

Giddens (1997:245) writes "Marx's idea of class directs us towards objectively structured economic inequalities in society. Class doesn't refer towards the beliefs people hold concerning position, but to objective conditions which permit some to own greater use of material rewards than others". So Marx isn't quite the easy advocate of two classes. He was conscious that 'on the surface', a bit more complex picture can emerge. However he thought these 'intermediate' classes wouldn't contribute to social change (Waters and Crook, 1993:177).

Max Weber (1864-1920) inked a 'debate' with Marx with the exceptional ideas on class. Weber certainly believed that classes existed understanding that they were significant to your life with the modern individual. Like Marx's applying for grants class, Weber's courses are based upon human relationships from the economic sphere of society also. However these courses are not, for Weber, located within the production process because they are in Marx's work. Rather Weber's courses are rooted in economic markets. Markets such as being the labour markets, the commodity markets as well as the money markets. Therefore classes will be the product of market relationships. According to Weber, class divisions arise from economic differences, who have nothing straight to do with property.

Classes aren't defined here as dependant on an individual's relationship to your production process but you are defined by factors of occupation and income (Giddens, 1997:246).

Weber, unlike Marx, explains other size of stratification besides class. One determined by 'life styles' (or status), that could be quite different from class systems (e.g. particular occupations may have traditional status no matter their numbers of income or wealth). Status groups for Weber, can have sources outside class: those who work inside the same place think they have much in keeping, for instance, even though they are part of different classes. (Haralambos and Holborn, 1995:37). What people in status groups have in common is often a style of life. Stratification therefore occurs along lines of lifestyles. Finally, you'll find independent systems of political ability to, where groups known generally as 'parties' (that might include pressure groups or informal lobbying outfits like consumer protest movements) struggle for capacity to influence legislation in order to control and limit markets etc. (Haralambos and Holborn, 1995:38). Just as status groups can both divide classes and cut across boundaries, so parties can divide and cut across both classes and status groups.

Weber's arguments about bureaucracy have to be added to this picture. The development of contemporary bureaucracy helps make the picture of class more advanced again. Weber notes, however, that bureaucracy is usually bound on top of class structure: bureaucracy is fully developed only these days and especially inside the 'advanced institutions of capitalism' (Gerth and Mills, 1947:196). Bureaucrats form a status group, and something, which cultivates and reinforces its position.

Marx belief that certain factors, for example capitalism 'alienating' workers using their job, would hasten the undoing of capitalism and this these factors will result inside polarisation on the two main classes. Polarisation meaning the gap relating to the proletariat and bourgeoisie will end up greater. For Marx, this might lead with a new synthesis, which will in turn produce communism plus a classless society (Haralambos and Holborn, 1995:36). Weber rejected this belief held by Marx and would not believe that people sharing an identical class position would take collective action but suggested the proletariat may react in the variety of ways (Haralambos and Holborn, 1995:37). Nor does Weber attribute a relationship of conflict between these classes. They are based, he tells, on competition between individuals permanently occupations rich in incomes. Individuals use various factors for example Education, Family and Culture so that you can achieve the highest wages/salaries possible (Bilton et al., 1996:145)