

A Critique on the Durkheimian Concept of Solidarity

K.A.A.N. Thilakarathna

Institute of Human Resource Advancement, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka

Abstract-The concept of solidarity as advanced by Durkheim in the 18th century concerns about the totality of a given society in which it tries to work together as a cohesive unit. Durkheim observed that at the initial stages, that is to say in the primitive societies people bonded together because of their similarities. As most of the people in a tribe or a clan in those periods were self-sufficient and their needs and wants being limited in nature, they were capable of surviving on their own and hence they formed alliances with one another out of their similarities. This was termed as mechanical solidarity. Durkheim observed that, during these periods' laws were stringently applied and that any deviant behaviors were heavily condemned and retributive justice was considered to be the norm. However, as the societies grew in numbers, the similarities which existed among the people in a tribe or a clan soon started to disappear and more and dissimilarities and differences among them began to arise. With these latter developments, the unity of the society was protected by a different kind of solidarity, which is termed as organic solidarity. Under this particular system social unity is based on a division of labor that results in people depending on each other. As one person became dependent on another the relationships which existed prior to such change of circumstances were not able to provide for the rather complex relationships which started to develop with the division of labor, where each person was somehow or the other produced a commodity which was to be exchanged with other commodities in which the exchange of ones capabilities with another became the norm of a society. Durkheim explained that, even with these differences people had to work together under an organic solidarity to make sure of their future existence. Durkheim observed that, during these periods, the laws are made not so with a retributive aim but with a rehabilitative aim, in which offenders or deviants are rehabilitated so that they can be re-released to a given society where once again they can become productive individuals. Using a black letter approach, this paper tries to evaluate the theory of solidarity as advanced by Durkheim in a conceptual manner with the prevalent realities of the modern society. In doing so this paper looks at the contemporary arguments which have been put forward both for and against the ideas presented by Durkheim with regard to his idea of solidarity. From these contemporary writings it has been found that, though not in its entirety, the Durkheimian concept of solidarity still holds true with regard to the working of or keeping a society together admits all of its differences.

Key Words- Sociology, Mechanical Solidarity, Organic Solidarity, Durkheim

I. INTRODUCTION

All intellectual fields are profoundly shaped by their social settings. This is particularly true of sociology, which not only is derived from that setting but takes the social setting as its basic subject matter (Ritzer, 2011). It is clear from the views expressed by George Ritzer that no sociological theory

or concept derives from a vacuum. A sociological theory or a concept is shaped and molded by such factors as industrial revolutions, political revolutions, social forces, religious changes and urbanization. Modern social theory first emerged during the period of the 'great transformation,' a term used by Karl Polanyi to describe the massive social change which took place in Europe between 1750 and 1920 (Polanyi, 2014). The French revolution, which occurred in 1789 had an overwhelming impact on the then, French society. The changes were captured in a negative manner by some of the thinkers of the time so much so that they even wanted to go back to the somewhat peaceful medieval times literally. However, thinkers such as Comte and Durkheim sought instead to find new bases of order in societies that had been overturned by the political revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Ritzer, 2011). The industrial revolution that also occurred in the Western European countries in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries also had a propounding impact on the development of sociological theories. The industrial revolution was not a one single event, but a chain of events that transformed the agricultural world in to an industrial one. The Industrial Revolution, capitalism, and the reaction against them all involved an enormous upheaval in Western society, an upheaval that affected sociologists greatly (Ritzer, 2011). In this time period socialism was proposed as an alternative to capitalism. However, apart from Marx, most of the early theorists, such as Weber and Durkheim, were opposed to socialism. Although they recognized the problems within capitalist society, they sought social reform within capitalism rather than the social revolution argued for by Marx.

In the above short analysis, it is evident that, Durkheim has become an influential figure in the discussion of sociological theories that were developed amidst both political and industrial revolutions. Even after hundred years after his death, Durkheim has remain relevant in the modern discourse on sociology. Though he lived in France and wrote about the society in which he lived his work is still referred and disused when dealing with contemporary questions of the society (Cotterrell, 2010). The real "who" of Durkheim slips through our fingers. Socialist, positivist, establishment figure, Jew and, of course, sociologist – Durkheim was all of these but cannot be reduced to their sum, their boundaries, or even their dialogue (Alexander & Smith, 2005). More than any other figure in the history of sociology, Emile Durkheim seems to embody what has proved to be conceptually most distinctive in the field and most fertile in its contribution to other modern disciplines. Durkheim, it might be said, is the complete sociologist. If one fixes attention upon those sociological

elements that are, and have been, unique in the family of social sciences and that have had the greatest influence on other social sciences, Durkheim appears to be first among equal (Nisbet, 1976). Durkheim took into account such issues as responsibility, justice and rights; democracy, cooperation and citizenship; faith and belief in a secular society which are still universal and contemporary. Durkheim believe that in addressing these topics sociology could cope and do better than philosophy. Durkheim identified and addressed problems about the character of social life in certain types of society at particular stages of their development - especially the particular type of modern European industrial society of his day.

This paper focuses on Durkheim and especially regarding the concept of solidarity which was a central theme in Durkheim's doctoral thesis of 'Division of labour in the society' which was published on 1893. The theme of Durkheimian thought, and consequently the theme of this first book, is the relation between individuals and the collectivity (Aron, 1968). The problem can be stated as follows: How can a multiplicity or a diverse set of individual make up a society? How can individuals living in such a society achieve what is the condition of social existence, namely, a consensus or a general agreement among themselves? 'Durkheim's answered to this central question by introducing the concept of solidarity and based on this concept he sub divided it in to two categories of mechanical and organic solidarity to explain this consensus in different societies.

II. THE SOCIAL AND INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND OF THE ORIGIN OF SOLIDARITY

Emile Durkheim was born on April 15, 1858, in Epinal, France. According to a biographical sketch provided by Ritzerhe rejected a traditional academic career in philosophy and sought instead to acquire the scientific training needed to contribute to the moral guidance of society. Although he was interested in scientific sociology, there was no field of sociology at that time, so between 1882 and 1887 he taught philosophy in a number of provincial schools in the Paris area (Ritzer, 2011). After visiting Germany where he was exposed to the scientific psychology, his appetite for for science grew even bigger. He published a lot from the experiences he gained in Germany. He was the first even in France to offer a social sciences course in a French university. Ritzer provides us with an in-depth account as to how Durkheim came to prominence with his publications. Ritzer provides that 'the years that followed were characterized by a series of personal successes for Durkheim. In 1893 he published his French doctoral thesis, *The Division of Labor in Society*, as well as his Latin thesis on Montesquieu (Durkheim, 1892/1997; W. Miller, 1993). His major methodological statement, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, appeared in 1895, followed (in 1897) by his empirical application of those methods in the study *Suicide*. Durkheim died on November 15 1917. Even after hundred years from his death the theories and principles that he introduced in to the realm of sociology and other spheres of

social sciences remains relevant today. Out of which the concept of 'solidarity' which he brought forward in his doctrinal thesis is one fascinating to study.

According to Morrison, 'historically, the circumstances shaping Durkheim's theoretical interests were rooted in the political climate that existed in France between 1870 and 1895. By 1871, France was in a deep political crisis which had led to a decline in its national unity. The ensuing social and political changes taking place in France during this period shaped the intellectual and social climate in which Durkheim worked' (Morrison, 2006). Morrison also accounts that 'as French nationalism began to grow, new intellectual currents such as positivism developed and this led to the use of the science to solve social problems'(Morrison, 2006). By 1880 France began a reforming policy which included two main themes. The first theme that came up was to use scientific methods to resolve social problems. As the national stress on science and social progress that had developed with the discoveries of the natural sciences grew even more the use of such methods in resolving social problems also took center stage. The second theme, which emerged in France during this time was the issue of individualism and the increasing autonomy of the individual's relation with the society. The prevalent belief at that time was that since the revolution, people were separated from the society and that they only came to associate with the society only in circumstances of economic necessity and self-interest. However, according to Morrison, Durkheim took a different view and believed that this resulted in placing the individual ahead of the national unity of society and threatened the cohesion of social institutions by obscuring the unifying nature of the collective order(Morrison, 2006).

Not only the societal circumstances that were prevalent in France helped to galvanize the critical thinking of Durkheim also there were a number of key theoretical influences from other led to the shaping of Durkheim's conception of society. Out of which four influences are of significance. First, one is the Comte's perspective on scientific methodology called positivism. It helped Durkheim create a scientific approach to the study of society. Second one was the adoption of a philosophical perspective called social realism, which Durkheim used to study society as an external reality existing outside the individual. Third were, the debates related to the problem of individualism that were common in France up to the period of the 1800's. Fourth were, the influences derived from the political writings of Thomas Hobbes and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. These individualist doctrines tended to trace the origins of society to individual human nature.

As Morrison points out 'Comte's ultimate stress on the scientific study of society influenced Durkheim in several respects. First, he accepted the positivistic thesis that the study of society was to be founded on an examination of facts, and that facts were to be subject to observation. Second, like Comte, Durkheim upheld the view that the only valid guide to objective knowledge of society was the scientific method and

the reliance on factual observation. Third, Durkheim agreed with Comte that the social sciences could become scientific only when they were stripped of their metaphysical abstractions and philosophical speculation' (Morrison, 2006). With regard to social realism, Durkheim adopted the realist perspective in order to demonstrate the existence of social realities outside the individual and to show that these realities existed in the form of the objective relations of society. Durkheim had to wage theoretical battles against the empiricist view in order to defend his realist argument that social realities exist outside the individual and that they have causal powers that affect individual acts. Regarding the ideologies prevalent on individualism on France after the French revolution after the 'Declaration of the Rights of Man, individual autonomy was at an all-time high. With the growth of individualism the collectivism of the State was in serious jeopardy. This led to serious debates being made on the relationship between the individualism and the collective. Durkheim set out to find answers to these questions by showing that 'social life would not be possible unless there were interests that were superior to the interests of individuals' (Morrison, 2006).

Regarding the individualist theories of Thomas Hobbes and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Durkheim tried to differentiate between their theories and his. Durkheim rejected both the thesis put forward by both Hobbes and Rousseau. Regarding the arguments put forward by Hobbes, Durkheim, disagreed with Hobbes' individualist doctrine on several fronts. Hobbes, took the view that, individuals impose restraint on themselves by agreeing to contract out of nature and by agreeing to the rules which the sovereign imposes in the form of law. However, Durkheim argued that, this restraint is nothing more than a byproduct of individual's will which is added incrementally to social reality. Durkheim, by contrast, believed that restraint was imposed externally by society independent of the individual and this made restraint the center of Durkheim's view of the structure of society. By arguing that restraint springs from collective life rather than from the individual, Durkheim thought that restraint could be studied in its own right as an independent social reality. On the other hand with regard to the arguments put forward by Rousseau, while it was similar to Durkheim in some respects, Durkheim rejected Rousseau on many other respects. According to Durkheim, Rousseau's idea of individual deriving from the society in the end was a mistaken one. Durkheim argued that because of the assumption of individual being a complete, organically and morally he owed nothing to the society in which he lived. Durkheim on the other hand assumed that the collective structure of society was separate from the individual and thought that it could be studied as a reality in its own right, and in this way he thought it was independent of the individual. Durkheim also argued that because of the overtly reliance on philosophical and idealist concepts of individualist natures Rousseau's account of the emergence of society was unsatisfactory. Lastly, Durkheim criticized the requirements put forward by Rousseau with

regard to the reasons, for a. individual to adhere to the rules of a collective society. In Rousseau's theory of social contracts, he treats society as a reduction of individual wills and this called into question the obligatory nature of social duties and obligations which Durkheim saw as an independent source of investigation since they originated from society.

All of the above mentioned social and intellectual factors had a propounding influence on Durkheim when he prepared his doctrinal thesis entitled 'The division of labor in society'. The Division of Labor was developed in such a way to understand about the society in completely new way. He wanted to find answers to several questions. First, he wanted to differentiate between the social and economic division of labor. Then he wanted to, find out the nature of the social bonds and links that exist among peoples in a society and what really connects these individuals in to unity. Durkheim also sought to examine the specific origin of the social links and bonds in order to see in what way they were related to the overall system of social cohesion in society, and the extent to which this cohesion was formed within the different social groups he studied. At last Durkheim wanted to, look at the extent to which the system of social links change as the structure of society became more complex and subject to changes in the division of labor. He stated this aim of the study when he asked 'why do individuals, while becoming more autonomous, depend more upon society? How can they be at once more individual and yet more cohesive?' (Morrison, 2006).

Division of labour refers to a situation where the process of making a particular commodity is divided among several individuals. By this process the main economic and domestic tasks are performed by by different people for achieving a collective functioning of the society. Durkheim believed that, this was due to a social process taking place within the structure of society rather than the result of the private choices of individuals or the result of organic traits that emerged during evolution. In looking at the division of labor in different societies, Durkheim began by making a distinction between what he called the 'social division of labor' and what Adam Smith had called the 'economic division of labor. Durkheim looked at the process he called the 'social division of labor' in comparison with Smith's somewhat more narrow focus on the economic division of labor. The term social division of labor was thus used by Durkheim to describe the social links and bonds which develop during the process that takes place in societies when many individuals enter into cooperation for purposes of carrying out joint economic and domestic tasks.

What Durkheim observed beyond Smith was that the social division of labor led to the formation of what he called social 'links and bonds' that attach individuals to the wider society and to each other by linking actual 'cooperators together.' These links and bonds, he went on to reason, formed a system of attachments to society which Durkheim referred to as social solidarity, and it was from these links that whole societies

were formed and a whole set of social relations were created. Durkheim looked at the question of the overall unity of society. Generally speaking, he referred to this unity as social solidarity and initially he used the term in several distinct ways.

III. THE CONCEPT OF SOLIDARITY

Durkheim looked at the question of the overall unity of society. Generally speaking, he referred to this unity as social solidarity (Morrison, 2006). He was interested in how societies manage to create social integration—their members united by shared values and other social bonds. The theme of Durkheimian thought, and consequently the theme of his first book ‘The Division of Labour in the Society’, is the relation between individuals and the collectivity. Durkheim wanted answers for two main questions, firstly, how can a multiplicity of individuals make up a society and secondly, how can individuals achieve what is the condition of social existence, namely, a consensus? His answer was formed in the concept of solidarity which was two faced, namely Mechanical and Organic. The change in the division of labor has had enormous implications for the structure of society. Durkheim was most interested in the changed way in which social solidarity is produced, in other words, the changed way in which society is held together and how its members see themselves as part of a whole. According to Alexander Gofman ‘for [Durkheim], [solidarity] serves as a synonym for the normal state of society, while absence of it is a deviation from that normal state, or social pathology (Gofman, 2014). Morrison explains that, Durkheim uses the term solidarity in four different ways (Morrison, 2006). Firstly, Durkheim uses it to refer to the system of social bonds which link individuals directly to the wider society. Secondly, he uses it to identify a system of social relations linking individuals to each other and to society as a whole. Thirdly, to refer to the system of social interchanges which go beyond the brief transactions that occur during economic exchange in society. And fourthly, describe the level of intensity that exists in the social attachments linking individuals to the collective structure of society.

Durkheim divided the concept of solidarity in to two parts, namely, mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity. By the term ‘mechanical solidarity’, Durkheim meant that people who perform similar tasks develop a shared way of viewing life. Mechanical solidarity is, to use Durkheim’s language, a solidarity of resemblance. The major characteristic of a society in which mechanical solidarity prevails is that the individuals differ from one another as little as possible. The individuals, the members of the same collectivity, resemble each other because they feel the same emotions, cherish the same values, and hold the same things sacred. The society is coherent because the individuals are not yet differentiated. Think of a farming community in which everyone is involved in growing crops—planting, cultivating, and harvesting. Because they have so much in common, they share similar views about life. Societies with mechanical solidarity tolerate little diversity in behavior, thinking, or attitudes; their unity

depends on sharing similar views. For Durkheim, the principal source of cohesion in societies characterized by mechanical solidarity is the *conscience collective*, shared ways of thinking and feeling which bind the members of society together to form a tightly knit community. This is solidarity based upon likeness and in primitive societies where it is most fully developed, uniformity is so strictly maintained that there is an almost total absence of individual autonomy and identity (Cotterrell, 2010). As Nisbet observes, for Durkheim ‘[mechanical] solidarity is induced by a community of representations which gives birth to laws imposing uniform beliefs and practices upon individuals under threat of repressive measures. These repressive laws are external—that is, observable in the positivistic sense (Nisbet, 1976). Durkheim describes the morphology of primitive societies as "segmental," that is, consisting of relatively undifferentiated parts linked together in a non-hierarchical manner. This structure "allows society to enclose the individual more tightly, holding him strongly attached to his domestic environment and, consequently, to traditions," thereby reinforcing the determinacy of group beliefs and practices. Under a society characterized by mechanical solidarity the individual’s relation to society is such that the individual does not emerge as separate from the group, and any individual differences are subordinated to the solidarity of the group. In this case, individuality is at its lowest point of development, there is no private life and no individual autonomy.

The opposite form of solidarity, so-called organic solidarity, is one in which consensus, or the coherent unity of the collectivity, results from or is expressed by differentiation. The individuals are no longer similar, but different; and in a certain sense, which we shall examine more thoroughly, it is precisely because the individuals are different that Consensus is achieved. As societies get larger, they develop different kinds of work, a specialized division of labor. Some people mine gold, others turn it into jewelry, and still others sell it. This disperses people into different interest groups where they develop different ideas about life. No longer do they depend on one another to have similar ideas and behaviors. Rather, they depend on one another to do specific work, with each person contributing to the group. Durkheim argued that primitive societies have a stronger collective conscience, that is, more shared understandings, norms, and beliefs. The increasing division of labor has caused a diminution of the collective conscience.

The collective conscience is of much less significance in a society with organic solidarity than it is in a society with mechanical solidarity. People in modern society are more likely to be held together by the division of labor and the resulting need for the functions performed by others than they are by a shared and powerful collective conscience. Nevertheless, even organic societies have a collective consciousness, albeit in a weaker form that allows for more individual differences. Durkheim called this new form of solidarity organic solidarity. To see why he used this term,

think about your body. The organs of your body need one another. Your lungs depend on your heart to pump your blood, and your heart depends on your lungs to oxygenate your blood. To move from the physical to the social, think about how you need your teacher to guide you through this course and how your teacher needs students in order to have a job. You and your teacher are like two organs in the same body. (The “body” in this case is the college.) Like the heart and lungs, although you perform different tasks, you need one another.

Because people in modern society perform a relatively narrow range of tasks, they need many other people in order to survive. The primitive family headed by father-hunter and mother-food gatherer is practically self-sufficient, but the modern family needs the grocer, baker, butcher, auto mechanic, teacher, police officer, and so forth. These people, in turn, need the kinds of services that others provide in order to live in the modern world. Modern society, in Durkheim’s view, is thus held together by the specialization of people and their need for the services of many others. This specialization includes not only that of individuals but also of groups, structures, and institutions. The change to organic solidarity changed the basis for social integration. In centuries past, you would have had views similar to your neighbors because you lived in the same village, farmed together, and had relatives in common. To catch a glimpse of why, look at the photo above. But no longer does social integration require this. Like organs in a body, our separate activities contribute to the welfare of the group. The change from mechanical to organic solidarity allows our society to tolerate a wide diversity of orientations to life and still manage to work as a whole.

In Durkheim’s thought, the two forms of solidarity correspond to two extreme forms of social organization. The societies which in Durkheim’s day were called primitive and which today are more likely to be called archaic (or societies without writing - incidentally, the change in terminology reflects a different attitude towards these societies) are characterized by the predominance of mechanical solidarity. The individuals of a clan, are so to speak, interchangeable. It follows from this - and this idea is essential to Durkheim’s conception - that the individual does not come first, historically; the individual, the awareness of oneself as an individual, is born of historical development itself. In primitive societies each man is the

same as the others; in the consciousness of each, feelings common to all, collective feelings, predominate in number and intensity. The opposition between these two forms of solidarity is combined with the opposition between segmental societies and societies characterized by modern division of labour. One might say that a society with mechanical solidarity is also a segmental society; but actually the definition of these two notions is not exactly the same, and the point is worth dwelling on for a moment.

In contrasting organic to mechanical solidarity, Durkheim was consciously reversing the dichotomy between modern and traditional society’s characteristic of-German social thought, and Tönnies (as he read him) in particular. His own distinction was partly a way of stressing the social differentiation of ‘organized’ societies, involving interdependent and multiplying specialized roles, beliefs and sentiments as opposed to the un-differentiated unity of uniform activities, beliefs and sentiments and rigid social control found in ‘segmental’ societies. ‘Mechanical’ and ‘organic’ referred, none too seriously, to an analogy - that of ‘the cohesion which unites the elements of an inanimate body, as opposed to that which makes a unity out of the elements of a living body’: in mechanical solidarity, ‘the social molecules .. Could only operate in harmony in so far as they do not operate independently’, whereas, in organic solidarity, ‘society becomes more capable of operating in harmony, in so far as each of its elements operates more independently’.

Anthony Giddens (1972) points out that the collective conscience in the two types of society can be differentiated on four dimensions—volume, intensity, rigidity, and content. *Volume* refers to the number of people enveloped by the collective conscience; *intensity*, to how deeply the individuals feel about it; *rigidity*, to how clearly it is defined; and *content*, to the form that the collective conscience takes in the two types of society. In a society characterized by mechanical solidarity, the collective conscience covers virtually the entire society and all its members; it is believed in with great intensity; it is extremely rigid; and its content is highly religious in character. In a society with organic solidarity, the collective conscience is limited to particular groups; it is adhered to with much less intensity; it is not very rigid; and its content is the elevation of the importance of the individual to a moral precept.

The Four Dimensions of the Collective Conscience

Solidarity	Volume	Intensity	Rigidity	Content
Mechanical	Entire society	High	High	Religious
Organic	Particular groups	Low	Low	Moral individualism

(Source: Sociological Theory, George Ritzer)

IV. THE CONTEMPORARY DISCUSSIONS AND CRITIQUE OF SOLIDARITY

Durkheim's concept of solidarity has both been appreciated and criticized by latter scholars on different grounds. The concept of solidarity itself provides a theory which describes how social interactions are made between the individuals. *The Division of Labour in Society* (1893), Durkheim's first major work, presents not only an argument about the different principles of social solidarity between the so-called 'higher societies (*societfs sup&rieures*) of his day and traditional societies based on mechanical solidarity. It also offers a theory of change in which the values of justice, individuality and human dignity play a central, indeed dynamizing role that would continue to transform the division of labour for future generations. This commitment to the values of justice and individual dignity remained profound throughout his career, even if his later work may have registered significant shifts on the pre suppositional and empirical levels. Those who have recognized the importance of justice and individuality in Durkheim's thought, such as Giddens, Lukes and Alexander, do not fully trace out its potential ramifications for an analysis of the division of labour (Sirianni, 1984)

Adair points out that, 'few central problems have been repeatedly identified in Durkheim's work. Previous critics have charged that Durkheim provides an inadequate theory of social inequalities that *The Division of Labor in Society* fails to demonstrate its central thesis that organic solidarity provides a stronger basis for social integration than mechanical solidarity (Adair, 2008). Hawkins argues that, 'although most sociologists have agreed that a central theme of Durkheim's work is a concern with the nature of social solidarity, a consensus has been less readily forthcoming on the question of whether the theoretical treatment of this subject in *The Division of Labor* remained crucial to his thinking after the book's publication in 1893 (Hawkins, 1978). Hawkins further points out that, 'Durkheim abandoned his original typology of solidarity as he came to realize that many features of mechanical solidarity, far from being confined to primitive and traditional societies, are in fact the foundations of unity in *all* types of social systems (Hawkins, 1978). Durkheim pointed out that in societies characterized by mechanical solidarity, there is a collective conscience where any form of individualism will not be entertained. But Durkheim, himself, contradicts this arguments when he suggest that there could be a case of "circle of physical necessities." Unfortunately, he fails to specify the precise nature of these necessities or their relationship to private spheres of behavior. This omission gives the impression that there is a realm of distinctively personal activity which avoids collective regulation, and, indeed, there are occasions when Durkheim appears to ascribe such autonomy to primitives. For example, he claims that the satisfaction of physical needs introduces an element of irregularity and capriciousness into the life of the savage and gives rise to weak and intermittent social relationships (Hawkins, 1978). It can be argued that,

there for, Physical needs are satisfied automatically and unconsciously, as with animals, and do not stem from a pre-social cognitive apparatus. Durkheim further presupposes the existence of moral attributes that contribute to the holding of similar values and virtues, which in any event becomes problematic as he is trying to understand morality in a positivistic manner. If moral resemblance constitutes a fundamental basis of social order then Durkheim apparently has revised his original theory, which restricted such conformity to pre-modern societies. Indeed, there are suggestions in these lectures that the model of organic solidarity is inadequate: "A society in which there is pacific commerce between its members, in which there is no conflict of any sort, but which has nothing more than that, would have a rather mediocre quality. Society must, in addition, have before it an ideal towards which it reaches" (Hawkins, 1978).

V. CONCLUSION

In *The Division of Labour* Durkheim tries to identify what is special about 'modern' societies as compared with earlier ones. He notes, like other writers, that these societies are characterized by a highly developed division of labour - that is, by high levels of functional specialization. He saw this development as brought about primarily by population growth coupled with increasing social interaction. But what is most important for Durkheim is the effect of this development on the cohesion and integration (social solidarity) of society. Social solidarity in simpler societies, lacking an extensive division of labour, is mainly the result of similarities between individuals as regards beliefs, values, social roles and so on (a form of cohesion and integration which he terms 'mechanical solidarity'). Rejecting his earlier view that mechanical solidarity declines as societies become more complex, Durkheim came to accept that the existence of a powerful collective consciousness was necessary for modern societies no less than for earlier or simpler ones. He now saw modern societies as characterized not by a displacement of mechanical solidarity, but by its extension and by the establishment of *moral individualism* as a collective consciousness.

Not all humanity can be embraced in such networks but (a concept of general human solidarity remains 'a limit notion where a horizon of possibility remains. Nodoubt Durkheim would have approved, while insisting that philosophical idealism must be built on sociological study of the possibilities and limits of transnational communication, organization, justice and reciprocity. The richness and pertinence of Durkheim's thinking about the intersections of politics, justice and morality has continued to keep Durkheim as a relevant theorist at all times.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1]. Adair, S. (2008). Status and Solidarity: A Reformulation of Early Durkheimian Theory*. *Sociological Inquiry*, 78(1), 97-120. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682x.2008.00223.x>
- [2]. Alexander, J., & Smith, P. (2005). *The Cambridge companion to Durkheim* (1st Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- [3]. Aron, R. (1968). *Main currents in sociological thought Volume 2* (1st Ed.). Harmondsworth: Pelican.
- [4]. Cotterrell, R. (2010). *Émile Durkheim* (1st Ed.). Oxon: Routledge.
- [5]. Giddens, A. (1972). *Emile Durkheim : selected writings* (1st ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [6]. Gofman, A. (2014). Durkheim's Theory of Social Solidarity and Social Rules. In V. Jeffries, *The Palgrave Handbook of Altruism, Morality, and Social Solidarity* (1st Ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press LLC.
- [7]. Hawkins, M. (1978). Continuity and Change in Durkheim's Theory of Social Solidarity*. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 20(1), 155-164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1978.tb01919.x>
- [8]. Morrison, K. (2006). *Marx, Durkheim, Weber: Formations of Modern Social Thought* (2nd Ed.). London: Sage.
- [9]. Nisbet, R. (1976). *Émile Durkheim* (1st Ed.). Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- [10]. Polanyi, K. (1994). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of our Time* (1st Ed.). Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press.
- [11]. Ritzer, G. (2011). *Sociological theory* (8th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [12]. Sirianni, C. (1984). Justice and the Division of Labour: A Reconsideration of Durkheim's Division of Labour in Society. *The Sociological Review*, 32(3), 449-470. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954x.1984.tb00822.x>