

The COVID-19 and Classical Sociological Theory

Surabhi

Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur (Bihar), India.

ABSTRACT

The fundamental understanding of society through the establishment of the discipline called 'Sociology' in the world, furnish the scintillating edifice to disseminate the comprehensive knowledge about various social phenomena with sociological perspective. It is embellished with a diverse range of sociological theories and concepts propounded by the eminent sociologists in different time periods. In order to study the spread and ramifications of COVID 19, which has been labeled as a pandemic, this paper contextualized some of the essential hypotheses of a few select classical sociological scholars, notably, Comte, Weber, Marx, Durkheim and Spencer. The prevailing viewpoint, which is a central theme in the works of classical sociological thinkers, is that COVID 19 demolishes the social order. Now, we will see how these Sociological Theories and Concepts are still relevant and provides a massive apprehension to study COVID-19.

KEYWORDS: Covid-19, Classical sociological theory, Social order/disorder, Pandemic

Date of Submission: 01-12-2022

Date of Acceptance: 12-12-2022

I. INTRODUCTION- CLASSICAL SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY

The methodical examination of society and social life that evolved during the early stages of Europe's social upheavals in the 19th century has been referred to as Classical Sociology. The instability that resulted from the social unrest of the 19th century prompted classical intellectuals to search for social order, which ultimately resulted in the development of Sociology as a scientific field of study. The core tenet of classical sociological theory is that modern societies are a result of the transformation of earlier societies. Studying relationships, patterns and social events is vital, but what's more crucial is coming up with a theory that would explain why social processes occur and function in a certain way.

COMTE is credited with coining the word Sociology in 1839 and modeling it after the physical sciences. He advocated **positivism**, sometimes known as positive philosophy, as a scientific philosophy that might help sociologists analyze and explain the social order or anarchy that pervaded French Society. According to him, understanding and elucidating social order should take into account the idea that technological and industrial advancements make it impossible to go back to the middle ages. This is further emphasized in his claim that social statics (existing social structures) and social dynamics (social change) should be of importance while looking for an explanation of the laws governing social life. The latter, however, is considered to be more significant than the former. This gave the impression that Comte was more interested in social development, which he believed to be more or less a natural evolution of human civilization and would improve things. This is known as the 'Law of the Three Stages' in his Theory of Evolution. He propounded three intellectual stages- **Theological, Metaphysical and Positivistic or Scientific** through which people's mindset, groups of people, science, societies and the entire world have progressed over time. Theological beliefs include the notion that God created the social and natural worlds as well as the existence of supernatural beings and religious figures. The metaphysical stage was marked by a rejection of God or the Goddess in favor of 'nature' as the source of all explanations. The third or final stage known as the positivistic or scientific stage, is distinguished by faith in science. Comte thought that the best approach to comprehend the root of social disorder is to concentrate on intellectual disorder. This is due to the fact that social dysfunction could be linked to earlier belief systems, specifically the theological and metaphysical, which persisted in the positivistic or scientific era. Social disorder will no longer exist when positivism reaches its pinnacle and intellectual transformation is necessary to make this happen. In this theory, Comte also emphasizes the significance of consensus in achieving social order in human civilization. He also clarifies the necessity for sociologists to do comparative historical study, experimentation and observation. These viewpoints are pertinent and useful in our modern civilizations.

Comte claimed that because of the advancements in science and industrialization, a return to the middle ages is not feasible. His worries about social change can be compared to the COVID-19's current difficulties. Since the pandemic has taken longer than anyone could have predicted, the social and economic life of humanity has been greatly disrupted and altered. There was concern that the pandemic's catastrophic effects

would have affected people all across the world before scientists could eventually create treatments and vaccines for the illness. The world's fragile social order is more strained as a result of the recommended precaution. Due to protracted lockdowns implemented in several nations to enforce the stay-at-home directive, social order has begun to break down throughout the world. The demonstrations by the different societies of the world during the lockdown led to a few instances of societal instability including racial and communal strife, criminal activity and other issues. Comte asserted that the greatest approach to comprehending the social disorder is to concentrate on the intellectual disorder. This meant that instead of placing a constant emphasis on lockdown, government should be thinking about ways to reduce social disorder such as sentiments of oppression, prejudice and poverty. Comte also claimed that social dysfunction might be linked to earlier concept systems, specifically the theological and metaphysical stages which persisted in the positivistic or scientific era. Similarly, even if the COVID-19 is on the rise, socio-cultural and religious myths continue to exist. This suggests that people still have a strong conventional propensity that is occasionally at odds with biomedical norms. Before the scientific advice has much of an impact on people's beliefs, it could take some time. Finally, Comte mentioned consensus issue is important in the examination of COVID-19. The fight against the COVID-19 can advance significantly when there is an agreement among the nations that comprise the World Health Organization. It is unacceptable to have any patronizing feelings about a specific country or region. When a remedy in the form of treatment or a vaccination are found anywhere in the world, they should be carefully considered in order to put a stop to the COVID-19. There have been various assertions made that the COVID-19 unique disease has a few treatments. Therefore, there is an absence of justification for ignoring the effectiveness of herbal or conventional treatments.

SPENCER is attributed with similar effect on the growth of sociological theory but he has a different perspective on societal transformation. Spencer's evolutionary viewpoint was more Social Darwinist in nature. He claimed that social life ought to develop naturally, free from outside meddling (external interference). He believed that society has been developing gradually and that there is no need for outside involvement that might impede or skew the course of human development. Like other animals or plants, he thought social institutions and social structures would gradually and favorably adjust to the social environment to which they belonged. The phrase "**SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST**", which is also known as Darwin's "**PROCESS OF NATURAL SELECTION**", was first used by Spencer. According to the guiding concept, individuals who are 'fit' would flourish and reproduce in society in the absence of any outside interruption, while those who are 'unfit' would wither away. He believed that civilization is evolving toward an ideal moral state and that this should be viewed as the entire world's adaptive upgrading process. According to Spencer's theory of evolution, societies evolve from simple to compound, doubly-compound and trebly-compound societies or from militant to industrial societies. Spencer propounded the concept "**ORGANISMIC ANALOGY**", inferring that, like a biological organism, society is made up of various interrelated and interdependent parts. Spencer borrowed the term 'organism' from biology to frame the concept of organismic analogy. It suggested that each component is necessary for the survival of the full system as a whole. In order for society to function as a system as a whole, everyone must cooperate. Spencer has faced criticism, nevertheless, for putting forth a notion of survival of the fittest that threatened a meliorism that was cherished by the first British Sociologists.

Some of the apparent circumstances of the present COVID-19 pandemic outbreak are depicted from Spencer's point of view. His evolutionary viewpoint encapsulates the world's seeming easing of lockdown. Lockdowns are being loosened in nations that have been badly impacted by the virus, including Spain, Italy, France, Germany and India. The vaccines or treatments for the novel disease are still being developed, though. This showed how the difficulties of being forced to stay at home during a lockdown are expressing on the social and economic structure of society. Many nations are left with no choice but to accept that social institutions and structures will eventually and favorably change to fit the social context to which they belong. People must develop coping mechanisms for the infection. The social order would suffer more if people were locked inside than if they were given the chance to learn how to live with the virus. Although COVID-19 is a pandemic, it is now clear that the 'survival of the fittest' and 'process of natural selection' are progressively coming to fruition. Without external interference, it is evident that those who are healthy will survive the virus and subsequently proliferate throughout society. At the same time, many people who are unhealthy and whose immunity has been lowered by long-term conditions may undoubtedly wither away. The research and development of a vaccine or treatment for the COVID-19 virus is currently in its early stages. Reopening society is analogous to a game of survival of the fittest. According to his theory, society is moving closer to an ideal or perfect moral state and this supports the assumption that COVID-19 is through a process of adaptive upgrading. The ongoing relaxation of lockdown throughout Europe, Africa and Asia is another sign of the obvious. It is also clear that immunization rates are quite low, especially in Africa. The painful implication of the lockdown's lifting is that people will have to put up with the infection. However, it is not entirely correct to say that people would be allowed to pass away without any intervention from the state (Spencer's concept of non-interference). Governments would keep enacting preventative measures and funding the vaccine and other treatments. However, personal responsibility must be exercised through self-defense.

Spencer's theory of the survival of the fittest is applicable because COVID-19 preys on the weak and those with underlying illnesses whose immunity has been partially weakened. Due to the way Spencer applied and modified Darwin's theory of the survival of the fittest to social phenomenon, it effectively conveyed what he was trying to say. COVID-19 may appear to be a natural occurrence, but it has more societal implications than that. In terms of COVID-19 fatalities, there is a sort of relative advantage to individuals with stronger immunity. COVID-19 casualties show the relative strength of adaptation and resistance at work. Even if reopening gradually is necessary for human survival (mostly for economic output and profits), it is a latent force that favors the survival of individuals with a relative adaptive advantage or greater resistance capacity.

DURKHEIM was a French Sociologist acknowledged for his profound concepts like social fact, collective consciousness, social solidarity, anomie, suicide, division of labor, etc. The legitimacy of sociology as a science was one of Durkheim's main concerns. He developed Auguste Comte's original positivism, advocating what can be characterized as an epistemological realism and the use of the hypothetico-deductive paradigm in social science.

The concept of social solidarity is highly valued in socio-logical discourse. Solidarity is the unifying force that ties people together based on moral commitments that support group action and societal order. Durkheim was the first sociologist who addressed the idea of social solidarity more than a century ago in his book-'**THE DIVISION OF LABOR IN SOCIETY**', which distinguished between mechanical and organic solidarity. The Durkheimian idea of social solidarity might be considered in the context of the current COVID-19 pandemic in order to lessen social distance, social exclusion and stigmas that are emerging as a result of health concerns, prejudices, apprehensions and rumours that disrupt social integration. The effects of globalization, which, in **Marshall McLuhan's** words, made the world into a '**GLOBAL VILLAGE**', have been demonstrated by COVID-19. The rapid spread of the coronavirus from local to a global level and vice versa is a result of the melting of borders as well as the compression of time and distance. The COVID-19 pandemic will have cascading effects as the world experiences a humanitarian crisis. Social order and stability are ensured by the cohesion that exists between members of a society. It emphasizes how interdependent members of a society are, giving them the impression that they can make a difference in other people's lives. In addition to communal responsibility for advancing the health of the group's members and the community at large, social solidarity places a strong emphasis on attending to the needs and interests of the group's less fortunate members. The United Nations has consistently emphasized the value of unity and international cooperation in combating the pandemic since the start of the COVID-19 crisis. The World Health Organization (WHO) is pushing the countries to undertake the fundamental public health measures as there is currently no "silver bullet" to quickly end the pandemic.

The unusual conditions surrounding the pandemic make the existence of mechanical solidarity in contemporary society during this humanitarian disaster evident. The distinctive characteristics of both mechanical and organic solidarity are explained in the following sentences. This section concentrated on the emergence of mechanical solidarity characteristics throughout the COVID-19 lockdown period, ignoring unusual circumstances. Firstly, Durkheim advocated that likeness formed the basis of solidarity in pre-modern civilizations whereas differences in modern civilizations. The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted both developed and developing nations, according to research. Before attacking, the virus does not validate the racial, religious, regional, caste or linguistic distinctions made by humans. Lockdowns are in place for about half of the world's population. Our civilization has been somewhat homogenized as a result of our geographical restriction during lockdown. Because of the lockdown situation and social isolation, people now live more similar lifestyles than they did previously. The similarity between the people can also be seen in the way that we are all fighting the pandemic together.

Secondly, Durkheim contends that solidarity is opposed to individuality and the expression of self-interest. While organic solidarity is characterized by individualism, mechanical solidarity in old civilizations was not. When social segregation and lockdown are severely enforced, the individualistic framework with which our lives are familiar is greatly changing. With the COVID-19 pandemic as a backdrop, many people have voluntarily given up their rights and privileges and are adopting new state rules and norms that are being propagated through close-knit communities in the village, the family and even the apartment complex.

Thirdly, the current public health emergency has resulted in social isolation and lockdown which has reduced social interaction and the compound division of labor in society. With effect from March 25, 2020, India entered a 21-day total national lockdown, which halted 70% of activity. Only critical service providers with specialized tasks, such as medical staff, administrators, political figures and the law and order apparatus, are actively working at the forefront during this time, whilst many individuals are working from and in their homes. If we contrast it to the different types of services that were offered during the pre-pandemic period, this is similar to the characteristics of the straightforward division of labor that existed in the pre-industrial cultures.

Fourthly, To determine what kind of solidarity each law corresponds to, Durkheim divided them into **Repressive and Restitutive laws**. Criminal laws that include penalties for hurting the feelings of the group are

signs of repressive sanctions. Restitutive measures are based on civil and cooperative laws that remedy the infraction. Repressive rules were associated with societies based on mechanical solidarity, while restitutive laws were associated with organic solidarity. Durkheim is unable to recognize the repressive features of contemporary law and the restitutive aspects of the laws that existed in prehistoric civilization. In order to stop the disease from spreading, laws that are in effect during the COVID-19 period have been predicated on punitive sanctions. Individuals' acts and occasions like social gatherings and freedom of movement that were previously not seen as violations are now seen as crimes. Lathi accusations, arrests and the deployment of torturous and humiliating punishments have been observed in areas where curfew and lockdown are strictly enforced.

Fifthly, traditional cultures developed strong collective consciousness as a result of their homogeneity. A society's collective consciousness is the sum of all the beliefs and feelings held by its typical citizens, which come together to form a clear system with a self-sustaining existence. These common values, perspectives and passions serve as the society's unifying force and sustain its cohesion and stability. Society is prioritized over personal interests. In these civilizations, the concept of uniqueness vanishes. Durkheim thought society went beyond the individual. In contemporary society, it was unavoidable for individualism to develop and for collective consciousness to atrophy simultaneously. Although collective conscience is weakened in modern cultures, according to Durkheim, it does not disappear as a result of the division of labor. This time period has seen excellent displays of voluntarism everywhere in the world. The crises' familiarity highlights how crucial collectivism is. When there is consensus of thought and reflection of collective action in acts, public safety measures can be effective.

The extensive emotional effects of COVID-19 and associated suicidal behavior have received a lot of attention. From the sociological standpoint of Durkheim, the analysis of the relationships between COVID-19 and suicidality presented in this section. Firstly, altruistic suicidal behavior has been documented among high-risk populations such as health-care workers who dread getting COVID-19 and then passing it on to their family members. On a similar point, the high demands of the job combined with the belief that medical research cannot find a treatment for the virus may make healthcare professionals feel overwhelmed, burned out and despairing, which may lead to **Altruistic suicide**. Insufficient social integration brought on by the limits placed on everyday life, such as lockdown and social isolation, may also contribute to the feelings of captivity and loneliness, as well as an increase in **Anomic suicide** behavior due to a lack of social direction. An example of this is the suicides committed by migrant workers during the pandemic, where the simultaneous loss of employment possibilities, stress from being separated from their family and support systems and uncertainty about the future may be the motivating factors. On a similar, though distinct, point, being imprisoned in a prolonged lockdown may leave individuals who weren't adequately connected to social groupings before the pandemic without a sense of support and induce emotions of apathy, depression and melancholy, as well as lead to **Egoistic suicide**. Last but not least, overbearing social restrictions like curfews and lockdowns may create cynicism about the future and lead to **Fatalistic suicide**. Recent reports on a rise in prison suicides have linked the problem to an unduly tight regime intended to stop the spread of a novel coronavirus infection but which instead demoralized inmates.

A mixture of the aforementioned variables most likely applies in the case of quarantine suicides. Economic hardship, social stigma, prejudice, an unknown future and strict laws may lead some people under quarantine to have fatalistic thoughts and they may consider suicide as a way to protect their loved ones from infection. To sum up, there are likely many intricate and interconnected pathways that connect COVID-19 and suicidal behavior. To comprehend suicidal behavior in the context of the pandemic, we should include a biopsychosocial approach that incorporates sociological viewpoints.

MARX was a German philosopher and famous advocate for communism. His works aid in framing the search for a compassionate and democratic global order by demonstrating how events like the pandemic do not touch all segments of society equally. Science will eventually assist humanity in resolving the crisis brought on by the coronavirus pandemic. There will be many new theories and philosophies. The public and governments will be shown a variety of interpretations. However, the question is whether the society after COVID-19 will remain the same or transform and whether the capitalist system will grow more exploitative and callous. According to Thomas L. Friedman, "COVID-19 is a black elephant. It is an inevitable result of our more catastrophic wars with nature". The new circumstance is expected to spark a lot of public discussion, with Karl Marx and Marxism taking centre stage.

"All philosophers have interpreted the world in various ways. However, the point is to change it"- Marx wrote in **THESES ON FEUERBACH**. This served as the central tenet of Marx and his close companion Friedrich Engels' intellectual investigations. They examined human existence, the interaction between humans and the natural world and the processes involved in human creation, reproduction and the economy. Marx and Engels examined the dialectics of nature while stating that "Labour is the source of wealth and the most basic condition for human existence". They emphasized how changes result from the balance of people, land, water and air. Marx stated in the book of **CAPITAL** that "labour is first and foremost a process in which both man

and nature participate”. Marx continued by stating that the production process was nothing more than the labour process. He demonstrated how labour is the source of wealth and how it continues to generate surplus value. He discussed how capitalists, who own the means of production, appropriate surplus value under capitalism in the same work. He also discussed how the appropriation of surplus value causes riches to concentrate at one pole while the working class becomes impoverished at the other. The poor living and working conditions of the working class are a direct result of this inequity.

Engels noted that “the wretched areas in which the workers are crammed together are the hatching places of all those diseases which from time to time plague out towns” while analyzing the housing problem of society, particularly how the bourgeoisie tackles the housing problems. The pestilential air and tainted water of these working-class areas spared no virulent diseases from spreading their germs, including cholera, typhus, small pox, typhoid fever and others. This explains why the impoverished and migratory workers from all nations, including India, are suffering from the COVID-19 pandemic and going through unthinkable hardships. The changes over the last two decades have compelled capitalists to devise new agreements and strategies to continue exploiting the working classes. Before COVID-19, the global capitalist system experienced a crisis in 2008 when a subprime loan crisis hit the US economy. The current pandemic has put the global economic system on life support.

Many people believe that this pandemic is having an equal impact on all nations, communities and socio-economic classes. Therefore, we ought to let the government handle it first before defending our concerns. However, that is incorrect. Entrepreneurs are more intelligent. Capitalist governments are gaining more power in the pretext of combating the pandemic. The BJP-RSS coalition in India is attempting to move the nation into a fascist theocracy. The wrath of the working class against this capitalist and fascist political regime, which has endangered the lives of millions of ordinary people by depriving them of their rights, has been channeled more aggressively by leftist and secular democratic movements.

It is necessary to reveal the government’s lies and shortcomings. Religion is used by capitalism as a weapon to incite conflict between people, but the vast majority of people will see the evil intentions of communal-fascist rulers and will not permit them to further polarize society. Marx recognized the role caste played in Indian society after studying it. He wrote on the urgent necessity for a “democratic revolution” in India as a result of the Taping Rebellion in China, the Sepoy Mutiny in India (India’s first war of Independence) and Black Resistance in America. The caste system may be abolished using Marx’s concept of a “democratic revolution”. Marxism evolved as a revolutionary theory and science in the philosophical search for a new world. Lenin emphasized that the three essential tenets of Marxism are the notion of class struggle as the driving force of history, the theory of surplus value and the philosophy of dialectical materialism (historical materialism).

To create a new social order in which the state provides housing, healthcare, education and all other means of subsistence to all of its residents and upholds equality, justice and human dignity for all, the future will see severe class fights for political power.

WEBER was a German sociologist, historian, lawyer and political economist who is considered as one of the most significant thinkers of the evolution of contemporary western society. Social theory and research are significantly influenced by his ideas. His notable ideas includes- **Ideal type methodology, Verstehen, social action, tripartite classification of authority, weberian bureaucracy, rationalization, etc.**

A sophisticated administrative paradigm for managing corporate and public organizations is bureaucracy. It possesses a variety of distinctive characteristics, including hierarchy, specialization, breadth of control, according to Weber, the state is “a human society that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the lawful use of physical force within a specific territory” and that other organizations or persons only have the right to use physical force to the extent that the state authorizes it. When all other institutions collapsed due to the COVID-19 outbreak, this unique state right to use force was more apparent, especially during lockdown. The bureaucratic institutions performed their traditional and functional job of stabilizing the state when the state was under danger.

The state was in danger during COVID-19 when everyone, including the President or Prime Minister, needed to isolate themselves, cut back on physical contact and even meet less frequently while still needing to maintain the state’s operations. For system upkeep and stability, institutions like the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (**MoHFW**) have to be established or strengthened under the bureaucracy. In order to protect the rest of society from infection, patients had to be admitted, contained, treated, fed and either released upon recovery or prepared for burial. As a matter of necessity, daily reports on casualties had to be made public. Whether they were efficient or not, drugs had to be obtained and taken. To stop the spread, precautionary measures had to be issued and put into effect. To lessen the people’s suffering, palliatives had to be acquired and supplied.

The actual problem is that, in order to protect society and stabilize the system, bureaucracy had to take a risk, but in doing so, elite privileges had to be upheld. The bureaucracy’s job was to unleash the tools of power in order to force the society toward overall safety, but while many perished in great numbers, the elite seemed to

feel safer, received better care, perished less frequently and in some cases even had to publicly admit their contact with the virus and self-isolation. Therefore, the state has been designed to uphold an iron law of privileges regardless of the type of political system in place- liberal, socialist, democratic, autocratic or theocratic. When the elite began to face a real threat from COVID-19-a virus that has shown to be indifferent to people or privileges-the law of the tiny number came into force. The elite was nevertheless able to “immediately initiate that logically planned action which is necessary to sustain its position of power”.

The COVID-19 pandemic best supports the thesis that dominance is a necessary component of bureaucratic governance because it involves the actions like effective information dissemination for avoiding infection, assuring that daily instructions or directives from the health ministry were followed, ensuring that cases of infection were promptly reported and implementing biosecurity measures in the face of an almost total lack of proper test-kits, where affliction had been established the prospect of receiving treatment and surviving, how to feel an entire population under lockdown, some quarantined and others self-isolated.

The bureaucracy plays this crucial role at the state’s direction in any modern society, according to Weber’s definition of the state as the sole organization that monopolizes the use of force to achieve obedience. The motivation for governmental administration can be summed up as dominance by use of force or coercion. The bureaucracy served as the regulating factor of its global equilibrium as a system at a time when even the most prominent and conspicuous state actors like Presidents, Prime Ministers and Central legislators had to be isolated or protected against any form of contact to preserve their lives. The bureaucracy plays a significant role in system maintenance and adaptation activities which are essential for sustainability and continuity in any society or organization. In times of crisis or disaster, it knits the administrative tentacles together and insures the system’s survival.

The tragedy of Indian leadership in the midst of the coronavirus pandemic is that we are forced to choose between a leader who wields charisma and oratory and authorities who are masters of opaque obfuscation. Throughout the COVID-19 issue, Prime Minister Narendra Modi’s charisma has continued to rule. Will he be able to deal with the new difficulties using his current character or will he have to become a rational-legal leader?

There are three sorts of authority, according to sociologist Max Weber: ***Traditional, Charismatic and Legal*** (Rational and dependent on state, modern law and bureaucracy).

The corona virus problem is that charismatic leaders aren’t working out so well at dealing with or managing it. They are no better than previous leaders in this sense, at the very least. It appears that this pandemic is causing a great deal of turmoil and disruption, hence combating it calls for solid organizational and bureaucratic institutions. No exception applies to charismatic leaders like Modi. He has enlisted bureaucracy, but it lacks the rational-legal authority to handle the COVID-19 crisis. Nobody is aware of Modi’s selection process for PMO personnel. They gain influence and power from Modi’s charisma and from their devotion to him. In normal circumstances, it might be effective. However, in unusual circumstances, such as a pandemic, the bureaucracy’s lack of rational-legal authority may result in confusion and interruptions. Servile paper-pusher bureaucrats with no stakes in the ground and who are unable to challenge Modi cannot manage a pandemic of this magnitude.

Since the COVID-19 outbreak hit India, it has been abundantly evident that the bureaucratic framework Prime minister Modi put in place over the years is either not working or just working partially. The bureaucracy can occasionally contribute to issues. Around 4,147 instructions concerning COVID-19 and the lockdown have already been given by the Centre and the States combined. The ministers have had to provide clarifications for many of these orders since they are so ambiguous. These clarifications occasionally need to be repeated. The situation is so Kafkaesque that it seems like everyone in the country is going through the trial and coming out the other side like a dog, chasing after people and being hunted and beaten by police. This is especially pronounced in the situation of migratory workers. Millions of workers would return home on foot or bicycles when the lockdown was lifted was not even something the administration had anticipated.

The political class and opposition supporters would have given Modi opposing viewpoints. A bureaucracy that derives its legitimacy from reason and the state’s legal system can also facilitate this kind of intellectual interchange. Institutional mechanisms must be strong and reliable for such decision-making. In such case, several institutions, including the judiciary, the legislature, the media, the CAG, investigative agencies, various commissions and regulators and even civil society organizations, would operate independently and in unison. That would have produced a Habermasian Public Sphere where democratic discourse on issues of public welfare might take place.

II. CONCLUSION

The debate above demonstrates the need to choose a few chosen classical sociologists to examine the current pandemic wreaking havoc around the globe due to the relevance of their contributions to modern challenges. It became apparent that the contributions of classical sociologists are pertinent in analyzing to

Covid-19 and world challenges. Covid-19 has been responsible for social disorder, trauma, suffering, and many deaths. In contrast to economic modeling, which is prominent in discussions about lockdowns, income assistance, and recovery, sociology has not yet received much attention in public policy debates around COVID-19, hence the discussion is primarily among academics. Simply put, we require more creative social thinking, particularly about the new power structures, as well as fresh approaches to organizing and bringing about change. Not to mention, we need to consider social living arrangements that are doable, compassionate, and ready to handle COVID-scale disasters in the future. Mostly because there will undoubtedly be more of them. Additionally, there is a race to develop vaccinations and treatments. Social solidarity and equity are another viewpoint found in the writings of both classical and modern sociologists that may provide a solution to the COVID-19 issue and any subsequent pandemics.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Acharya, K. (2020). How to see what the world is teaching us about covid-19. Retrieved 15 August 2020 from: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/how_to_see_what_the_world_is_teaching_us_about_covid_19
- [2]. ASA (American Sociological Association) (2020) Special Issue: Sociologists and Sociology During COVID-19.
- [3]. Bello, Bashir and Amzat, Jimoh. (2021): "The Theory isn't dead: A Classical Sociological Gaze of Covid-19", Tanzania Journal of Sociology, 7(1), pp.48-61.
- [4]. Comte, Auguste (1865) A General View of Positivism, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- [5]. Connell, Y. (2020). Covid-19/sociology. Journal of Sociology,1-7. Retrieved 30 July 2020 from:<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1440783320943262> doi:10.1177/1440783320943262
- [6]. Durkheim, Emile (1893) The Division of Labor In Society, (Translated by George Simpson, in 1933), New York, The Macmillan Company
- [7]. Giddens, A. (1991) Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in the late modern age. Polity.
- [8]. Marx, Karl (1867) Capital: A Critique of Political Economy (Vol-1) (<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/>)
- [9]. Marx, Karl (1888) Theses on Feuerbach (<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/theses.htm>)
- [10]. McLuhan, M. (1968). War and peace in the global village. Toronto: Bantam Books.
- [11]. Mishra, C. and Rath, N. (2020): "Social Solidarity during a pandemic: Through and beyond Durkheimian Lens", Social Sciences & Humanities Open, pp.1-7.
- [12]. Ogali, Matthew Dayi. (2021): "The Politics of COVID-19 and Weber's Bureaucratic Public Administration Theory", International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research (IJPAMR), 6(2), PP.72-83.
- [13]. Pickering, M. (2003). Auguste Comte. In Ritzer, G. (Ed.), The Blackwell Companion to major classical social theorists (Vol.26). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- [14]. Ritzer, G. (Ed.). (2008). The Blackwell companion to major classical social theorists (Vol.26). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- [15]. Spencer, H. (1851). Social Statics. London: Chapman.
- [16]. Spencer, Herbert (1864) The Principles of Biology (Volume 1), Harvard University, Williams and Norgate.
- [17]. Turner, J.H. (1994). Sociology: Concepts and Uses. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [18]. Weber, Max (1922) Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology (Vol-1), https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economy_and_Society
- [19]. Weber, Max (1962) Basic Concepts in Sociology, the University of California, Citadel Press (https://books.google.co.in/books/about/Basic_Concepts_in_Sociology.html?id=Aq9ExgEACAAJ&redir_esc=y)

Surabhi. " The COVID-19 and Classical Sociological Theory." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 27(12), 2022, pp. 06-12.