to the seventeenth and eighteen centuries in Western Europe, is incompatible with the diversity of the contemporary order.”

In preserving this ideal, by contrast, Marx argues the obverse: the tendencies which lead to the destruction of capitalism are themselves capable of effecting a recovery of the ‘universal’ properties of man, which are shared by every individual and therefore according to Schiller 1795 (Oxford, 1967: 31 – 43) “The abolition of division of labour is conditional upon the development of intercourse and productive forces to such a degree of universality that private property and division of labour become fetters on them _ _ _ private property can be abolished only on condition of an all round development of individuals.” In other words free development of individuals must be determined by the interrelationship of individuals, an interrelationship which must consist partly in the economic prerequisites and partly in the necessary solidarity of the free development of all, and, finally, in the universal character of the activity of individuals on the basis of the existing productive forces. On the other hand, if the overcoming of alienation is read to mean the complete disappearance of any barriers to the activity of the subject man, then this would suppose a utopian world in which human self – determination reigns supreme, and all human potentialities are finally realized. In all previous eras, according to Marx, the ideal of the universal man has been either achieved only at the expense of the alienation of man from nature, as in primitive societies or has or will remain exclusive to minority classes; as has been the case in previous societies and today by predatory elites and their governments by means of overt corruption and patronage, thus dominating and subjugating the masses.

The overthrow of capitalism must be an ideal that requires pursuit throughout the modern world given the economic meltdown, the overt inequality, poverty and massive unemployment as exemplified by the world’s poor. This is seen vividly in both the developed and developing countries. This is further exemplified by the worldwide economic recession, the greed by the capitalist forces, the control the economy of the world by these forces, proliferating wars and deepening poverty, printing paper money by the super – powers who are the greatest debtor nations. This will allow man to be released from the occupational categorization for purposes of social equality. It is in such a context of the past debates that today’s discourse must be set and that the more general divergence between the respective standpoints of Marx and Durkheim must be set to once again resume necessary relevance in contemporary society. As matters stand today, this dichotomy, it appears would not be resolved, because of the organization of contemporary society today. Today, it is the question of transmitting privilege through the system of patronage, greed, exploitation, and the destructing of education in particularly developing countries by their so – called elected democratic governments. These governments have subordinated themselves to the capitalist forces. In such societies ‘the war of all against all’ is the greatest threat. This has to be contained by the balancing of egoism with altruism because they are destined to be in perpetual conflict as is being seen in many countries of the world including, Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Greece, South Africa and a host of other countries given the current economic crisis. There is thus a major role to be played by the labour movements of
countries individually and collectively on the international stage, in order to overcome this overt exploitation and annihilation of the majority of the world’s people.

THE PROBLEM OF BUREAUCRACY

In Marx’s analysis of the extension of the division of labour underlying the formation of capitalist enterprise, the expropriation of the worker from his means of production is given pride of place. In Marx’s view, this is the most essential condition for the emergence of bourgeois society, and identifies, along an historical dimension, the formation of the class relationship between capital and labour which is implicit in the capitalist mode of production. It is the intrinsic nature of the connection between the division of labour and the class structure which makes it possible for Marx to proceed to the conclusion that the transcendence of alienation is possible through the abolition of capitalism. Neither Durkheim nor Weber denies the possibility of the formation of socialist societies. Durkheim’s position diverges sharply from that of Weber, in that Weber’s conception of the development of the division of labour in the occidental societies constitutes a third alternative to that offered by both by Marx and by Durkheim.

Weber’s epistemology separates his general perspective upon social development from that assumed by Marx and Durkheim, whatever their differences, share a commitment to a definite overall pattern in the stages of development of society, from a primitive society to the one in modern times. However, it must be understood that from Weber’s standpoint, as Giddens (1971: 323; Gerth and Mills, 1968) point out that “the analysis of growth of rationalization does not equal the only or the correct representation of history, but simply knowledge from one culturally given point of view. With this postulation, it is therefore possible to make a comparison of Weber’s analysis of the typical process of capitalist development with that postulated by Marx.”

An important part of Weber’s writings consists in delineating the factors promoting rationalization on the level of meaning, in the sphere of religious belief. However, Weber always insists upon tracing the nexus of social relationships which both influence, and are influenced by, the growth of rationalization. In this sense, the most important questions concern, not only the degree of rationalization, but the mode in which its effects promote a particular conjunction of social relationships and institutions. Thus not only the degree, but the direction assumed by rationalization in the West, and more specifically, in capitalism, differ from that of the other major civilizations. In modern Western capitalism, there are various spheres in which rationalization has proceeded in a direction, as well as to extent, unknown elsewhere. Thus, without going into the perspectives of the science debate, the conduct of rational capitalism entails unavoidable consequences in the sphere of social organization, and inevitably fosters the spread of bureaucracy.

Weber, does not deny that modern capitalism entails the formation of a class system based upon capita and wage labour, and he recognizes the historical importance of expropriation of the peasantry upon which Marx places so much of stress. This according to Weber is not the main structural axis in the differentiated division of labour which characterizes capitalism. In other words Weber separates, but in a different manner from Durkheim the class system of capitalism from differentiation in the division of labour as such; and that bureaucratic specialization of tasks is treated by Weber as the most integral feature of capitalism. He believes partly in a separable process of bureaucratization in the economy and the polity. The growth of the rational state, which has its corpus of bureaucratic officials, is not wholly derivative of economic rationalization, but has to some extent preceded the development of capitalism, and indeed, has created conditions which promoted it to rise. However, Weber denies that the expropriation of
the worker from his means of production has been confined to the immediate sphere of industry, and instead applies the conception to other institutional contexts. “Weber substitutes the means of administration and gives to the organization of relationships of domination and subordination the prominence which Marx attributes to relationships of production. Any political association, in respect to Weber’s explanation may be organized in an estate form in which the officials themselves own their means of administration. The formation of the modern state apparatus was promoted by the actions of the monarch in gathering the means of administration into his own hands: the administrative officials, and of the workers from the material means of administrative organization is completed” (Giddens, 1971: 235). For the Marxian notion the hierarchy of authority can become subject to a process of expropriation in terms of the means of production. These developments were the most important factors promoting the emergence of the modern state in which expert officialdom, based on the division of labour, and are wholly separated from ownership of its means of administration. In general, the advance of the division of labour progresses in step with the centralization of the means of administration, and the concomitant expropriation of officials. The expansion of bureaucratization leads to the demand for specialist education. Weber and Durkheim express the same view. It is therefore obvious that since the trend towards bureaucratization is irreversible in capitalism, it follows that the growth of functional specialization is a necessary concomitant of the modern social order. It should be clear from this narrative that in Weber’s terms, there is no possibility of the transformation of the bureaucratization of social life through the occurrence of socialist revolution. In reality the opposite is the case. In the capitalist economy, a considerable number of operations are left to the play of the market forces; but in a socialized economy, these would be taken over by the state, and would then become subject to bureaucratic administration.

A socialist society would hence be more imprisoned within the toils of bureaucratic control than is already the case in capitalism. Thus the elimination of private property in the means of production would not enable this process to be reversed, but would further hasten its advancement. Marx’s view of bureaucracy is very different and the difference lies primarily in the connection which Marx establishes between market alienation and technological alienation, that is to say, between the class structure and the bureaucratic specialization. The critique advanced by Hegel in this regard is not the subject of this paper, save to say that according to Hegel the division of labour in government affairs, the civil service bureaucracy, forms the organizational mediation between the particular, individual interests of men in civil society, and the universal qualities of the state” (Hegel). In Marx’s terms, however, Hegel’s discussion of bureaucracy merely exemplifies in a direct way the general errors contained in the Hegelian concept of the state. Bureaucracy does not represent the common interest, but a particular interest; bureaucratic authority rests upon an illusionary universality which in fact cloaks a specific class interest. The state bureaucracy is thus the administrative organ through which the sectional power of the dominant class is institutionalized. This is the order of the day in many so-called democracies and in socialist driven countries and is a feature of the South African polity and has reached very dangerous proportions in terms of bureaucracy and public administration and management. The bureaucratic state is an organ superimposed upon society. Because of its tightly integrated character, bureaucracy is an especially irresponsible form of political administration. “Bureaucracy is a circle no one can leave because it possesses the state’s essence, the spiritual essence of society, as its private property; the universal spirit of bureaucracy is the
secret, the mystery sustained within bureaucracy itself by hierarchy and maintained on the outside as a closed corporation” (Fetscher, 1967: 164 0 73).

To Marx, bureaucratic centralization is one particular manifestation of the bourgeois state. And consequently is as transitory a social form as I capitalism itself. In his view it has to therefore, be dismantled and smashed. The problem of bureaucratization in the sphere of industry is not discussed by Marx in relation to the question of the bureaucratic state, but is handled in comparable terms. The authority system of the modern factory according to Marx is intrinsically linked to the necessities engendered by the capitalist economy.

SOME CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

- The paper has emphasized that the perspectives of Marx, Durkheim and Weber are rooted in divergent conceptions of the basic structure and trend of development of the modern form of society.
- For Marx, a primary factor underlying the early origins of capitalism in Western Europe is the historical process of the expropriation of producers from control of their means of production.
- Capitalism in economic terms of capital is a system of commodity production, in which the driving impulse is the search to maximize exchange value, and this applies to human labour and its exploitation. This is a direct contradiction and negates the labour movement.
- The transcendence of the class system of bourgeois society, according to Marx, allows for the development of a society in which the existing division of labour is radically transformed.
- For Durkheim and Weber, the class structure is not integral to the progressive differentiation in the division of labour.
- In a social world which is organized on the basis of a routinized division of labour, the avenues of expression of individual autonomy and spontaneity become limited to the interstices of social institutions.
- Religion and mysticism are nothing more than an escape from the demands of the modern social order, for purposes of viewing the realities of life and the ability to face such realities and to measure up to them inwardly.
- The existence, therefore, of contradictions within capitalism generates no historical necessity for such contradictions to be resolved.
- Given the realities of a contradictory economic world that humanity is confronted with today and, exemplified by greed and corruption within most capitalist countries including the large Western democracies and the advance of rationalization, which creates an abundance of material wealth for a minority and the predatory elites of many countries; stimulates a further separation between the distinctive values of Western civilization of freedom, creativity and spontaneity, to pronounced moral bankruptcy and the destruction of the world economic, social, political and cultural order; and the realities of the iron cage in which modern man, the world economy, liberated governments and humanity together with modern man is confined.
CONCLUSION
Given the world economic recession over a protracted period of time and over the last several years, this paper assumes significance, in that, the debates in respect to capitalism must be revisited and a new economic order requires to be engineered by modern governments. The works of Marx, Weber and Durkheim have to be reexamined and discussed on the basis of worker rights, overt and vulgar profits by capitalist institutions and governments, in order to reengineer sound economic conversation, in an attempt to rectify and overhaul the failed capitalist system of production, in an era of world poverty, the economic meltdown, gross inequality and unemployment perpetuated by greed driven governments and their bureaucracies, including their capitalist allies. An era of morality and values must become the order of the day. The 21st century must be a century for all the inhabitants of the world and not merely the minority. An economic revolution is required to right the wrongs of the past, in order to create a world of peace and stability.
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