Essay: What does Durkheim’s argument in Suicide say about the relationship between the individual and the social? Are there alternative views of this relationship?
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It is important to define first of all the terms ‘social’ and ‘individual’. The ‘social’ is referred to as the object and the ‘individual’ as the subject. The distinction between the two originates from a French philosopher/mathematician Descartes¹. He talked about ‘extended things’² and ‘thinking things’³. The former refers to bodily things with spatial dimensions (height, depth, width) and the world ‘out there’. The latter is the ‘conscious mind’ of the individual. This subject-object distinction is referred to as dualism or Cartesian⁴.

As we will see in this essay, different writers have different conceptions of the relationship between the individual and the social. Subject-object dualism provides two options: to take either an objective or subject approach. Subjectivists place greater emphasis on the individual’s relationship with the world and each other⁵. In this essay Husserl and Weber will be cited. On the other hand, objectivists (said to be established by Comte⁶) attempt to decipher the logic of external forces which transmute independent individual behaviours into coherent collective actions. In other words the former believes that individuals determine the social and the latter argues that the social determines individuals. In addition to Durkheim’s study of suicide, Levi-Strauss’ structuralist approach will be briefly introduced.

Despite vast studies by authors who took subjectivist and objectivist approaches, Descartes’ dualism has been challenged by writers such as Wittgenstein⁷, Heidegger⁸, Dreyfus⁹ (drawing on Heidegger), Bourdieu (drawing on Wittgenstein and Heidegger), and Goffman¹⁰. Their aim was to

---

¹ Robinson 2003: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/dualism
² Referred to as “res extensa” - objects
³ Referred to as “res cogitans” - subjects
⁴ Collins 1998: 32-3
⁵ Dallmayr and McCarthy 1997 :19
⁶ Ellwood 1916: 291
⁷ Wittgenstein 1958
⁸ Heidegger 1996
⁹ Dreyfus 1994
¹⁰ Goffman 1963
find a compromise between the two emphases with the explicit intention of bridging or even dissolving the opposition between the two approaches\textsuperscript{11}. I will examine Wittgenstein and Heidegger primarily in this essay. They both believe that human beings should be seen as beings engaged in activities in the world\textsuperscript{12}. In sum the picture of sociological theory including other writers may look like this.

All Durkheim, Levi-Strauss, Husserl and Weber’s approaches start from the object-subject dualism, which involve a problem - decentring of either the individual or the social. In addition these approaches involve rule following, which seems to be the key issue. These issues will be highlighted throughout the essay. In contrast, Heidegger and Wittgenstein have an anti-rule following theory\textsuperscript{13}. Heidegger starts his inquiry from a totally different perspective which avoids the decentring. This then leads us to a conclusion that subject-object dualism may have been a false step for starting a sociological inquiry.

For Durkheim the ‘object’ is the starting point from which he begins his line of enquiry, which makes him an objectivist. For Durkheim sociology should concern itself with social realities external

\textsuperscript{11} Subjectivist and objectivist approaches
\textsuperscript{12} Rhodes 2003b: Sociological Theory Lecture Week 8
\textsuperscript{13} Heidegger 1990: and Wittgenstein 1958
to the individual such as social structures and forces. Durkheim was the first to insist on a sociological explanation for suicide. Durkheim tried to show that sociology is the scientific study of society and that society has real substance.

For Durkheim suicide is a “social fact” which is claimed to be ‘sui generis’. According to him, social facts can explain individuals. Thompson introduces three forms of social facts: Morphology, Institutions and Collective Representations. ‘Collective Representation/Conscience’ is the key term here as he applied this concept to his study of suicide. Durkheim defines it as “the totality of beliefs and sentiments common to average citizens of the same society forms a determinate system which has its own life”. In an attempt to stress that collective representations were somewhat “more than individual psychological phenomena,” Durkheim explained it by using an electrical analogy:

![Electrical Analogy Diagram]

Durkheim suggests that current B mirrors current A. It may be easier to put it this way: if you rub a steel paper clip (the individual) against a ‘+ magnet’ (the collective representations/collective conscience) then the steel paper clip

---

14 Durkheim's methodological principles were developed in "The Rules of Sociological Method" (1895).
15 Up until Durkheim's analysis, suicide was studied as psychology because it was regarded to be so ultimately individual (Lukes 1973: 194).
16 Thompson 1990: 59
17 Thompson 1990: 60
18 See Appendix C for details of three forms of social facts: Morphology, Institutions Collective Representations
19 Thompson 1988: 61
20 Durkheim 1952: 79
21 Thompson 1988: 62
becomes a ‘+ magnet’. However this analogy is nothing more than a metaphor\textsuperscript{22}. Therefore the relationship between the collective representations and an individual’s mind is unanswered. It is worth noting Ellwood’s criticism: Durkheim "accepts the hypothesis of a ‘social mind’\textsuperscript{23} and this is not fully objective.

Durkheim studied the long-term trend of suicide rates across different nations, using governmental statistics\textsuperscript{24}. If suicide is an individual choice made without reference to any social reference, then the distribution of suicides should be random. This was not the case in Durkheim’s study. Suicides were not randomly distributed. A pattern occurred across all nations he studied. His findings also showed that the suicide rate of any given country was relatively stable over any given time with sudden rises or drops in rates, and that there were also sharp contrasts between different nations and social categories of people. He found out for example that there were more suicides among Protestants than Catholics and among single over married people\textsuperscript{25}. He found that individuals’ decision to commit suicide was logically based upon the operation of some form of external force.

Durkheim theorised the nature of the relationship between the social order and the types of suicide using two concepts: a) levels of social integration and b) levels of social regulation\textsuperscript{26}. The former refers to the way in which people are a part of a greater whole (e.g. society) where an integrated group of individuals has a sense of belongingness\textsuperscript{27}. The latter refers to the ways in which social groups or societies control their members, such as by laws, customs or traditions. Durkheim argued that if integration and regulation were not carefully balanced society would show signs of illness, of which an increased rate of suicide is a symptom. The table below shows the social orders and four types of suicide Durkheim elaborated\textsuperscript{28}. The explanation of each type of suicide has been presented in Appendix B.

\textsuperscript{22} Rhodes 2003a: Sociological Theory Lecture Week 6
\textsuperscript{23} Ellwood 1916: 292
\textsuperscript{24} Thompson 1990: 109
\textsuperscript{25} Thompson 1990: 111 (For further explanation refer to Appendix B)
\textsuperscript{26} Thompson 1990: 110
\textsuperscript{27} At the risk of illegal movement, I will use the term "sense of belongingness".
\textsuperscript{28} Thompson 1990: 110
Durkheim’s study of suicide concluded that by looking at the social order of a society it was possible to determine the type of suicide emerging in the society. Thus the social (the object) explains the individual (the subject). We can apply this theory of the relationship between the object and the subject to other social facts. For example, votes tend to increase for particular parties in a particular social context (e.g., when there is an economic crisis, votes for extreme right or left parties increase29). However, there seems to be a problem in Durkheim’s theory. Certainly people do not act in accordance with the social order they are in. People actually think and make decisions which may have not necessarily been the effects of the social order30. We have our own experiences. In the example above, we could perhaps say “people tend to search for an ideal strong person who can lead the economy and thus vote for the extreme right or left parties”. However this is a taboo statement for Durkheim 31. Durkheim is often criticised as being deterministic in that he assumes humans are almost entirely constructed by their collective beliefs and their behaviour is developed by the social environment. Durkheim underestimates the implications of individuals’ conscience mind32 and his approach leads to the problem of decentred individual.

There have been extensive criticisms of Durkheim’s study of suicide. The main criticisms are statistical inaccuracies and the categorisation of suicides such as coroners’ problematic reports33.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Orders</th>
<th>Types of Suicide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Lack of Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>Lack of Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-Regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 Legget 1964  
30 However it seems plausible to understand that the social interact with the individual therefore influencing the individual thinking to a certain extent. It is important to note that the reverse effect is possible as well.  
31 You must never refer to an individual state of mind when explaining individual beings.  
32 In case of suicide, for example, some people may be very stressed out due to certain things and they think “I might as well commit suicide because I don’t feel like living...” or maybe some people could be in a severe mental state which leads to committing suicide.  
33 O’Donnell 1992: 315
Douglas and Atkinson insisted and produced evidence to prove that coroners have very different criteria as to what they consider as verification of a suicide. Some coroners may request a suicide note before he concludes that a suicide was a cause of death whereas other coroners may need much less convincing evidence. Thus the inconsistent definition of suicide and data gathering mar the statistical reliability and validity of the data used by Durkheim. The results could have occurred by chance.

For Durkheim quantitative research is the only relevant method. However with the decentred subject it is difficult to justify and practically apply his theory\textsuperscript{34} to sociological studies since it would develop into one-sided research. We cannot dismiss the individual’s influences towards the social. Thus we need to find a balanced view on this relationship.

Structuralism (originated in Ferdinand de Saussure’s study of language\textsuperscript{35}), regarded as one of the objectivist approaches, takes a slightly different approach. Originally Saussure claimed that meanings were created by connections between words rather than by external reality (as Durkheim suggests). Structuralists regard \textit{“social structure as having priority over action”}\textsuperscript{36} and believe that individual actions are an outcome of a transpersonal structure. Levi-Strauss realised that it was now possible to go further than Durkheim’s theory: culture can be looked upon as a code of meaning in Saussure’s sense. Levi-Strauss attempted to extend structuralism to anthropology. Levi-Strauss applied the linguistic model first to the rules of kinship in preliterate societies, and then to the structure of myth\textsuperscript{37}. In his ethnographic research on kinship societies, he aimed to discover laws of operation \textit{“either by induction ‘or... by logical deduction, which would give them an absolute character”}\textsuperscript{38}. He concluded that kinship behaviour was an outcome of a structure. He found out for example that if the relationship between the father and son was informal then the relationship between the uncle and the nephew was formal. According to Levi-Strauss, a structure automatically determines the way in which people behave. Thus the individuals are determined by

\textsuperscript{34} Nevertheless I am not dismissing the fact that quantitative researches are useful.
\textsuperscript{35} Danesi and Perron 1999: 40, 48 (See Appendix A for a brief explanation of Saussure’s study of linguistics)
\textsuperscript{36} Marshall 1988: 646
\textsuperscript{37} Levi-Strauss 1977
\textsuperscript{38} Levi-Strauss quoting Troubetzkoy, Levi-Strauss 1977: 33
the social (more precisely social structure). However Levi-Strauss’ structuralism faces the same problem as Durkheim’s. He dismisses the subjects. Thus decentres the subject. Furthermore Pierre Bourdieu challenges his theory by insisting that while rules do exist, individuals do not automatically follow them\(^{39}\). The rules are flexible; we stretch and bend them. Bourdieu takes a Kabyle marriage as an example of this flexibility of rules\(^ {40}\). While one family claims a marriage to be in line with official rule, in reality this marriage can be against the rule. Given this example, Bourdieu argues that rules do not automatically determine our behaviours but individuals “aim to ‘fall in line’ with the rule”\(^ {41}\).

In contrast to objectivist approaches, Edmund Husserl, a philosopher, and Max Weber take a completely opposite approach. They believe that it is the individual that is real and that sociology is about individual actions that are socially orientated. In this sense they are subjectivists. I will cut across the argument by noting that Husserl believes “consciousness brings its own objects into being”\(^ {42}\). Thus we see the world as it appears in consciousness\(^ {43}\). However this view raises a question: can you trust your own consciousness? Here we fall into solipsism. What appears in our mind could be illusory or deceptive\(^ {44}\). Decentring occurs in Husserl’s theory just as we saw in Durkheim’s theory, but this time it is the object that becomes decentred.

Now let’s see whether Weber gets around the problem of solipsism within his subjective sociological theory. Weber thinks “[s]ociology...is a science which attempts the interpretive understanding of social action in order thereby to arrive at a causal explanation of its course and effects. In “action” is included all human behaviour when and in so far as the acting individual attaches a subjective meaning to it.”\(^ {45}\) Weber notes that there are four ideal types of social actions\(^ {46}\): instrumentally rational actions, value rational action, affectual action, and traditional

\(^{39}\) Bourdieu 1990: 170  
\(^{40}\) Bourdieu 1990: 173-6  
\(^{41}\) Bourdieu 1990: 170  
\(^{42}\) Collins 1999: 42  
\(^{43}\) The debate of ethnography comes into place in this discussion, since the facts we find out through interviews are what we see through our eyes and nevertheless the interviewees’.  
\(^{44}\) Collins 1999: 40  
\(^{46}\) Weber 1947: 116
action. Instrumentally rational actions (in relation to a goal) are actions motivated by self-interest. Company directors acting rationally to increase profits by implementing computerised systems, cutting material cost, and conducting market research is an example. Consumers purchasing commodities to meet their needs and desires is another example. Therefore the picture of this action includes objects and subjects. An individual creates an internal map of objects, and takes rational actions. It is not necessary, for the main focus of the present discussion, to go into the details of the other three actions. The aim is to concentrate on the idea of how Weber explains the interaction between the subject and the object. However it is worth noting that traditional actions constitute most of our actions.

On surface it seems as if Weber's theory arrives again to solipsism as we need to look into an individual's mind to explain one's behaviour. However Weber avoids it in instrumentally rational actions and value rational actions. When seeking to explain somebody's rational action we first look at their goal and figure out the means available. "Insofar as the action was rigorously rational it could not have taken any other course" because individuals take actions in typical ways. For example if I am to buy some bread today and have £2 in my wallet and a bicycle, then the available means to achieve this goal is limited. I would probably use a bicycle, bring the £2 with me, and buy some bread at the closest supermarket available. In this sense he avoids solipsism when accounting for the subject. However there is a problem with this theory. What if I decide to walk because it is a very nice weather? Or what if I don't feel like shopping? Then my action cannot be explained by any of the categories Weber suggests, because it is not rational. Moreover instrumentally rational action does not account for most of our daily actions because most of our behaviours are traditional. The theory itself has some criticism that the focus of his methodological attention leans too far in the direction of the intentions and motives of individuals.

---

47 As Weber admits, it would be very unusual to find actions in the real world that contained only one of these ideal types (Weber 1947: 116)
48 Explanations and examples of Value Rational Action, Affectual Action, and Traditional Action can be found in Appendix D
49 Refer to Appendix D for explanations and examples
50 Weber in Marxist.org: http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/ge/weber.htm
51 Newby and Lee 1983
In sum Weber’s aim was to study meaning associated with individual behaviours systematically. Attempting to understand the individual is necessary to provide an explanation of how society works and how social change takes place. Furthermore Weber capably gets around the problem of solipsism within the category of rational actions of individuals; however these actions do not concern most of our actions. When we act, most of the time we do not think things through. We do not act upon set of rules (resembling models of rational actions) that Weber suggests. Therefore there seems to be a problem in the prime idea of “people acting according to a set of rules”.

Heidegger, Wittgenstein, Bourdieu and Dreyfus are contemporary writers who criticise “rule-following” theories. While objectivist and subjectivist thinkers believe that human behaviours involve following a set of rules, these theorists believe that rules do not always apply and stress the practical consciousness of individuals. Heidegger and Wittgenstein suggest “a new way of grasping the sources of intelligibility” which avoids “the tendency to think of ourselves as subjects or minds distinct from a world of brute objects”, thus prevents the decentring of subjects and objects.

Wittgenstein notes that rules work like a machine and that the outcome is already pre-determined, as he says the answer “seems to be there from the start” say in a drawer. Subsequently all you need to do is take the answer out of the drawer. He explains that individuals act in a certain way which we are trained to do so. In reality we do not act according to rules. Wittgenstein hints a radical and deep moral: perhaps we should not think of rules as determining their outcome in advance. He suggests that interpretations fix meanings which implies that rules involve infinite regress; “[A]ny interpretation still hangs in the air along with what it interprets”.

Heidegger did not start from dualism which identifies human as an isolated thinking thing but from Dasein which is the essence of human being. Dasein is that “being which is concerned in its being...”

---

52 Guignon 1990: 654
53 Guignon 1990: 654
54 Wittgenstein 1958: #193
55 Wittgenstein 1958: #198
56 Wittgenstein 1958: #187, #190-195, #209
57 This is where Dreyfus picks up his argument of the failure of Artificial Intelligence – Dreyfus 1994
58 Wittgenstein 1958: #198
59 The term Dasein seems to overlap with the term human beings
about its being\textsuperscript{60}. Being in the world is about a complementary dependence between Dasein and its world which is primarily practical. In other words it is about human life’s engagements with various worlds\textsuperscript{61}. Heidegger reminds us that we do not exist as independent entities but as part of the world “because Dasein is essentially Being-in-the-world”\textsuperscript{62}. Thus separating the subject and the object is invalid for Heidegger, but only come to be separated when problems emerge. Also Heidegger notes that we use rules only when we are beginners. Heidegger uses an example of hammer to illustrate these aspects\textsuperscript{63}. Here is my example. Say I am working for a new office from today and am learning how to data-input on a computer. At first I will be very cautious paying attention to every detail such as looking for the right input field. Here I use a rule, perhaps instructed by my manager. As I go on, I get used to data inputting. This is where I begin not to use rules. I merely get on with the work. Other aspects emerge: the computer as a handy tool which does not appear in my mind, and the mindless subject who does not think of his/her activity. Thus the object and the subject disappear. What remains is the mindless activity of data inputting. However on the occasions of problems the object and the subject emerge as separated. For example if the computer does not switch on, then I figure out that the computer is not working (the subject emerges) and also the computer pronounces itself (the object emerges). Thus when things go wrong we think like an isolated thinking thing as articulated by Descartes. Heidegger presents to a certain extent a critique of the Cartesian idea. However it appears that he is not attempting to entirely obliterate the subject-object dualism but rather providing the forgotten elements\textsuperscript{64} imbedded in it.

Now we have seen a variety of approaches citing criticism and alternative views of Durkheim’s approach. Durkheim and Levi-Strauss insist that individuals are determined by the social. Critics say; that Durkheim’s study of suicide accompanies statistical inaccuracies, that his belief in collective consciousness is questionable which leaves his theory incoherent, and that he assumes that individuals are entirely constructed by collective beliefs and the social. Levi-Strauss’ structuralist

\textsuperscript{60} Heidegger 1996: 40  
\textsuperscript{61} Heidegger uses the term "world" as in world of media, world of academy, world of sports.  
\textsuperscript{62} Çüçen http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Cont/ContCuce.htm (Accessed 27/01/2004)  
\textsuperscript{63} Heidegger 1990: 149-169  
\textsuperscript{64} The elements are for example the fact that the object-subject dualism is only applicable when things go wrong and that individuals engage in mindless activities.
approach is confronted by Bourdieu because we actually bend rules. Both Durkheim and Levi-Strauss’ approaches dismiss the individual, as they regard individuals as not influential to the social. Thus individuals are decentred in their approaches. On the other hand, Weber and Husserl argue that the individuals determine the social. However solipsism was one problem unpreventable in their approach. Weber indeed attempted to avoid solipsism however was not quite successful as his theory works only for the type of action that most of our behaviour do not fit into. Subjectivist approach decentres the social and dismisses its influence on the individuals. Descartes was successful in making the distinctions between the social and individual. As we have seen however, both subjectivist and objectivist theories result in prioritising one over the other. They do have one thing in common; both approaches believe in the idea of rule following, which cannot be true as already noted introducing some criticism and examples. In sum “the quest for certainty that motivates Cartesian foundationalism end[s] in frustration”\textsuperscript{65}. Heidegger and Wittgenstein are the ones who argue that rule following theories cannot be true. Wittgenstein suggests that if the idea of following rule was right then the answer is predetermined. He goes on to say that rules involve infinite regress because interpretations fix meanings. Heidegger suggests rules only apply for beginners and individuals cannot exist without the social, and the social cannot exist without the individual. Both Wittgenstein and Heidegger emphasise the importance of investigations of individuals engaged with the world.

Considering the problem of decentring and the primarily mistaken idea of rule following in subjectivism and objectivism, the idea of dualism as a starting point of sociological inquiry becomes questionable and thus classical sociological theory itself needs to be rethought. I believe that further investigations into Heidegger and Wittgenstein’s theory will enrich the variety of theories and perhaps a further evolved approach could emerge. Their novel approach indeed opens up a new inquiry: “Was it appropriate in the first place to make a distinction between the subject and the object as a foundation for sociological study?”

Alternative views of the relationship between the individual and the social are available as seen, although what you choose depends on what you believe. Naturally sociology embraces a variety of

\textsuperscript{65} Guignon 1983: 29
theoretical views and disagreement between and within approaches is quite radical. However I believe this diversity is a sign of the strength of sociology, as it provides a wide range of opinion depicting the world we live in.
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Appendix A

Saussure starts from the object but believes that meaning starts up in language, which is made up by “words” and “objects”\(^{66}\): the former is referred to as “signifier” and the latter “signified”. The signifiers have an arbitrary relationship to the mental pictures of the signifieds because the “signifier” can be anything\(^{67}\). For example the thing you sit on is the “signified” and the word to call that object is chair, the “signifier”. However if all signifiers were identical then we cannot establish meaning. The signifieds depend on “differences” to work.\(^{68}\) We know that a university is a university because it is not a primary school.

\(^{66}\) Danesi and Perron 1999: 72
\(^{67}\) If we had called the “thing you sit on” a “table” then that would have been completely fine as long as it conveyed a meaning different from other signifiers.
\(^{68}\) It is also important to note that different languages give us a different world. In china for example the signifier “dog” signifies “domesticated animal” as well as “food”, whereas in Japan it would only signify “domesticated animal”.

Appendix B

Egoistic suicide results from a weakening of the social ties that bind the individual to the society. Thus individual interests come forward replacing "collective life". For example, Durkheim noted that amongst the Protestants the suicide rate was significantly greater than amongst Catholics. The reason he gives for this is that Protestants have a less doctrinal creed, being encouraged to question and be individual. Durkheim argues that this individualism, the isolation from a close-knit religious community, leads to more Protestants committing suicide. On the other hand Catholics are more integrated than their Protestant counterparts. Altruistic suicide is the result of over-integration into the society. Japanese Kamikaze pilots who risked their lives for their country, regarded as a deeply-honourable form of behaviour within a society, are an example of this sort of suicide. Anomic suicide occurs due to lack of social regulation. Durkheim observed that this form of suicidal behaviour was relatively common in times of increased social instability that resulted from social change. An example for this type of suicide would be a group of suicides who have enough money that there is no need to work. "[T]he higher socio-economic strata ... [the] higher rates of suicide that the poor". Fatalistic suicide was seen by Durkheim to occur amongst social groups that suffered from oppressive social discipline and over-regulation. Durkheim considered this form of suicide to be almost non-existent in modern societies (and therefore did not go into great depth) - an example here may be the high suicide rates amongst slaves.

---

69 Thompson 1990: 110
70 Thompson 1990: 111
71 Thompson 1990: 110
72 Thompson 1990: 112
Appendix C

I. Morphology (substratum)

Volume, density and distribution of population. Territorial organisation. Material objects incorporated in the society such as buildings, channels of communications or technological instruments.

II. Institutions (normative)

a) Formal rules and norms such as law, moral ideas, or political/economic forms

and

b) Informal rules and norms such as collective habits and beliefs.

III. Collective Representations (symbolic)

a) Social values and collective ideals, opinions, representations, which the society has of itself.

and

b) Free currents of social life and creative collective thinking and values and representations in the process of emerging

(Thompson 1988: 60) – Summarized
Appendix D

- **Value Rational Action** (in relation to a value)

  It involves "a conscious belief in the absolute value of some ethical, aesthetic, religious, or other form of behaviour, entirely for its own sake and independently of any prospect of external success"\(^\text{73}\).

  **Example**
  
  After boarding a train to go to a zone 3 station you realise that you have bought a zone 1 ticket, however you know that the destination station does not have any ticket machines. So you decide to stay on the train. This is a rational action if this dishonesty is one of your values.

- **Affectual Action**

  It is an "affectually determined behaviour, ... which demands the immediate satisfaction of an impulse, regardless of how sublime or sordid it may be, in order to obtain revenge, sensual gratification, complete surrender to a person or ideal, blissful contemplation, or finally to release emotional tensions"\(^\text{74}\).

  **Example**
  
  When you have a dispute with somebody and you give that person a push. Another example maybe when an crafts-maker is not satisfied with his work, looses control of yourself, and bangs his work on to something (breaking it).

- **Traditional Action**

  "The great bulk of all everyday action to which people have become habitually accustomed"\(^\text{75}\) can be considered as traditional actions, although much of them are behaviours rather than meaningful actions, because we do not think about what we are doing. Some of them, however, are knowingly explained in terms of customs.

---

\(^{73}\) Weber 1947: 116

\(^{74}\) Weber 1947: 116

\(^{75}\) Weber 1947: 115
Example

Say Japanese people would explain an Italian person that “we do not hug and kiss cheeks but instead bow and greet when we have family gatherings”.