

Dr Thoahlane Thoahlane

Founding Editor-in-Chief

Professor Herbert Vilakazi (posthumously)

Given the three spheres that this journal seeks to accommodate in the learned contributions it publishes, as indicated in its title, it seems appropriate at this juncture to consider the historical interrelationship of at least two of them – society and development – in the editorial for this issue. Accordingly, we consider the terms “development” and “society” in an attempt to find connections, if any, between them both historically and in the present context. Our starting point must necessarily be the discipline of Sociology and its approach to social change and the division of labour in society, as seen through the not inconsiderable eyes of two of its pioneering exponents, Marx and Durkheim.

Most sociologists would not hesitate to mention the names Karl Marx (1818–1883) and David Émile Durkheim (1858–1917) as being those of two scholars who contributed to the theories of social change and the division of labour in society. It was they who, through their divergent perspectives and views, have helped us to understand the fundamental social and economic changes wrought by the transition from agrarianism to a system based on manufacture plus the consequences of that socio-economic revolution. And, in turn, to understand better the societies in which we live and the concepts “social change”, “division of labour”, “alienation” and “anomie” as they pertain to the social challenges we face in the twenty-first century.

Marx saw the division of labour as resulting in alienation in society, whereas Durkheim maintained that alienation created a condition of “anomie” (social instability resulting from a breakdown of standards and values), a condition that originates in the division of labour in society. Alienation itself implies “breakdown”, a process by which a worker is separated from the product of their labour. There is a difference between “technological alienation” and “market alienation”, but both of these concepts are derived from the division of labour and are inseparable from it (Giddens 1971, 224–225). They are also integral to the expansion of the division of labour.

The emergence of different classes derives from the specialisation of tasks and was made possible by surplus production. According to Durkheim, though, the division of labour portrays the integrating consequences of specialisation rather than the formation of social classes, and he distinguishes between two types of division: forced and “anomie”.

Change for Marx is a process that leads to a socialist society; for Durkheim, on the other hand, change brings about the destruction of traditional institutions, resulting in a state of anomie in society (Giddens 1971). For him, too, alienation is dehumanizing, and this is the anomie among workers that follows the breakdown of their morale. In other words, for Durkheim, the worker has lost that bond which binds them to the rest of the working members of society.

The argument has been put forward, therefore, that if it were not for economic surplus, society could not have been divided into unequal classes (Marx 1977, 70). During the time when primitive modes of production prevailed, all the members of a society appeared equal. With the exception of outstanding individuals, such as fighters, hunters, athletes, communal doctors and elders, everyone occupied the same economic position in society. These were individuals whom the populace understood to possess the “grace of god” and who also claimed knowledge, acquired by divine revelation or godly inspiration, about why a crisis had arisen and what people should do to resolve it.

Pre-class society formed a large and complex historical epoch of its own, with its own history and laws of development and its own varieties of socio-economic organisation – which Marx tended to call collectively “the archaic formation” or “Type” (Marx 1977, 51). When primitive modes of production prevailed, or during the early stages of underdeveloped productive forces, no one in society was excused from work unless they belonged to the group of disabled, sickly or elderly adults and underage children. Under that system productive forces were largely underdeveloped and did not enable anyone to be freed from participating in productive processes.

To understand the division of labour in history one has to study it in conjunction with the emergence of surplus, the rise of a primitive aristocracy, the division of society into unequal classes, the demarcation between towns and the countryside, and the formation of states. In order to understand fully the division of labour in society it is important to appreciate how change is brought about in society. Societal changes are the result of contradictions or conflicts in society between the new stages of development reached by the productive forces, on the one hand, and the old-established, pre-existing rules and regulations (power relations) that prevail in a society, on the other. These contradictions become translated into a conflict between different social classes. So, in effect, changes in the structure of societies are viewed as an outcome of class struggles (Marx and Lenin 1972, 629–644). But how does this phenomenon come about?

The productive forces of any society are constantly developing or changing. Why? Because the very use of a productive force – namely, natural resources, land, minerals, tools, technology, manpower and scientific knowledge used in production – means that you are depleting or exhausting it or wearing it out. The speed with which the productive forces change or develop will vary from very slow to very fast, depending upon the period of history and social factors. When the primitive mode of production prevailed, before the Industrial Revolution, for instance, the productive forces changed very slowly; in fact, they changed so slowly that to the average person they appeared hardly to change

at all. After the Industrial Revolution, with the introduction of mechanization, however, the productive forces began to change more rapidly, bringing about transformations in both the social structure and social relations. Social realignment was inevitable. The laws of change indicate that change or development occurs as a response to contradictions or conflicts between negative and positive elements. The negative elements are forces interested in maintaining things as they are; the positive forces bring about change and transformation.

As change and development take place, new jobs, new occupations and new productive activities emerge. With new jobs, new occupations and new productive activities, new occupational groups arise – in effect, new classes. In turn, these new classes, new individuals and new groups develop new forms of consciousness as a result of the new experiences they are exposed to. They also develop new wants, new needs and new aspirations compared to those of their predecessors, the products of a previous stage in the development of the productive forces.

But as the social structure changes or develops, the social and power relations in society do not necessarily change or develop hand in hand, or step by step, along with the development of the productive forces. This means that the laws, rules and regulations governing relations between different groups, individuals and classes in society, and those governing the distribution of the goods and services produced, tend to lag behind the development of the productive forces.

Why do they fail to develop hand in hand with the productive forces? Because the social class that controls the superstructure – namely, the laws, courts, police, prisons, military, statutes, kings, presidents, senates, ministries, bureaucracies, social consciousness and social institutions – fears the loss of social, political and economic status, and therefore tends to keep power relations much as they have been all along (This development brings about a crisis in society, because a conflict has arisen between the new stage of development of the productive forces, on the one hand, and the old power relations, on the other. This crisis – this contradiction – is felt by the different social classes or groups in society. First and foremost, it is felt by the new social classes or groups that emerge from the new productive forces. This crisis or contradiction is translated into action and conflict between social classes, that is, between the new and the old social classes or groups, and ultimately into a class struggle between the oppressed and the ruling classes.

The conflict taking the form of a rearrangement of society, whether peaceful or violent, affects all aspects of social life, including social institutions such as religion, family and education, sexual relations, the economy, politics, art, music, literature, language and fashion.

Examples of the primitive mode of production are to be found from North Africa to the Middle East, India and Central Asia. The Asian mode of production was founded on a social base of village communities, each community owning and tilling its land as commonage. From North Africa to Central Asia, climatic conditions forced

primitive communities to develop irrigation, which made it important to develop central government structures that would centralise power (Marx and Engels 1972, 68). The function of primitive government was to establish a primitive bureaucracy that would serve communities in their social settings.

In contrast to the development of bureaucratic machinery, which was typical of North Africa, the Middle East, India and Central Asia, the European model operated on the basis of tribal property, feudal landed property, the property of the guild and the manufacture capital that characterised the advanced stage of the division of labour: without private landed property, feudalism was out of the question. It is worth noting that the division of labour occurred not only among villagers themselves, but among different village communities. In contrast to these arrangements, the power of the state was based on disconnected systems such as village water supplies.

Although one can talk of a division of labour existing during the Asian mode of production, it is important to mention that even though there were many different occupations, each member of a community continued to operate in a traditional way. This traditional way of life would have continued undisturbed had it not been for two key developments: the rise of international trade, which fostered the spirit of competition and which, in turn, transformed the private property latent in all primitive communities into commodities in various forms.

This same Asian mode of production, which is embraced by much Oriental civilisation, is a basic concept in Marxist historical thought on the division of labour. In some respects, this mode embraces variants of the master–slave division of labour, in others the feudal variety.

Yet another mode of production – that of the ancients – not only suggests economic production but speaks of social changes and the division of labour in society. In more specific terms, it suggests the economic and social changes that occurred in ancient Rome, a civilisation based on slave labour and the slave trade that was common around the Mediterranean cities and towns. When Greece was conquered by Macedonia and Macedonia in turn by Rome, the outcomes were a further breaking down of the division of labour (Kautsky 1959, 25). After conquest, the conquered were taken as slaves, irrespective of their previous social class, but those same slave conquests brought scattered tribes together as nations in the Mediterranean world. As Marx and Engels (1972, 19) point out,

The first form of ownership is tribal (Stammeigentum) ownership. It corresponds to underdeveloped state of production, at which a people lives by hunting and fishing, by rearing of cattle or, in the higher stage, agriculture.

The more such factors operate, the more do conditions arise that allow the individual to become a private proprietor of land – of a particular plot, whose cultivation and produce belongs to them and their family. In the face of such a development and for the sake of self-preservation and continuity, the system of division of labour found itself in survival

mode: kinship institutions handing down either landed property or some form of ‘basic’ capital such as money from one generation to another.

Social historians link the destruction of the ancient mode of production to passive resistance by slaves, especially by those in city states such as in ancient Greece and Rome. There are historical records of slaves deliberately mistreating animals and breaking tools to register protest and to demand their release from slavery.

According to Marx, the separation of towns and countryside was the end result of the separation of mental from material labour Marx and Engels (1972, 20). It had its roots in the transition from barbarism to civilization, from tribe to state, from local to national and from national to international, which was closely linked to the formation of city states. The division of labour in towns led to the emergence of small-town bureaucracies in the form of administrators, police, tax collectors, and so on. Towns were identified by their concentration of capital and the fulfilment of specific needs; the countryside comprised mostly agricultural land that was isolated and separated from and largely independent of the urban centres. The two were brought together through a system of exchange.

But it was the advent of manufacturing that began to change that status quo. The first manufacturing industries developed in Italy and Flanders; in England and France manufactured goods were at first confined to the home market. One of the preconditions of manufacture was a concentration of the population, more especially in the countryside, which gave birth to towns. Weaving was the first of these; it was based mainly in villages and market centres that did not have existing guild organisations attached to them. Manufacture became the refuge of the peasants from the guilds, which either excluded them or paid them badly, and such towns also offered refuge for the peasants who served the oppressive landed nobility (Giddens 1989, 49). With the emergence of manufacture there was a simultaneous improvement in agriculture, with great strips of tillage being transformed into pasture land. It was during this period that the division of labour as a feature of modern society emerged.

The division of labour between the countryside and the towns divided society into two principal parts: on the one hand, the countryside with its own form of organic solidarity and cooperation through diversity (a “conscience collective” or collective consciousness – the set of shared beliefs, ideas and moral attitudes that operate as a unifying force within society). This was not at all mechanical in nature, but it was characteristic of homogenous archaic societies. In contrast, in the developing urban centres role differentiation became the norm, together with the phenomenon of particularism (as opposed to mere mechanical solidarity). In this light, sanctions that were repressive were the most preferred criterion of mechanical solidarity: they were applied to bring into line those who violated the social norms.

Organic solidarity, in contrast, was known more for resorting to restitutive sanctions, for reinstating the status quo through the payment of damages. Collective

consciousness, as a corrective and rehabilitative institution for dealing with instances of anomie, tended to be too restrictive and did not make room for individualism outside the conscience collective.

This universalistic collective consciousness in the modern world forms the basis of humanism. The conscience collective means two different things in modern and archaic societies. For instance, in the archaic world humanism as conscience collective applied to the immediate community in which one worked and lived. In contrast, in the modern world humanism as a philosophy applied to a universalistic conscience collective which characterizes the era that witnessed the birth of nations and of international trade and commerce. This universalistic humanism was both opposed by militant nationalists and supported by liberal patriots. Of this dualistic approach Durkheim (1964, 71-72) wrote:

... but, for solidarity to predominate over particularism, related groups would have to share a conscience collective containing norms which defined the justified modes of interaction, mutual expectation, and exchange with one another. This requirement placed a dimension of organic solidarity within the province of conscience collective. In fact, we find an awareness of this requirement in the discussion of contract law and its social environment in *The Division of Labor* itself.

In *The Division of Labor*, Durkheim retains and develops the general notion of crime and punishment. On the one hand, a certain level of crime was considered an important and unavoidable measure of a healthy and normal society. In functional terms, crime was said to be a more dramatic display of social solidarity in punishment. On the other hand, it was a test for existing institutions to measure their flexibility in the existing social structure. From this perspective, there was indeed a hidden relationship between the criminal and the idealist:

For society to evolve, individual originality must break through; for that of the idealist, who dreams of going beyond his century, to manifest itself, that of the criminal, who is below the level of his time, must be possible. One does not go without the other (Durkheim 1964).

The debate proceeds to point out that this structure of reciprocity bound crime and conformity together. This was indeed more so during the period of social transition where no distinction could be drawn between the idealist and the criminal, because both were equally involved in destructive actions and the creative potential of anomie.

It would be incorrect to think that Durkheim's interpretation which brings together assimilated ordinary crime and ideological crime was evidence of his conservative approach to the study of anomie. As Merton (1968, 189) indicates:

It should be pointed out that [Durkheim's definition of crime] eventuates in anomie that can easily glimpse in a series of familiar and instructive, though perhaps trivial episodes.

During periods of rapid transition, members of society would themselves go through the experience of ambivalence in judging certain things in society.

Returning to Marx and Durkheim, they agree that to understand the whole concept of the division of labour fully one has to look into its historical origins. As stated at the outset, Marx considers the development of a sense of alienation to be a result of the capitalist mode of production, whereas Durkheim views alienation as the creation of anomie in society. For him, anomie originates in the division of labour in society. To Marx, an anomic situation arises from the ashes of social collapse caused by the formation of class differentiation, and alienation is a concept that refers to a worker being “ruthlessly” separated from the means of their livelihood – their labour being the only instrument ensuring their daily survival. There is a distinction between “technological alienation” and “market alienation”, but they are bound together by both being derived from the division of labour, from which they are inseparable.

According to Durkheim, the division of labour is the outcome of the integrating consequences of specialisation rather than the formation of social class. The only problem with this portrayal is that Durkheim fails to realise that the integrating consequences of specialisation to which he alludes are actually founded in class formation. He further argues that class conflict is not based on the revolutionary restructuring of society but on a defiant pattern in social norms. He separates the forced from the “anomic” division of labour. Economic development and the development of productive forces are responsible for the destruction of traditional institutions.

For Marx the division of labour means radical change in political and social life. The dehumanization brought about by alienation is seen by Durkheim as a breakdown of anomie in the morale of the workers, and this can be restored only if the workers are made aware of the importance of the role of morale in the workplace. (Marx did not anticipate the formation of strong trade unions that would ultimately intervene on behalf of exploited workers.) For Durkheim, the extent to which abandoned norms could be integrated would depend on the individual’s sense of obligation to restore and take on board disintegrated morale.

Much of Marx’s and Durkheim’s thinking has a direct bearing on the social, economic and legal issues with which the world – and the contributors to this journal in particular – is currently grappling. To make a meaningful contribution to an ongoing global epistemological debate, the contributors of the collection of articles in this volume grapple with a wide range of contemporary multi-, inter- and transdisciplinary issues such as “The Customary Law and Adoption: The ‘O e gapa le namane’ Custom”, “Resource Misery’ and the Politics of Resource Governance in the Petro-states of Africa”, “The Never-ending Story of Law and Electoral System in Lesotho”, “The Crime of Attempted Suicide in Uganda: The Need for Reforms to the Law”, “Creating the Deserved Protection: Reflections on Civilian Joint Task Force Counter-Insurgency Operations in the North-Eastern Region of Nigeria” and “Unrest and Violence.”

I trust that this collection of articles, wide-ranging as their topics are, provides something of relevance and interest for every one of our readers.

REFERENCES

- Coser, L.A. (ed). 1977. *Master of Sociological Thought*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Durkheim, E. 1964. *Division of Labour in Society*. New York: The Free Press.
- Feuer, LS (ed). 1959. *Marx & Engels. Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy*. New York: Doubleday.
- Giddens, A. 1989. *Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jordan, ZA (ed). 1971. *Karl Marx*. United Kingdom: Michael Joseph.
- Kautsky, K. 1959. *Thomas More and his Utopia*. New York: Russell & Russell.
- Marx, K., Engels, F. 1972. *On Historical Materialism*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Marx, K. 1977. *Capital Volume 1. A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production*. New York: International Publishers.
- Merton, R.K. 1968. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press.
- Skocpol, T. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions*. London: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815805>.
- Schapiro, L. and Reddaway, P. 1967. *Lenin: The Man, the Theorist, the Leader: A Reappraisal*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger.
- Tucker, R.C. (ed). 1978. *Marx–Engels Reader*. New York: WW Norton.