

Durkheim and division of labour

Sociology



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Durkheim's Division of Labour in Society Author(s): J. A. Barnes Source: *Man*, New Series, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Jun., 1966), pp. 158-175 Published by: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2796343> . Accessed: 06/05/2013 07: 42 Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at . <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp> . JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org . Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Man*. <http://www.jstor.org> This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

DURKHEIM'S DIVISION OF LABOUR IN SOCIETY J. A. BARNES The Australian National University

Introduction The first edition Emile Durkheim's *The division of labour in society: study of the organization of the higher societies* published in 1893 while the author was professor of social science at the University of Bordeaux. It constituted a major work for Durkheim, as he presented the two theses which he presented at the University of Paris for his doctorate. Durkheim had previously published several reviews and articles, this was his first book. He gained his doctorate and his book made a significant impact, it so annoyed the orthodox economists that for some time he could not obtain a teaching position in Paris (Mauss 1958: 2). The book went through five French editions, only work by Durkheim do so, and was first translated into English in 1933.

<https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

published an English translation in 1933. It has been described as its translator Durkheim's greatest work by Simpson (1933: 4). Yet despite these indications of its importance, some critics have seen little value in the book. Thus, in his *History of Ethnology*, where he devotes fifteen pages to Durkheim, Lowie has absolutely nothing to say about the *Division of Labour*. The English translation of it was greeted in the pages of the *American Journal of Sociology* with the comment: 'Published when the author was thirty-five years old, the work is accurate and free of the crude misconceptions of 1880 concerning primitive life. The work is more of a competent description than a treatise written by a man who would not have been able to write his field without having a plant.... ever seen Nottobese severe a writer forty-one years ago, accepted is now known to be untenable, would at least seem that extended discussion an argument based on abandoned premises might be considered unnecessary expenditure of energy' (Faris 1934: 376). The English translation is poor. The development of social conditions, well as the findings of scientific research, during the seventy years that have elapsed since the work was first published have cumulatively demonstrated the falsity of many of its substantive propositions. If we are to understand what context the *Division of Labour* still has interest, we have to look elsewhere for it. In introductory courses on occupational specialisation, social evolution, the changing or patterns of legal organisation, any other of the various themes discussed in the book. We need, however, only to go first in sentence to the book to find the answer: 'This book is pre-eminently an attempt to treat facts of life according to the method of the positive sciences' (DOLI 32). Here we have a clear statement

<https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

Durkheim's programme, programme of a worked in subsequent out publications which remained far and not from centre the of his intellectual goal throughout life. In this book we can easily see the his from which his later studies suicide, education, on beginnings law and religion This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions DURKHEIM S DIVISION OF LABOUR IN SOCIETY 159 In to developed. order understand Durkheim what meant 'collective by representations' by 'anomie' have study only Elementary forms we to not his of religious the and but of Division labour where these life his Suicide, also those sections the of concepts first discussed length religion, DOL 288-9; for suicide, at (for see see DOL 246). The rules sociological of method, published year later, Durkheim a was, in said, implied the Division labour of (Rules Ix). Durkheim proclaims he intends study that to moral facts the methods by of science. have come to realise, We perhaps more explicitly did Durkheim, than that of the distinguishing of science that is cumulative, that one marks is it and each generation investigators of incorporates discoveries its predecessors the of into its established corpus organised of understanding. the humanities, In things are Sartre Auden in no sense and and different; supersede Shakespeare Homer. In Euclid and Plato out But philosophy, and Aristotle never of print. in science, are Hippocrates either are incorporated or discarded have and become of historical only a value; the cartographer not go back to Alexander drawing map. does before if Likewise, sociology scientific, is as Durkheim stated should we do not need it be, to go back Durkheim, certainly to his major to how and not first to work, discover to tackle new analysis social a of is it phenomena. if what had to say true, For, he should long ago have become of the corpus sociological part of <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

propositions and theorems utilised subsequent in work. by sociologistseven Durkheim's later or own It is an indication Durkheim's of clarity a writer it is, alas, still of lack as that his to necessary return theDivision labour guidance howto interpret to of for on later writings forclarificationthevalidity themany and on of diverse criticisms that have been levelled against Durkheim a sociologist. more as But importantly, it is also an indication forone reason another, to that, or Durkheim's efforts makesociology scientific notbeenwholly have successful that can still and we readhimfor helpin interpreting results current the of enquiries. organised The of science remains unfulfilled corpus positive still an programme. According Mauss, Durkheim to intended, whilestillat theAcole normale, to write account therelationshipindividualism socialism later but an of of and recast planofhithesis dealwith relation the to the between individual the and in in near society. bookwasoutlined 1884 while wasteaching a lyce'e Paris, The he andwas first in written i886 after hadreturned hisyearin Germany. he from It waspresenteda doctoral as thesis seven years later (Mauss 1958: i). Thisthesis wasnotmerely academic an in exercise, itarose least part ofDurkheim's for at out concern therevival French in for of society following defeat France the the of Franco-Prussian andhisbookstresses necessity political war the of action, evenif thedetails left are unspecified. says: He weshouldjudgeresearches noworthall they tohave a speculaour tohave at if were only tive is to of health alone interestthere a state moral ... which science isable determine .., science, furnishing lawofvariations competently in us the through moral which the health already has usto into which new passed, permits anticipate coming being, those of order things Ifwe in demands. know what the of sense law property associeties evolves become

<https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

and and some growthsize density new new in and make modificalarger denser, if tions weshall to beforenecessary, beable foresee and them, foreseeing will them, them hand. scientific Finally, comparingnormal with the type itself-a strictly operation-we shall able finditisnot be to if inagreement itself, contains it with if entirely contradictions, is which tosay, and them. seek them imperfections, toeliminate ortocorrect (DOL33-4) This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions i6o J. A BARNES Likewise, in the second editionof Divisionof labour, issuedin 1902, he added aimedat specific political proposals, 'Some noteson occupational entitled groups', restoring country a better the to stateof socialhealth. These were followedby practical suggestions social changes a variety fields, for in of advocatedin many publications. Perhaps becausethiswas Durkheim's climate first majorwork, theintellectual in whichhe had been trained, and againstwhichhe was now rebelling, a had influence theformof his argument. on decisive Durkheim never Unfortunately succeeded freeing presentation sociological in his from intellectual the of argument in he heritage soughtto repudiate, muchof the difficulty experienced and now in what Durkheimmeansor, to an even greater understanding extent, understanding whyhe wrote thewayhe did, stems in of from ignorance themenand our positions thatDurkheim was attacking. Durkheim's Simpson, translator, go may too farin trying reduceSpencerto Durkheim's to Diihringwhen he says, in of to justification his editorial policyof not givingreferences Spencer's original works: Where of Durkheim to him as in quotes Spencer order criticize adversely, inthe majority cases, there wouldseemto be no reason being for interested Spencer's in ideasafter Durkheim finished them. has with (DOL x) in <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

Durkheim called action the for in world learning, part a necessary as of preliminary to any political action in the nation. He was directly concerned with the establishment of sociology as an academic discipline in France, although, at least in his first edition of his book, his national political comments are mainly negative, arguments which have immediate implications for the academic politics of his time. In his later writings he sets in greater detail the separation of sociology from philosophy and development in some special kind of psychology (DOL 359-62; cf. Benoit-Smullyan 50i, n. 7). 1948: Yet it is Durkheim's attack on Herbert Spencer—who had been translated into French by Espinas Ribot—and on the utilitarian tradition going back to Adam Smith, led to Durkheim's being identified as an anti-individualist and a social realist (Parsons 1960: 119; Peyre 1960: 24; Alpert 1939: 150). In the later chapters of *The Division of Labour* Durkheim advocates political social harmony, specifically organic solidarity, achieved only by each individual being free to exercise his natural talents and fulfil his ambitions. This stance was overshadowed by his attack on utilitarianism and his use of political metaphors by many of the social realists. For the modern reader, his intellectual position is further complicated by what seems to be his frequent use of biological organic analogies that seem at first glance to put him in the camp of the man he is attacking: Spencer. Commentators have argued that Durkheim fought against the use of analogies drawn from biology (Peyre 1960: 24), but by present standards he did not fight hard enough (e. g. DOL 217-8). Similarly, attention given by Durkheim to Comte has to be seen in the light of Comte's persisting influence on French thinking providing the stereotype of sociology as an ambitious, <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

imprecise heretical. and Durkheim began his professional career when evolutionary doctrines anthropology were at their height, and the notion of a broad transition from savagery to This content downloaded from 158.143.192.135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions DURKHEIM 'S DIVISION OF LABOUR IN SOCIETY (6) was an opponent unilinear of evolution (Parsons 7: 3 72); yet Durkheim (193) expects his readers know what is meant social evolution brings to by and forward evidence kind that conforms late nineteenth to century canons support the particular of in of as evolutionary process was seeking establish. he to evolution a Formally, treats the process, but in fact he argues most of the time in merely dichotomous terms, primitive versus civilised, and does little towards demonstrating there are that societies intermediate at points the scale. The nearest get to doing this in on the comparison the legal codes of five of the societies, ancient the Hebrews, Romans of the fifth century, Franks the and under Salic law, the Burgundians the Visigoths. Yet, even here, Durkheim is interested merely demonstrating there are in that quantitative differences between one code and another, he neither and correlates these with other features the societies work out how these five societies of nor might regarded be in that relative one another. merely to He asserts a footnote 'if the genealogical tables of social types could be completely drawn up, it would resemble tufted a tree, with a single trunk, be sure' (DOL 141, n. 21; Cf to Alpert 1939: 196-8). It has been said that subtitle the Division of Labour the of of should be Against dilettantism, Durkheim's but efforts establish to sociology a professional as specialism have given an appearance amateurism much of his own work. of to His arguments remain, however, despite inadequate the he evidence was <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

able to meet their needs in support. Some commentators between Durkheim have drawn attention to the similarities to his typology, when seen as dichotomous, the views of Tönnies on *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*. Earlier, Maine had made a distinction between societies based on status and those based on contract, Spencer's and division of labour societies industrial military along similar lines. Redfield's continuum folk-urban may be viewed as a modern essay in the same tradition (Bohannan 1960: 88; Freeman & Winch 1957: 461), and even Robert Park's sacred and secular Albion Small's cultures civilisation, Riesman's societies, and tradition-oriented personalities have been fitted into the same pattern. This simple analytical procedure yields interesting results we still are from a satisfactory calculus of concepts. In the course of his work Durkheim introduces a number of concepts a of which he links by several propositions. Concepts and propositions are intermingled in his presentation, it is often not clear whether concepts are deliberately introduced as analytical tools or as the name of some phenomenon already in existing real or metaphysical world. For our purposes maybe convenient it to try to unravel mixture. Let us take first a battery of concepts. Durkheim deals with a plurality of discrete societies, each containing a number of human beings, individuals who belong to the society. Each individual has qualities are merely that human, common to all humanity, he has other to and distinctive qualities that derive from heredity, presumably own physical his ancestry seen as distinct from anyone else. The individual aptitudes of has and civilised taken granted his work without is of for in specific discussion the assumptions have been made. Some of his commentators that note

<https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

Durkheim This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions 162 J. A. BARNES ambitions holds and he the ideas beliefs; has feelings, most and relevant feeling in the context the of Division labour of being offeeling that Within single a coerced. society, individuals grouped are either segments, into sub-units society of largely similar one another, into to or organs, sub-units are characteristically that different from another. one By examining societies observer the discovers about them. the Rules facts In Durkheim that says social facts to be treated things this are as and slogan been has widely misunderstood. Benolt-Smullyan soi) has noted that (1948: Durkheim the employs name for different and hence methodo his 'thing' four concepts that in The logical premise beread four may ways. interpretation Durkheim that claims own in the ashis Rules is deals with (xlili), that sociology only externally observable In but is facts, this not always borne in his writings. the Division labour out of he distinguishes kinds facts. of and several Internal the events phenomena facts, in occur theminds individuals, that of us. these necessarily escape We can study internal only facts through external that an expression and which the facts are of, in some sense the facts. of of being symbolise, internal Thenotion exteriority, external, Durkheim applies twoways. in Some facts external the are to observer; belong they to the intractable and he to the records which seeks understand; reality observer he cannot the external to fit theories, his theories be fitted alter his but must facts But to them. Durkheim designates facts external some as because also are they or to experienced perceived the actor external him. as by One sub-class external contains are of social These characterised facts facts. not but that exert by their and only by their exteriority, also by

<https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

the constraint they are. The discusses laws and customs, generality. main social facts Durkheim that for these clearly are. In Division labour is not much he external observable. the and of concerned that with which other kinds of social fact, social to statistics, was later form basis his the of enquiry suicide. is easy agree a law constrains to that those into. It to whom applies, again find Durkheim the it uses notion constraint of but we that in a variety ways. Sometimes of constraint means need to conform social the to standards, at other but times constraint for is used pressure from stemming persons with or or else mere mechanical prestige authority, for necessity (Lacombe 1926: 40 seven of 8). In the view of Benoit-Smullyan, distinguishes different who meanings in constraint Durkheim's between collective he writings, fail to distinguish in the constraint, the as in enforcement law; cultural of a determination, acceptance of the ambient of values adolescents scale by growing in a culture; up physical facts and where material limit determination, geographical other and possibilities; in in psychological compulsion, when individuals a crowd act in unison a as from one kind of distinctive (Benoit-Smullyan 529). By shifting way 1948: in constraint another, to is Durkheim able to set out his propositions forms difficult to verify to disprove. either or Laws and customs then in a are general that they apply widely throughout us external enable to infer facts society, they and exert constraint. and other They of the presence internal the most internal being fact that social of relevant facts, In social facts be solidarity. view the of insistence social must explained other that by it has and which sociologist to operate, is the these the facts are facts, that with is a social to important stress by Durkheim's that, definition, solidarity not itself social fact. says: He

This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07:
<https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions DURKHEIM S
DIVISION OF LABOUR IN SOCIETY I63 by does Butsocial solidarity completely
phenomenon is a moral which, taken itself, not lend itself exact to
observation indeed measurement. nor to To proceed this to classification for
internal which fact us escapes anexternal andthis comparison, must we
substitute this in light thelatter of which it the index symbolizesandstudy
former the (DOL 64). between Despitethis, Durkheim's book is arranged
aroundthedistinction two in of kindsof solidarity. are therefore the
unsatisfactory We position havingto of between whichis not itself defined two
sub-types a phenomenon distinguish or observable. haveto takesolidarity
granted. We for Durkheim divides solidarity solidarity intotwo types, positive
negative, thenfurther and and divides positive are intotwo types, mechanical
organic. All three and kindsof solidarity present in everyrealsociety, in
varying to but proportions, it is possible distinguish and themanalytically.
without any Mechanical solidarity bindstheindividual directly the society to to
intermediary (DOL I29) and is predominant thosesocieties in belonging the in
and of are collective type, whichthebeliefs sentiments eachmember
thesame, not merely becauseof theircommonhumanity becauseof
theircommon but or membership a specific in society. Organicsolidarity
arises whenthe members and sub-units a society of differ from one another
dependon one another are but specialised controlled constrained regulated
one another by somesingle or or by or sub-unit. Durkheim justifies use of
terms saying: his by and Theterm [mechanical solidarity] notsignify itis
produced mechanical does that by the artificial means. callitthat byanalogy
the We only to cohesion which unites elements ofaninanimate as opposed
that an of body to which makes unity oftheelements a out dependent living
<https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

body.... The individual conscience, considered in this light, is a simple object upon the collective and follows its movements, possessed of the same type as the owner of those things (DOL 130). On the other hand, organic solidarity produced the division of labour in society, so that each member has his own specific activity which makes some contribution to the lives of other members. No member lives alone, for each depends on the activities of others for his own well-being. In effect, the hand, one depends much on one as each as more strictly society labour on of as more divided; on the other, activity each as much as the is more personal. This solidarity that among the higher specialized.... resembles which we observe in animals. Each organ has special autonomy. Moreover, and, physiognomy, the unity of the organism as great the individuation of the parts more of is as marked. of analogy, propose call the solidarity is due to the division of labour, because this we to which labour, organic' (DOL 131). of the Organic and mechanical solidarity together constitute two forms positive in makes little of use solidarity, contrast to negative solidarity. Durkheim the concept negative of He any solidarity. says that it does not produce integration class of legal rules; but in to by itself (DOL 129), and that it corresponds to a certain fact use the term as a synonym for the rules for themselves, those rules that define between real rights real property. As far as I can tell, he makes no distinction to As property and chattels and hence speaks of 'the solidarity things', another of for synonym negative solidarity 'real solidarity' or (DOL 116). He says that these to rules do not cause the people whom they put in contact with one another or restore maintain, concur; they do not demand co-operation; they do any but simply This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions 164 J. A. BARNES the law punishes' (DOL 301). 'Normally', he says, 'custom is not opposed to law, but is, on the contrary, its basis'. 'If, then, there are types of social solidarity, its which custom alone manifests, are assuredly they secondary; produces law those which are essential they the only ones we need to know' (DOL 65-66). and are The individuals who together make up a society thought as each having are of a conscience consciousness, we might a value system, this or what call and conscience can be analysed into its parts. 'There are in each of us ... two consciences: which common our group one is to its entirety, which, consequently, not ourself, society is but living acting and within us; the other, on the contrary, represents in us which is personal and that that distinct, which makes us an individual.... However, these two consciences are not in regions geographically distinct from us, but penetrate from all sides' (DOL 129-30). The social component the conscience, common or collective of the is elements contract not contractual' (DOL 211), and it is in the non-contractual of that can find true sources organic we the solidarity Parsons (cf. 1937: 319, where says he Durkheim mistaken). was in to Indeed, his eagerness overthrow the Hobbesian view of society, to reject randomness individual and the of goals, Durkheim almost as overlooks similarity the between solidarity there such may in be spontaneous relations his own organic contractual and solidarity. Indeed, a later he varieties of passage, reinstates contractual as solidarity one of the important organic solidarity (DOL 381). Durkheim makes distinction a a between and customs. law, he means laws By law as written a code of laws. There two sub-categories in are of law, repressive and restitutive, classified to to of attached them. according the kinds sanctions Some sanctions, Durkheim, 'consist in or at a says <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

essentially suffering, least loss, inflicted the on agent. or They make on or demands his fortune, on his honour, on his life, on his liberty, deprive of something enjoys. call them or and him he We repressive. constitute law'.

'As for other it does not They penal the type necessarily for agent, consists of the imply suffering the but return things they as only of were, in there-establishment of troubled relations their to normal state'(DOL 69).

Restitutive are further laws divided two types, into those dealing real with rights, i. e. rights things, mentioned over as above, and those dealing with interpersonal rights, it is these Durkheim and that makes of as the use external of the sign inward organic solidarity. concept custom not divided in

the same way, The is of up and Durkheim little say in this has to book about custom other to treat as a than it feeble version the law. He says: of 'The acts which custom alone must repress not different are in nature those from regulating enforcing and contracts (Parsons 1960: whose are this in the new conditions which produced, negative solidarity circumvents stances

troubled functioning' ii8). have (DOL kind industrial contractual He mentions another of solidarity, yet or solidarity to to Durkheim refers it principally show to (DOL xviii, 200) attributed Spencer. of that is spurious. would be

the solidarity a society which it It in individuals, his were linked by a vast of each with own goals values, and only system particular refutes principally entered Durkheim contracts 203) spontaneously into. (DOL this, on known by reference the limitations to of placed every by society the kinds of contracts are valid and by the existence elaborate that for legal machinery I 19-20). in the

'For everything This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

DURKHEIM S DIVISION OF LABOUR IN SOCIETY i65 conscience DOL 79), is <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

itself (cf. divided into two parts. There is an affective element consisting of sentiments 'phenomena of sensibility', there is a moral and representative element consisting of ideas and doctrines of (DOL 170). As with solidarity laws, the proportions which these and in different varieties of conscience are found in different individuals in any society, and in different societies, vary. It is with the manner in which these proportions vary, relative to one another, that Durkheim principally is concerned. Solidarity, and conscience three of Durkheim's laws are of variables, only one of which is readily accessible to scientific observation. There is, therefore, likelihood that the whole system of analysis of becoming tautologous self-fulfilling, it and were not for the fourth variable, division of labour, aspect of social morphology. The of an It is this variable which gives the book its title, which that and perhaps provided the newest element in Durkheim's thesis. The concept of division of labour seems to be nowhere to be defined explicitly as we shall see, there is no clear distinction and, is between what we would call specialisation and fragmentation of activities. Durkheim merely and of says: ... co-operation. does not come .. not of To about without division of labour. co-operate, the in short, to participate in a common task. it is divided into tasks qualitatively similar, mutually but indispensable, in a simple form there is division of labour the degree. of first If they of a different character, is compound there is division of labour, of specialization properly (DOL 124) called. The division of labour, of however, only what we would call an intervening variable for, in Durkheim's terms, is 'a derived and secondary phenomenon' which 'passes on to the surface of social life'. He therefore warns us against mistaking a of for superficial division of labour, acquired by imitation and diffusion, the genuine or article (DOL 282, n. 30). The division of labour is likewise not to be confused with mutualism, hostile

<https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

whereby two mutually societies 'exchange products a more or less regular manner' (DOL 281-2), nor with differentiation and 'pure in simple', when certain as persons specialise crime, this the 'very negation for is of solidarity' (DOL 353). Thus, to this extent, Durkheim admits as division of labour only those kinds occupational of specialisation which satisfy relationship the between division labour and social solidarity he is seeking demonstrate. to of that As befits scientist, a Durkheim and recognises value of measurement uses the several is quantitative concepts. Yet, in many cases no attempt made to provide rules for determining these quantities operationally, we are given only statements about 'larger' and 'smaller' and the like. Durkheim refers the volume of to social life (DOL 198), the volume of a legal code (DOL 205), the size and intensity of various phenomena. to Indeed, he gives considerable attention the way in which a given component, the law or in the conscience, vary in size both in can and relatively the other components. Most of his commentators to absolutely to have overlooked this aspect of Durkheim's but methodology, it is interesting note that the analytical of concomitant tool variation, which Durkheim develops in in is in form the Division labour. considerably Suicide, present embryonic of 'Vivacity' (DOL 237) is another apparently quantitative concept, but the notion of quantity and measurement most developed in Durkheim's use of is 'density'. He deals with 'material density' which we would call population between and of which is the relation density, 'moral or dynamic density society', This content

downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All

use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions i66 J. A. BARNES 'individuals in

contact be able to act and react sufficiently to upon one another' and 'the active

commerce resulting it' (DOL 257). The 'condensation from of society'

<https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

'social density' and (DOL 260) seem to be synonyms population for density. There two other are analytical concepts which by Durkheim to link his tries of four the variables: 'function' 'type'. He says: 'To ask what function the and division labour is to seek the need which supplies' of it for is, (DOL 49). Endless confusion followed has Durkheim's popularisation this term, I cannot of and unravel confusion it must sufficient this in here. be to note that Merton's terminology Durkheim concerned 'latent is with or function' rather with than manifest the mathematical function (Merton 1949: 22, 62). In the Division labour term of 'function' restricted is to beneficial function. in one of his Thus numerous biological analogies Durkheim with says, reference crime: to and of organic without ... cancer tuberculosis the increase diversity tissues bringing forth a new specialization of of biologic functions. these In all cases, is no partition a there or common of function, in the midst the organism, but, whether individual social, another is formed seeks live the of first. there even which to at expense the In reality, is not a function, way acting this for in a of merits name if joins others maintaining only it with life general (DOL 353-4). in his to Frequently book Durkheim to the refers 'collective as opposed the type' 'individual type' (DOL 106-3 3). The English-speaking at least asks reader is that 'type what?' the answer not immediately Sometimes seems of it and clear. the collective individual are types conscience which or the and of in other types one at these are corresponding component predominates; other times seems it that in of types society which conscience these of kinds to be found. either In are case, Durkheim his types what would call polar ideal types. uses as we or Durkheim uses a batch evaluative also of concepts, usually adjectival in form. He describes phenomena 'abnormal' as (DOL 190), 'decadent' (DOL 196), 'pathological' (DOL 196, 271) or 'morbid' (DOL 219).

These words seem to be interchangeable, are contrasted with another 'normal' and with set: (DOL 375), what 'ought be' (DOL 190), 'healthy', to 'spontaneous' (DOL 377) and the like. This use of terms from springs from Durkheim's conviction that scientific enquiry provides the only reliable basis for political action, it involves in considerable but in his difficulties efforts find scientific for good. to a basis the Finally, introduces he a useful typology of sanctions. is fairly of This straightforward I need discuss for has become of the general and not it, it part stock-in-trade of social enquiry (DOL 69; cf. Radcliffe-Brown 205-19). 1952: Propositions Using conceptual this scheme, Durkheim makes several substantive propositions. Many these made passant, two central of are in but these emerge from book. the Firstly, asserted societies in broad it is that may, terms, placed a morphological be on and at least partly historical continuum. one end of the At continuum primitive are societies; these characterised internal are by differentiations similar into segments with negligible division labour, codes are mainly of legal that repressive, a collective conscience predominates individual that in each member's over individual mind the low component, moral density, small population mechanical and solidarity. At This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions DURKHEIM 'S DIVISION OF LABOUR IN SOCIETY 167 the other are the end higher societies characterised internal by differentiation into many distinct organs, great a division labour, legal of a code that predominantly is concerned restitutive with regulation inter-personal a collective of rights, conscience constitutes a modest that only portion the mind of each individual, of high moral density, population organic large and solidarity. we have seen, As solidarity

<https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

conscience internal so that and are facts, essentially first the proposition amounts no more than to saying (though Durkheim might protest this) that at the extent the division of labour in a society correlated of of in is positively moral with and density with predominance the of repressive concerned inter-personal laws with rights its legal in code, correlated and negatively the with predominance of repressive laws. This second proposition that society's is a movement from primitive away the and towards higher of the continuum due to a causal the end as is chain running A follows. Society begins increase population to have higher to a in and population density. Consequently, struggle existence the for becomes more acute and, in order survive, to members the society of develop division of labour. As Durkheim says: Thanks [the to division of labour] of opponents not are obliged fight a finish, can to to but exist beside other. In proportion development, of one the Also, the to it furnishes means maintenance and survival a greater to number individuals in more of who, homogeneous societies, be condemned would to extinction (270). (DOL The increasing division of labour leads a higher of a decline then to moral density, in the collective component the conscience, in a shift the structure the law, in of and the growth organic of solidarity the expense mechanical at of solidarity. In this proposition be described the only serious has as attempt anywhere Durkheim's writings provide explanations social to an of change (Benolt-Smullyan 1948: 518), but there little is evidence support (cf. to it Schnore 1958: 627). Durkheim devotes of almost much as space attacking arguments his opponents to the as he does putting to the forward for He evidence his own assertions. does not discuss many possible alternative responses increased to competition Alpert (cf. 1939: 94). He relies he forward quite heavily the argument elimination, on in which puts by an array

alternatives advances is of and arguments eliminate but one, which to all then declared be proved to be that correct. However, think one reason why there is evidence advanced Durkheim by appears to be so inadequate that, to although the whole of his book is proclaimed to be a science, according to the facts are Durkheim continually to show that some sense conclusions drawn from his definitions, do not require support from fresh data. The empirical is significant in this first there comparatively appeal to little that his book is more facts and he in later of history ethnography, whereas his writings are much closer to 'Durkheim concerned the analysis specific to Levi-Strauss with his remarks: facts. social him struggled between methodological his which attitude, made consider facts as as " things and his ", philosophical formation uses which those " things" a ground on which fundamental he can be seated. Kantian ideals be firmly Hence, oscillates between dual empiricism and aprioristic and frenzy' (Levi-Strauss 528). In the Division of Labour are still there in the philosophy history in of of of we In it have not yet entered fresh the of fields sociological enquiry. fact, would be 2-M. This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions 168 J. A. BARNES the (Alpert 1939: 96). Heredity influenced division of labour (DOL 305), has societies. The physical environment particularly among the more primitive may of to its cause a segment society specialise activities become an organ with a and function becomes wider, recognised (DOL 263). As the scale of social interaction there are entities become more numerous symbolised the collective by representations become more abstract, and hence the common conscience (DOL 287), and its characteristic is the cult of the individual dogma (DOL 107, 172). Under of <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

the and conditions social change wisdom of the aged is less revered the bonds of tradition loosened, as, likewise, are they in cities where the aged are less numerous than they are in the country. Hence individuals comparatively feel to follow their own inclinations there greater in and diversity occupations (DOL 294-6). It is then a multiple chain of causation that Durkheim is putting forward, it is difficult either to verify or to disprove it. Part of the first that the division of labour is positively correlated with laws with inter-personal and with the predominance of restitutive concerned of rights with the predominance of repressive of to and negatively laws, is easier to tackle, indeed to disprove, and its disproof turns doubt on the second proposition. Durkheim supports his arguments with some comparative evidence on legal codes which I have already mentioned, the evidence confined to one part only of the correlation. It shows that various legal codes do differ from one another, one in but only takes granted corresponding for the differences in the division of labour. In general of Durkheim terms the level of the division of labour in speaks only of and some of his critics have not been very successful too specified societies, in to giving precision to this term. Thus, for example, one attempt to disprove to the 'primitive communism i. e. of in theory', that the division of labour is non-existent in the primitive material world, using to to managed that of assert among the Aranda in central Australia there were seven distinct domestic functions performed by women and three by men, and that in the whole of by there were ten different for Aranda activities occupations men and three for of of is women. The unreliability of this method of analysis shown by the fact that this same investigator found only one recognised domestic activity for women among the Warramunga and none for men (Watson 1929). Yet, in fact, and <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

these two tribes of are quite close to one another in the division of labour they almost and are identical. But the main weakness of the first is of the thesis that ethnographic the evidence shows in are that, general, primitive societies not characterised repressive by laws. Durkheim took his evidence legal codes from classical on and antiquity early Europe, and some historical of progression the kind he had in mind may have taken place even in this area. Merton there, though holds she was mistaken (Merton 1934: 326). But this cannot be extended to the primitive world, where legal codes do not exist in writing, at all. In stateless societies almost all jural rules are, in these terms, restitutive rather than repressive. that Indeed, it is interesting in an based on evidence from forty-eight and inquiry societies, aimed to test whether to prove second this to facts, even since quite difficult proposition reference by is is conclusive the division of labour hard to quantify there little of evidence and in for level moral the of at time Durkheim density any anywhere. any case, hedges his assertion introducing he several by secondary factors, though does not discuss a cause and a secondary what difference is between primary there factor logical This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions DURKHEIM S DIVISION OF LABOUR IN SOCIETY 169 or not Tonnie's, Durkheim, Park, Small, Maine, Redfield and Riesman are all terms about the same dimension of societal complexity, talking in different what Durkheim to had the authors have, perhaps unconsciously, overlooked quite in of of variables terms greater say about the development law. They examine eight and or less societal as complexity, suggested these by theorists, equate punishment and action with greater by government complexity, punishment the person by & <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

wronged with less complexity (Freeman Winch 1957: 461, 463). Yet, the is show that is governmental it action that typically record ethnographic repressive, and redress self-help is restitutive. Nisbet (1965: 30) notes, is perhaps that As it by Durkheim does not refer all to social solidarity at significant in his later that writings generated repressive by laws. of Durkheim on firmer is ground when he correlates division labour with the this is hard to state quantitatively. the Division of labour In moral density, though his moral and material Durkheim weakens own cases somewhat treating by density this as interchangeable, in the Rules he corrects fault. Herskovits cites Durkheim's proposition: of of in and The division labour varies direct with volume density societies, if ratio the and, it progresses a continuous in of it is in manner the course social development, because and more societies become denser generally voluminous regularly (DOL 262). this comments: is not possible document statement, 'It to Herskovits especially in its dynamic it aspects. Yet if the quantitative precision implies is not insisted main assertions this in The difficulty testing of Durkheim's book lies partly in the absence of data with historical depth from an adequately wide range of terms involve on societies, partly and from fact the that propositions his which, his own definitions, not accessible observation. are to Mechanical and organic solid and collective individual and arity types of conscience may be hand names for of concerned with legal systems, recognised constellations observable facts occupy size. But they cannot be tional specialisation, and population density population criteria introduced which their more than mere names unless are independent by This Durkheim to existence be proved or disproved. can failed do. The singularly in term 'solidarity' come to have a clear meaning did of later, the writings Leon the but his book, La <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

solidarity, published was after Division labour Bourgeois, of 1960: 1). (Alpert 1939: 178; 1941; Richter Despitethis lackofoperational definition, notionofsocialsolidarity the remains central Durkheim's to of Formsof thedivision labourare assessed argument. as normalor pathological to according thekindof socialsolidarity theyengender. We havenotedearlier thatDurkheim the crime as rejected notionofprofessional an exampleof thedivision labour. Nevertheless does admitthree of he kindsof of as or thedivision labourthathe classes exceptional pathological (DOL 353-4). First is there thedivision labourcharacterised chronic of by conflict between capital Thisanomic form is andlabour. arises because there inadequate contact between the variousorgansof society, and thisin turnis due in partto thelack ofjuridical of of determination the rights capitaland labour(DOL 367), and in partto the as fact cannot the for the that, organised society develops, producer appraise market his productat a glance. Hence production becomesunregulated thereare and carriesconsiderable a uponthe position validity' (1952: 142). This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions 170 J. A. BARNES periodic crises (DOL 370). This is pathological, under for normalconditions, the his workeris 'not a machinewho repeats movements without knowing their ' he of meaning, ... he feels is serving but something' . . . thisessential character of (DOL 372-3). thedivision labour... is above all a sourceof solidarity' Yet, if under-regulation insufficient and contact lead to an anomicdivision of labour, too muchregulation may lead to another pathological form, forced the of if division labour. Thereis no spontaneity peopleare linkedto their functions only by constraint, we have only an imperfect and and troubledsolidarity. Durkheim herehas in <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

mindcastesocieties, he goes on to distinguish and between inequality
 incomeand status, of whichis not necessarily bad, and inequality in of
 whathe callstheexternal conditions conflict (DOL 379), whichis bad. Overor
 regulation, occupational specialisation prescription by rather thanby
 achievein stateof affairs whichsocial inequalities thatdesirable ment,
 prevents exactly and This express natural inequalities labouris
 dividedspontaneously. is achieved intoand adhered (DOL 377). to entered by
 contracts spontaneously Finally, some societies, functional in the activity
 each worker insufficient of is Durkheim of doesnotgiveanymodern to produce
 required the degree solidarity. but thatas societies examplesof
 thispathological condition, notesapprovingly advancethereis less leisure.'In
 societies whichare exclusively and agricultural labouris almostentirely
 pastoral, suspended duringthe seasonof bad weather'. But as we advance,
 work becomesa 'permanent occupation'and 'if sufficiently 'not only of
 strengthened, a need'. The division labourmakesindividuals solidary of
 becauseit limits activity each, butalso becauseit increases (DOL 394-5). the
 it' Developments someassessment theDivision labour, maybe convenient
 Beforemaking of of it to notesomeofthedevelopments havesprung that from
 In a sense, greatest it. the of these theworkof Durkheim is himself as already
 the for, mentioned, seedsof muchof hissubsequent writings, Rules, Suicide
 Elementary are to be the and forms in In found theDivision labour.
 theRuleshe stresses autonomy socialfacts the of of to a greater extent thanin
 theDivision labour, thatthephysical so environment of in andfactors heredity
 becomelessadmissable links thechain socialcausation. as of of is The
 collective in an conscience conceived theDivision labour containing of as but
 or element is mainly that affective component, itis thecognitive
<https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

representative in dealtwith. In laterwork, particularly theElementary these forms, representative on elements an of coercive force theinbeginto acquire autonomy their own, their is comes at exdividual stressed, hence affective and the element alsoto bestressed the in of In penseof sentiments arising theindividual component theconscience. the is Division labour collective the withthefactthatthe of conscience linkedclosely to members a society of themselves be, similar one another; to are, and perceive Durkheimis concerned with culturally homogeneous, not plural, societies. and But in Suicide collective the is the conscience seenas merely system moralbeliefs of commonto members a society of and sentiments (Parsons 1937: 337; cf DOL 129) or whether not theyhave the same occupations socialstatuses. and Durkheim's nextsteps to concentrate these on ideasand beliefs rather thanon thelegalcodes so of of and occupational comesto be thestudy systems groupings, that sociology thansystems action(Parsons1937: 446). Thistrend now in full of is ideasrather This content downloaded from 158.143.192.135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions DURKHEIM S DIVISION OF LABOUR IN SOCIETY 171 on of floodin French anthropology under leadership Levi-Strauss, whom the the mantle Mauss has descended who maybe regarded Durkheim's of as heir. and conscience the existWe can distinguish, leastanalytically, at between collective ing as an entity itsown, independent anyindividual on of manifestation, any and is individual's imperfect comprehension it. But Durkheim neverclearon this of and it himto thecharge advocating of distinction hisfumbling towards exposes a groupmind. Some modern writers assert thatthe distinction be understood can constrain speech the of withthelawsofgrammar, whichunconsciously byanalogy of even the ignorant <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

unschooled peasant. Durkheim accepted the existence of the unconscious mind in an article he published in 1898 (Durkheim 1953: 21-3; Cf in Neyer 1960: 61-2). Yet Levi-Strauss comments: The solution Durkheim's of factitious antinomy in the awareness of these lies that object structures underlie vated systems ideas unconscious that of are or unconscious psychical them make and them possible. Hence their as and time the character" things" at the same dialectic-I mean of this un-mechanical-character explanation. (Levi-Strauss 528) 1945: While Moliere allows Monsieur Jourdain discover to that merely he has been talking prose all his life without knowing Levi-Strauss it, makes him obey the rules of grammar well. as A no less fruitful consequence Durkheim's of book has been the development of the notion organic of solidarity through Mauss' study exchange an integrating of as mechanism, seen in his book *The Gift*. as in Durkheim the Division of Labour still regards social solidarity derived in part from such non-social as factors 'The as affinities the community blood brings that of about' (DOL 175), but in later work his followers have expanded social causes of solidarity. exchange goods the of The and services of through division of labour is seen to be only one source of the the multiplex diverse and social ties that bind together members a differentiated the of society. I have already referred to the work of Radcliffe-Brown the classification to on of as on of sanctions, where, in his writings law and in his use of the concept function, he follows Durkheim Yet to influence closely. it is curious how little Durkheim seems to have had on anthropology in America, least until at to in quite recently. Lowie, in despite devoting chapter Durkheim his *History of Ethnological Theory*, to write his three major books on social organisation *Social (Primitive) Society*, *Organization of the State* and *The Division of Labour* without single reference to Durkheim. a to <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

of Even more surprising that the weighty is in Anthropology with 966 pages and today, to these references Durkheim, of these two fifty bibliographies, are only four being in This is the more remarkable that it was an anthropologist, by Levi-Strauss. for who Durkheim's Radcliffe-Brown, was partly responsible introducing work to sociologists America, as Nisbet (1964: 4) stresses. in Durkheim's writings on religion were close to American interests anthropological prior to 1950 than he and anything had to say about social organisation, the former have become may so much a part of anthropological that citation was unnecessary. thinking direct Yet the apparent for of of irrelevance the Division labour studies social organisation is strange. there Since Durkheim, have been only two serious to attempts study the division labour on a world-wide of was scale. The first in 1915 by Hobhouse, Wheeler and Ginsberg, the second in 1955 by Udy in a book whose title and This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions 172 J. A. BARNES mirrors analysis of of work: a comparative exactly Durkheim's- Organization to book is there reference any production non-industrial In neither among peoples. part Durkheim. seems his book is already of prehistory. It that Assessment of Either can see it as a we There are two ways of looking at the Division labour. towards the defeat of the social nominalists, of Spencer in and contribution professional of as particular, towards establishment sociology a recognised and the in to academic discipline France; or else we can view it as a contribution present about social cohesion, legal development, occupational specialisation day thinking if would take us too far for our present and so on. The latter, fully developed, yield rather meagre results. purpose and would, as I have <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

already suggested, would require much greater a knowledge of Durkheim's of To explore the former and adversaries I have. All I can do is to offer few than a philosophical sociological of on method he comments points Durkheim's that, even seventy years after wrote, still seem relevant. In the first place, Durkheim seem to have been very poorly served by his He in an terminology. wrote, so Alpert claims, as mechanical idiom as possible that and hence it is not surprising some (Alpert 1939: 85) for polemical reasons He was misunderstood Malinowski, who said by people took him literally. was 'slavish, that Durkheim claimed that there fascinated, passive obedience' to social codes (Malinowski syndicalism 1939: 208). He did not support 1926: 4; Alpert 1960: corporate state (Richter (Parsons 1937: 339), nor did he advocate the fascist both these accusations were brought against him. He has been 196), although his accused of breaking own canon of explanation saying that cause of the the by is fact, the growth of growth of organic solidarity to be found in a non-social and on this score his latest defender (Schnore 1958: 624) gives the population, list Parsons and Sorokin as all having impressive of Alpert, Benoit-Smullyan, All Durkheim. of these points substance he can scarcely of and misunderstood ire that he could not be expected write clearly to about be excused on the grounds is he about the average, nor the everything had to say. More serious his confusion mal, the healthy and the ideal. In Rules, Durkheim says that the normal type is with the average type and that every deviation from this standard a identical 1948: 504), but he never pathological phenomenon (Rules: 64; Benoit-Smullyan even Halbwach points statement. followed consistently this clear, if surprising, which Durkheim the as out that rising suicide should, regarded so undesirable, rate, be by Durkheim's own criteria, judged to be quite normal (Benoit-Smullyan for <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

Division of labour there is greater confusion, 1948: 529, n. 21). In the earlier that sickness not 'part of the normal type of old age. On this writes Durkheim of the just as those of the adult' contrary, illnesses old age are abnormal facts for (DOL 433, n. 22). He seeks to identify 'normal moral fact a given social diffuse sanction to attaching it (DOL 435), but while this type' by the repressive like crime rates. may work for rules of conduct it cannot apply to phenomena of to Peristiany (1953: viii-xx) devotes most of his introduction the translation and but Durkheim's to on Sociology philosophy commenting these points, Durkheim's usages still remain confused me. It is perhaps significant This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions DURKHEIM'S DIVISION OF LABOUR IN SOCIETY 173 Herbert seventeenth century poem by George (1941: in occurs that in of of longest discussion these concepts the Division of Labour of portion the preface the first to edition which was omitted from second and subsequent the There would seem to me to be a fundamental conflict between Durkheim's editions. in Durkheim's attempt look at values relativistically, the context the society of to that certain social conditions are and at which they held, his insistence the same time This conflict obscured lack of clarity is are intrinsically pathological. by about the status the norm, which is equated at one moment with the average and at of with the healthy, this another with what ought to be. Unfortunately particular still at confusion persists, least terminologically.

Alpert claims that Durkheim recognised integrative the value of conflict in there little the is in Division (1960: 194) but social (Alpert life 1941: 173; cf Richter of to this dismissal what Durkheim of labour support view. Indeed, the contemptuous and Durkheim calls mutualism, between of limited co-operation enemies,

<https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

his restriction the concept function beneficial of to function, suggest he looked upon internal that of conflict essentially as unhealthy and destructive solidarity. Solidarity and integration seen as good in themselves, the more the better. concept are and The of is in altruism used a little the Division labour of (DOL 196, 197, 228) but it is not of linked to suicide, which by the criteria Suicide while those suicides would be classed as altruistic to are here referred as not 'true suicide' (DOL 246-7). is Hence there no need to discuss dangers excessive the of integration. Instead, we as have seen, that the division labour produces of Durkheim argues solidarity if only it is spontaneous, forced not (DOL 376-7). There must external be equality that so cannot to be realised, fail between natures social functions and 'harmony individual at least in the average case. For, if nothing impedes or unduly favours those it who are most apt at each kind of disputing tasks, is inevitable only those over that activity indulge it'. 'It will be said that it is not always sufficient make will in to men content, that there are some men whose desires beyond their faculties. go cases' (DOL 376). This is true, these exceptional but are and, one may say, morbid can The freedom find the right to niche in society be secured only by conscious based on action on the part of the state, and only by this action can a society conscience. organic solidarity survive, since it cannot rely on its weak collective Far is to Hence 'liberty itself the product regulation. from being antagonistic of social action, results it from social action' (DOL 386). of It is true of that the politically in most controversial section the Division labour Durkheim protests that this idyllic state of affairs far from being realised is in to contemporary France. He might have been surprised find that it was to be in between Soviet Russia between war that notions the connexion of the his organic in on most explicit solidarity

the division of labour found and of expression, the stress workers the social value of the humblest tasks performed factory by (Friedmann by Stephen Spender 1955: 49). This view is found in the poem 'The funeral' in (1955: 53), published in the early 1930s. On death is another milestone their way. Round them winds with on laughter their and with lips blowing they record simply in belts. 2 all How this exceeded others making one driving in are sentiments to be found a that However, it should be remembered similar (185). This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions 174 J. A. BARNES A servant this with clause Makes drudgerie divine: Whose sweeps room, for laws, a as thy Makes and th' action that fine. Divine determinism dialectical and materialism provide the solidarity both Durkheim reserved applied for positive science. in But Durkheim's recipe harmony twentieth for century industrial society in neither the changes industrial with tallies organisation his day, brought since nor about increased the of by mechanisation, with findings industrial psychology. of Georges Friedmann his ends discussion 'Durkheim's and the thesis contemporary of of forms the division labour' saying: by the which the of report, forms During half-century has followed publication this the taken in industrial have the the consequence specialisation society only enlarged gap between ideal of of as quences the division labour Durkheim them that expounded and the effects real in we observe our societies. (Friedmann 58) 1955: In much same the spirit, Richter writes Durkheim investigated that never political with like care institutions anything the he gave to his work suicide religion. on and He says: limitations of Durkheim's thought nowhere clear when in The are more than put political the of twentieth totalitarianism. (1960: 199, 204) perspective century (Richter of The virtues the Division labour <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

must find it elsewhere. Negatively, provided arguments against utilitarianism. Positively, was the first substantial statement that values, beliefs, aspirations not randomly and were distributed nor from throughout population, diffused independently one to another nor derived from common to a society, directly from humanity. Rather, they were to a significant shared members of a society, reason their of degree by the form and content of these common forms of membership. Values were likewise of connected with the forms of organisation of the society, that a change of in so was or sooner later, a change of values, vice versa. In and organisation followed, by all so far. We take this much granted we tend to forget that to where it came from.

NOTES

References Durkheim's to own writings indicated shown: are as in of G. DOL The division of labor in society. Ill.: Simpson, (trans.). Glencoe, The Free Press, 1947. Rules of the sociological method. Solovay, S. A., & J. H. Mueller (trans.). Chicago: Chicago U. P., 1938. 1953 Sociology and philosophy. Pocock, D. F. (trans.). London: Cohen & West. 2. Quoted with acknowledgments to the author and the publishers, Messrs Faber & Faber.

REFERENCES

Alpert, Harry 1939. Emile Durkheim's sociology. J. and (Studies in history, in and economics public law 445) New York: Columbia U. P. -- 1941. Emile Durkheim and the theory of social integration. Soc. Philos. 172-84. of J. 6, Emile 1948. The sociologism of Emile Durkheim Benoit-Smullyan, of and his school. In An introduction to the history of sociology Barnes, to the of (ed.) Harry Elmer. Chicago: Chicago U. P. Bohannan, Paul 1960. Conscience collective culture. Wolff, H. (ed.) 1960. and In K. Faris, Ellsworth 1934. Emile Durkheim's division of labor in society. on of Review in Am. J. Sociol. 376-7. 40, Freeman, Linton & Winch, C. Robert Francis 1957. Societal complexity: empirical of an test a typology of societies. of Am. J. Sociol. 461-6. 62, This content downloaded from 158. 143.

<https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

192. 135 on Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions DURKHEIM S DIVISION OF LABOUR IN SOCIETY 175 Friedmann, Georges 1955. La these Durkheim les formes de contemporaines la division de du et travail. Cah. intern. Sociol. 45-58. 19, Oxford: Clarendon Press. Herbert, George 1941. The works of George Herbert. Herskovits, J. 1952. Economic anthropology: a comparative study of economic life. New York: Knopf. New M. culture social and Hobhouse, T., Wheeler, C. & Ginsberg, I. 1915. The material culture of primitive societies. London: Chapman Hall. de e'tude Lacombe, Roger E. 1926. La methode sociologique Durkheim: critique. Paris: Alcan. In Levi-Strauss, Claude 1945. French sociology. Twentieth century sociology (eds.) Gurvitch, G., & W. E. Moore, New York: Philosophical Library. Lowie, R. H. 1937. The history of ethnology. London: Harrap. of theory. in London: Kegan Paul, Trench, B. and Malinowski, 1926. Crime customs savage society. Trubner. In to edition. Socialism Saint-Simon, and Mauss, Marcell 1958. Introduction the first Durkheimn, Ohio: Antioch Press. Emile. Yellow Spring, R. Division of labor in society. AmJ. Sociol. 316-28. Merton, K. 1934. Durkheim's 40, and the 1949. Social theory social structure: towards codification theory research. of and III.: Glencoe, The Free Press. and in In K. Neyer, Joseph 1960. Individualism socialism Durkheim. Wolff, H. (ed.), 1960. selected ... R. Durkheim with Nisbett, A. 1965. Emile essays. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice Hall. social action. III.: Parsons, Talcott 1937. The structure of Glencoe, The Free Press (2nd ed., 1949.) contribution to the theory of social systems. Wolff, to of In 1960. Durkheim's K. H. (ed.) 1960. In and Peristiany, G. 1953. Introduction. Sociology philosophy, J. Durkheim, Emile. London: Cohen & West. and his intellectual Peyre, Henri 1960. Durkheim: man, his time, the <https://assignbuster.com/durkheim-and-division-of-labour/>

background. Wolff, In K. H. (ed.) 1960. Radcliffe-Brown, R. 1952. Structure
function primitive A. and in society: essays addresses. and London: Cohen &
West. In Richter, Melvin 1960. Durkheim's politics political and theory. Wolf, K.
H. (ed.) 1960. Schnore, F. 1958. Social morphology human Leo and ecology.
63, Am. J. Sociol. 620-34. Simpson, George 1933. Emile Durkheim's
social realism. Sociol. Res. 18, 3-II. soc. Spender, Stephen 1955.
Collected poems 1928-1953. London: Faber & Faber. Udy, Stanley Hart, jr.
1959. Organization work: comparative of a analysis production of among non-
industrial New Haven: H. R. A. F. Press. peoples. T. Walter 1929. A new
census an old theory: and division labor in the pre-literate of Watson, world.
34, Am. J. Sociol. 632-52. Kurt 1960 (ed.). Emile H. a Wolff, Durkheim, 1858-
1917: collection of essays translations a with and bibliography. Columbus,
Ohio: Ohio State U. P. This content downloaded from 158. 143. 192. 135 on
Mon, 6 May 2013 07: 42: 11 AM All use subject to JSTOR Terms and
Conditions