



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

REVIEW ON MARXIAN AND DURKHEIMIAN PERSPECTIVE ON THE SOCIAL ORGANISATION OF WORK IN THE INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY AND ITS APPLICATION.

Devaraju

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Sociology,
Rural College,
Kanakapura, Ramanagara Dist- 562117
Karnataka State, INDIA

Abstract:

Adam Smith defined the wealth of the nation through the division of labour, which promoted the development of differentiated knowledge. The integration of this knowledge was to be acquired by the people of the country and required an ethical basis. Say, Babbage and Menger contributed to this; Marshall then included developmental trial and error and the critical gap between stimulus-response and deliberate thinking strategies. The later emphasis on equilibrium modeling facilitated further developments, but Schumpeter, Hayek, Penrose, Richardson, Nelson, and Winter helped to stimulate motivation, especially interest in achieving a particular capacity. Adam Smith told his rhetoric class. (1983, p. 145), "to present a didactic text with the details of a system; Let us establish only one or a few principles by which we can explain many laws, or phenomena, to unite one with another in their natural order, or begin to say that separate things must be explained of that, and we do not adopt a different principle nor the subsequent same as the previous ones.

Durkheim says the causes of division of labour lie in the fact that individuals need to cooperate and do a variety of tasks in order that industrial society may survive. According to Marx, division of labour is imposed on workers so that the capitalists may benefit.

This paper is an attempt to review the Marxian and Durkheimian perspective on the social organisation of work in Industrial society.

Keywords: Division of labour, dignity of work, equality, harmony, capitalism, Industry, society.

I. INTRODUCTION

According to Durkheim, the source of social life is the similarity between consciousness and the division of labor. The former is most obvious in classical societies where the "unity of machines" evidenced by coercive laws prevail; the latter in developed countries where populations evidence a greater "dynamic density," and judicial rules define the nature and relationships of cases. Fighting and basing the existence of societies on the basis of "agreed categories," Durkheim refutes his positivist emphasis on a latent anti-mechanical tendency in his discussion of existence of ends which denies the usefulness of ends irrelevant to the scientific study of society. The theory of unidirectional evolution is based on insensitive racial data. It assumes no division of labor in ancient societies and no "mechanical unity" in modern societies. The repressive and superseding law that Durkheim tries to use as a symbol of mechanical and biological harmony, but does not identify with precision what he thinks corresponds exactly to its harmony and justices.

Karl Marx, a leading figure in socio-economics, analyzed the complex division of labor in detail in his seminal work, 'Capital', Volume I. In his analysis, Marx found labour two main types of divisions: the social division of labor and the division of labor in production. These distinctions are essential to understanding Marx's critique of capitalism and his proposed remedy for related problems. The division of social labor is a widespread phenomenon that exists in all societies and occurs naturally in order to ensure the proper execution of services essential to sustaining socio-economic life. In this complex system, labor is distributed in society in various fields such as food production, handicrafts, and weapons. The division of social labor allows for exchanges between different groups in society. For example, a potter can trade their clay pots for a farmer's grain or a weaver's cloth. This system of exchange stimulates mainstream employment, resulting in the production of various goods and services.

Concerns in the Industrial society and the changes required.

Recent theory includes the idea that fast returns from individual specialization are necessary to promote functional division. Yanni et al., 2020, showed that topologically constrained groups, where cells and direct neighbors only cooperate as in fibers or branches of growth, can have developmental work distributed in reproduction. We develop a conceptual framework and specific models to explore factors that may contribute to the early development of the reproductive cleavage. We find that choosing a division of labor in geographically complex groups: (1) there is no one way to optimize the division of labor—depending on the context of the group structure, a division of labor can be granted has been good for a variety of reasons (2) it seeks consistent gains in efficiency at the fitness level of the group; and (3) some form of cooperation is needed to determine which individuals perform which actions. Because such interactions can develop prior to or simultaneously with division of labor, we present experimental hypotheses to show where topological constraints can prematurely constrain the development of division of labor and why division of labor is good on the natural world and ends.

It has long been established that the evolution of division of labour requires an efficiency benefit from individual specialisation Bourke, 2011; Cooper and West, 2018; Ispolatov et al., 2012; Michod, 2006; Oster and Wilson, 1978; Schiessl et al., 2019; Biggart, 1776; Maynard Smith and Szathmáry, 1995; Solari et al., 2013). In particular, that there is an accelerating (convex) return when individuals commit more effort to

a particular task, such that twice the investment more than doubles the return (Bourke, 2011; Cooper and West, 2018; Ispolatov et al., 2012; Michod, 2006; Solari et al., 2013). An accelerating return from individual investment can exist for several reasons. A task could become more effective as more effort is put into it, or it could be carried out with diminishing costs. This could occur if there are large upfront costs from performing a task. For instance, any reproduction by a cell in Volvocine groups first requires individual growth to the size of a daughter colony (Michod, 2006). Alternatively, there could be a disruptive cost to carrying out multiple tasks at the same time if the tasks do not mix well. For instance, in cyanobacteria the enzymes that fix environmental nitrogen are degraded by oxygen, a bi-product of photosynthesis (Flores and Herrero, 2010).

Durkheim – View Points

Durkheim was at variance with these views. If, as Comte suggests, it is moral consensus that holds society together, then would not modern industrial society crumble? After all, modern society is characterised by heterogeneity, mobility, and diversity in activities and values. It is a society where individualism is valued. Spencer's suggestion that selfish interests hold society together was also found to be faulty by Durkheim. If indeed, individual interests hold sway, the resulting competition and antagonism would break the backbone of society. Each would struggle for his own profit even at the expense of the other. Conflict and tension would bring about social disintegration. According to him, the basis or focus of social integration differs in preindustrial and post-industrial societies. He demonstrates how the process of occupational specialisation or division of labour helps to integrate societies where heterogeneity, differentiation and complexity are to be found. These societies, as you have already studied in Block 3 are those based on organic solidarity. In the following sub-sections we will see how Durkheim studies division of labour in terms of 1) the function of division of labour 2) the causes underlying division of labour 3) deviations from the normal type of division of labour, i.e. abnormal forms.

Marx- View Points

Profits for capitalists:

Marx's analysis highlights an important question: Where do the profits of the division of labor in production ultimately accumulate? His point is clear: the main beneficiaries are capitalists, not workers. The participation of labor in combination with private property reinforces the power and wealth of the capitalist class. Having the means of production, capitalists determine and organize production in order to maximize profit.

Loss of employee capacity:

According to Marx, the division of labor in production diminishes the status of workers as real producers. Instead, capitalists are merely cogs in the machinery of production following a well-designed and controlled chain of production. Employees are detached from the final outcome of their work and rarely see the end result. They have no control over the sale, purchase and purchase of these products. For example, an assembly line worker in a laundry never sees a finished product, let alone the ability to sell or use it, because a fraction of the products are produced and therefore productivity is high power goes completely into the hands of capitalists, extinguishing productive free choice workers.

Personality to the workforce:

Marx paints a strong picture of a capitalist system characterized by the division of labour. Workers are no longer independent producers, but are reduced to supplying the labor power needed to produce goods. Their individual identities, needs and desires are irrelevant to capitalists. In the eyes of the capitalist, the value of the worker is based solely on their productive capacity.

Conclusion

Division of labour based on inequality of opportunity, according to Durkheim, fails to produce long-lasting solidarity. Such an abnormal form results in individuals becoming frustrated and unhappy with their society. Thus tensions, rivalries and antagonism result. One may cite the Indian caste system as an example of division of labour based on inequality. People have to do certain kinds of work not because of their capacity but because of their birth. This can be very frustrating to those who want to do more satisfying or rewarding jobs, but cannot have access to proper opportunities. Durkheim however describes this as deviations from the normal type. He terms these as (1) anomie, wherein new rules and norms governing division of labour do not arise, (2) inequality, which results in discontent, tension and conflict and (3) inadequate organisation, which makes division of labour meaningless, producing disunity and disintegration.

Karl Marx's analysis of the division of labor elucidates two distinct types: the social division of labor and the division of labor in manufacture. The latter, prevalent in industrial societies influenced by capitalism, leads to several consequences, including profit accumulation by capitalists, loss of control for workers, dehumanization of the working class, and pervasive alienation. Marx's proposed remedy for these problems is the revolutionary transformation of society, marked by the abolition of private property and the establishment of a classless, communist society. In this vision, workers would regain ownership and control over the means of production, enabling them to break free from the alienation and exploitation inherent in the division of labor in manufacture.

It is required to educate the employees and know about the dignity of labour. The ideas proposed by Durkheim and Karl Marx are to be adapted at work places to reduce the economic disparity in the society for the benefit of all.

References;

- Durkheim, Emile. "The division of labor in society." *Social stratification*. Routledge, 2018. 217-222.
- Merton, Robert K. "Durkheim's division of labor in society." *American Journal of Sociology* 40.3 (1934): 319-328.
- Hechter, Michael. "Group formation and the cultural division of labor." *American Journal of Sociology* 84.2 (1978): 293-318.
- Gorelick, Root, and Susan M. Bertram. "Quantifying division of labor: borrowing tools from sociology, sociobiology, information theory, landscape ecology, and biogeography." *Insectes sociaux* 54 (2007): 105-112.
- Kemper, Theodore D. "The division of labor: a post-Durkheimian analytical view." *American Sociological Review* (1972): 739-753.