

THE DIVISION OF LABOR BY: EMILE DURKHEIM

In his 1893 work *The Division of Labor in Society*, Durkheim examined how social order was maintained in different types of societies. He focused on the division of labor, and examined how it differed in traditional societies and modern societies. Authors before him such as Herbert Spencer and Ferdinand Toennies had argued that societies evolved much like living organisms, moving from a simple state to a more complex one resembling the workings of complex machines. Durkheim reversed this formula, adding his theory to the growing pool of theories of social progress, social evolutionism and social darwinism.

He argued that traditional societies were 'mechanical' and were held together by the fact that everyone was more or less the same, and hence had things in common. In traditional societies, argues Durkheim, the collective consciousness entirely subsumes individual consciousness-social norms are strong and social behavior is well-regulated.

In modern societies, he argued, the highly complex division of labor resulted in 'organic' solidarity. Different specializations in employment and social roles created dependencies that tied people to one another, since people no longer could count on filling all of their needs by themselves. In 'mechanical' societies, for example, subsistence farmers live in communities which are self-sufficient and knit together by a common heritage and common job. In modern 'organic' societies, workers earn money, and must rely on other people who specialize in certain products (groceries, clothing, etc.) to meet their needs.

The result of increasing division of labor, according to Durkheim, is that individual consciousness emerges distinct from collective consciousness-often finding itself in conflict with collective consciousness. Durkheim also made an association of the kind of solidarity in a given society and the preponderance of a law system.

He found that in societies with mechanical solidarity the law is generally repressive: the agent of a crime or deviant behavior would suffer a punishment, that in fact would compensate collective conscience neglected by the crime-the punishment acts more to preserve the unity of consciences.

On the other hand, in societies with organic solidarity the law is generally restitutive: it aims not to punish, but instead to reconstitute normal activity of a complex society.

The rapid change in society due to increasing division of labor thus produces a state of confusion with regard to norms and increasing impersonality in social life, leading eventually to relative normlessness, i.e. the breakdown of social norms regulating behavior; Durkheim labels this state anomie. From a state of anomie come all forms of deviant behavior, most notably suicide.

CONTRIBUTION OF DURKHEIM IN UNDERSTANDING "THE SOCIETY"

1. He called Sociology "a science of social facts" forces in society which influence the individual.
2. Division of labor in Society: "Mechanical & Organic Society"
3. Social Solidarity:
4. His contribution towards understating of LAW: "Repressive & Retributive"
5. His views on Religion: He believed that religion was a power element and institution of society.
6. His observation on suicide:
7. His concept of Society: Its existence is possible only because of what he called collective conscience.
8. His emphasizes the importance of EDUCATION.
9. He also focused on Crime and Punishment.

“EVOLUTIONARY THEORY “IBN-KHALDUN”

The very first form and foundation of social evolution was the philosophy of organic society. Organic society is the prospective that societies are really living organisms that experience cyclic birth, growth, maturity, decline, and ultimately death due to universal causes that undergo many of the same stages and developments that animals and humans go through.

The very first of these philosophies can be traced back to the 14th century in the writings of Ibn Khaldun, an Islamic scholar. Ibn Khaldun uses the term Asabiyyah to describe the bond of cohesion among humans in a group forming community. The bond, Asabiyyah, exists at any level of civilization, from nomadic society to states and empires. Asabiyyah is most strong in the nomadic phase, and decreases as civilization advances. As this Asabiyyah declines, another more compelling Asabiyyah may take its place; thus, civilizations rise and fall, and history describes these cycles of Asabiyyah as they play out.

The Asabiyyah cycle described by Ibn Khaldun was true for nearly all civilizations before the modern era. Nomadic invaders had always ended up adopting the religion and culture of the civilizations they conquered, which was true for various Arab, Berber, Turkic and Mongol invaders that invaded the medieval Islamic world and ended up adopting Islamic religion and culture.

Beyond the Muslim world, the Asabiyyah cycle was also true for every other pre-modern civilization, whether in China whose dynastic cycles resemble the Asabiyyah cycles described by Ibn Khaldun, in Europe where waves of barbarian invaders adopted Christianity and Greco-Roman culture, or in India or Persia where nomadic invaders assimilated into those civilizations.

DURKHEIM & WEBER THEORIES: COMPARISON AND RELEVANCE TODAY

Introduction

Classical, seminal sociological theorists of the late 19th and early 20th century such as Durkheim and Weber were greatly interested in religion and its effects on society. Like those of Plato and Aristotle from ancient Greece, and Enlightenment philosophers from the 17th through 19th centuries, the ideas posited by these sociologists continue to be examined today.

Durkheim and Weber had very complex and developed theories about the nature and effects of religion. Of these, Durkheim and Weber are often more difficult to understand, especially in light of the lack of context and examples in their primary texts. Religion was considered to be an extremely important social variable in the work of these two.

Emile Durkheim

Emile Durkheim was a French sociologist with a background in anthropology, and became known as ‘the father of sociology’. He lived from 1858-1917 and was educated in both France and Germany. Durkheim viewed religion as an essential part of one’s social life and went as far as to say that without religion society could not possibly exist cohesively. Religion, as ‘the cement of society’, is entirely a social concept.

Durkheim’s method in studying religion was based on the scientific method. It does not take into account specific beliefs or the origins of religions. Matters regarding the truth of religion are not accounted for, nor is there any such thing as a false religion. The fact that a religion has survived for so long gives the religion meaning, and that is central to the social dimension of religion.

Unlike most other sociologists of religion, Durkheim did feel that religion was real, and will survive. There was nothing illusion or deceptive of religion, and a strong religion will simply ensure social solidarity.

Max Weber

Max Weber was a German sociologist, economist, and political scientist. He lived during the same time frame as Durkheim, from the late 19th to the early 20th century. Weber saw religion as fulfilling self-interest. Although not to the same extent as Marx, Weber did feel that religion was something that arose out of an individual need for life to have meaning. Unlike Durkheim, society was not central, but rather what was important to study is how different individuals of a religion relate to one another.

Weber's method was groundbreaking at the time because he refuted all previous understandings of history dealing with religion, particularly those of Marx, and of course, Durkheim. Nonetheless, he did share some similarities with his French colleague. Like Durkheim, he used a strict scientific outlook when studying the field, which helped to establish the field of sociology as an academic discipline.

Comparison of Durkheim & Weber

In comparison studies, unlike Durkheim, who compared social entities, Weber used the notion of the individual and ideal-types. From his studies, Weber hypothetically created an ideal form, from whose characteristics can be taken from various individuals or events. Weber argued that no scientific process can account for every issue regarding his studies of sociology of religion.

Along with the use of ideal-types, Weber's goal of sociology of religion was to understand the individual impact of religion. While Durkheim stressed how religion caused society to remain interconnected and moral, Weber did not feel it was necessary to delve into the social function of religion. The personal role of religion and its individual meaning was much more crucial. He refuses to allow the importance of religion to be reduced to something merely social. Max Weber believed that religions provided meaning for individuals who aspired it. Religious beliefs are an example of these self-interests. As far as Durkheim's society theory relates, Weber believed that the study of society and religion for that matter should be the study of the interrelation between individuals.

Weber did not disagree with Durkheim regarding the reality of religions or its future. Weber and Durkheim were in the minority of sociologists who believed that religion was real and sacred.

They also agreed that religion did have a future, albeit for different reasons. While Durkheim thought religion was necessary for the society to exist, Weber believed that individuals who were religious would be influenced to take part in so called worldly affairs, and succeed, such as capitalist Protestants.

Emile Durkheim and Max Weber were not only the two founders of sociology, but also the founders of sociology of religion. These two men, from roughly the same time period and geography, approached their field with due scientific processes. However, while Durkheim viewed religion to simply the basis and entity of social function, while Weber refused reduce religion to a single theory, but saw the importance of religious ideas in the personal realm and the influences it could have not only to oneself but to other surrounding individuals. Both Durkheim and Weber attempted to interpret religion and its social composition, and understood the nature of its utmost real importance and role it would have in the future of humanity.

Relevance Today

Emile Durkheim & Weber were two sociologists who mainly tried to make us understand society taking the religion as a base element. They both focused on religion as an important constituent of society. According to

Durkheim there would be no society without the factor of religion and same as Weber described his opinion about the significance of religion in terms of individual social life.

What they both had defined in terms of religion is very relevant in modern time; as the science has grown its roots to the very peculiar direction everyone entitles to know the truth especially in religion. Understating the religion is one of the solutions of basic problem of human. In whole world people are trying to understand the importance and relevance of religion in their social life. It is a burning issue in today's time. The point which has been raised by Durkheim and Weber is still getting the full concentration of people. If we talk about Islam; is the most fastest growing religion in UK and USA, one of the primary reasons is people interest to know about the religion and how it effects our collective or individual social life.

We can elaborate this from the primitive societies which exist on the basis of religion, we have example of countries like Pakistan and Israel those got the entity only on the basis of religion. From this whole discussion we came to know that both Durkheim and Weber have explained a key point as the factor of religion to understand the society which is still very much relevant today.

THE LABOR THEORY OF VALUE (KARL MARX)

Karl Marx's labor theory of value asserts that the value of an object is solely a result of the labor expended to produce it. According to this theory, the more labor or labor time that goes into an object, the more it is worth. Marx defined value as "consumed labor time", and stated that "all goods, considered economically, are only the product of labor and cost nothing except labor".

The labor theory of value is the fundamental premise of Marx's economics and the basis of his analysis of the free market. If it is correct, then much of Marx's critique of capitalism is also correct. But if it is false, virtually all of Marx's economic theory is wrong.

Here is an example of how the labor theory of value works: A worker in a factory is given \$30 worth of material, and after working 3 hours producing a good, and using \$10 worth of fuel to run a machine, he creates a product which is sold for \$100. According to Marx, the labor and only the labor of the worker increased the value of the natural materials to \$100. The worker is thus justly entitled to a \$60 payment, or \$20 per hour.

If the worker is employed by a factory owner who pays him only \$15 per hour, according to Marx the \$5 per hour the factory owner receives is simply a ripoff. The factory owner has done nothing to earn the money and the \$5 per hour he receives is "surplus value", representing exploitation of the worker. Even the tools which the factory owner provided were, according to Marx, necessarily produced by other workers.

According to the labor theory of value, all profits are the rightful earnings of the workers, and when they are kept from the workers by capitalists, workers are simply being robbed. On the basis of this theory, Marx called for the elimination of profits, for workers to seize factories and for the overthrow of the "tyranny" of capitalism. His call to action has been heeded in many countries throughout the world.