

The Division of Labour after Durkheim

Sondra L. Hausner

Introduction

Overviews, commentaries, responses, and critical editions

General Texts

Social Solidarity, Morality, and Social Theory

Law

Exchange

Gender, Family, and the Sexual Division of Labour

Caste, Class, Power, and Occupational Groups

Nation, Nationalism, and Transnationalism

Introduction

The division of labour is a concept referring to the way a society or social group organizes itself internally, but is also used in contemporary terms to refer to Emile Durkheim's seminal text on the subject, *The Division of Labour in Society*, originally published in 1893. In Durkheim's analysis, the division of labour manifests in advanced societies such that professional groups do the work of separate sectors, and the group itself functions, it was assumed, more efficiently than if every individual had to perform every act on his or her own. The division of labour is not only the mark of an advanced society for Durkheim; he argues rather that it is the very nature of social interaction, inherent in the workings of every social group and even in animal species. He suggests rather that the division of labour, or the separation of an organic whole into organized parts, is close to a biological imperative that enables the coherence and cohesion of a social order. Writing in the late nineteenth century, Durkheim does not dispute the evolutionary character of social groups, however: what differentiates different kinds of societies is the kind of division of labour they present. A primitive, or less differentiated, society, relies on its relative internal sameness to produce what he calls mechanical solidarity; an advanced, or more individuated, society, creates (through the difference between not only individuals but also between different sub-groups, or occupational groups, within the larger social order) what he calls organic solidarity, in the sense that it may more naturally form an organic whole. The ways in which human societies come together form the mainstay of Durkheimian thought, and the discipline of sociology more generally; Durkheim's concern with the relative strength or weakness of that social bond – always based upon the division between individuals, linked mechanically or organically – would never leave him as the primary focus for his study of society, beginning with an analysis of difference and fragmentation in *The Division of Labour in Society* and moving, over the course of his intellectual development for the next two decades, to an analysis of the transcendence of those divisions. Society as a whole was understood as incorporating both individuals in their differences and social groups in their wholes: this project still grounds contemporary sociology, which attempts to understand the nature of collective formation at different levels and scales, through its analyses of solidarity and morality; law; economics and exchange; gender and the family; class and

caste; and the nation, the state, and transnational forces as they respond to and produce the now global division of labour.

Overviews, Commentaries, Responses, and Critical Editions

The Division of Labour in Society was the first published book by the sociologist Emile Durkheim, based on his doctoral dissertation, revised and released in 1893. Durkheim's ideas would develop further in his analyses of religion, but they are laid out in this early text in nascent form. He argues (1902 [1893]) that the social order – and particularly, here, the way individuals within a society relate to each other, or divide themselves up – sustains itself by separating the roles those individuals play. Separation, thus, is then transcended, such that human (and even animal) societies find the solidarity that establishes them as advanced social orders. The text has become a sociological classic, and many responses – critical and praising – have been published in the century since it was released. Merton 1934 challenges the relation between primitive and modern law, and Rueschemeyer 1982 disagrees with Durkheim's logic for the division of labour, but Tiryakian 1984 considers it one of the great, timeless contributions to the sociological canon. Lukes 2013 [1984] offers a thorough introduction to the text in his critical edition.

Durkheim, Emile. 1902 [1893]. *De la division du travail social*. 2nd ed. Paris: F. Alcan.

For Durkheim, the divisions that one sees in all societies are core to the configuration of the social order itself. Primitive societies come together in a form he calls 'mechanical solidarity,' because people are less differentiated to begin with, automatically linked because they are similar. Advanced societies, by contrast, come together in a more sophisticated rendering, or 'organic solidarity': more differentiated individuals organically work together to form a cohesive whole.

Lukes, Steven, ed. 2013 [1984]. *Emile Durkheim: The Division of Labour in Society*. W.D. Halls, trans. 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lukes notes criticisms but focuses on the sociological achievements of the text, including a consideration of the individual in relation to the social whole, and the ways in which collective consciousness is produced. The role of citizens in a nation-state (and the envisioning of a European union), and the capacity of law to help instil order are important concepts contained in Durkheim's work taken as an oeuvre, despite the absence of the notion of power.

Merton, 1934. Durkheim's Division of Labor. *American Journal of Sociology* 40.3:319-328.

In this early assessment of the classic work, Merton questions the correlation between penal law and mechanical solidarity in primitive society, and restitutive law and organic solidarity in advanced society. Merton worries that Durkheim conflates the 'abstract' with the 'concrete,' and he wonders whether organic solidarity may be governed as powerfully with unarticulated social customs as it is by a changed legal system.

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. 1982. On Durkheim's Explanation of Division of Labor. *American Journal of Sociology*. 88.3: 579-589.

Rueschemeyer disagrees with Durkheim's thesis, critiquing its reasons for the emergence of the division of labour. The work is faulted for a 'global' or theoretical approach (as compared to an empirical or local study), and also the causal relation posited in the text: Rueschemeyer challenges the Darwinian suggestion that a greater population density should increase competition in the arena of 'production' (rather than that of 'consumption'), and thus facilitate the division of labour.

Tiryakian, Edward A. 1994. Revisiting Sociology's First Classic: The Division of Labor in its Society and Its Actuality. *Sociological Forum*. 9:3-16.

Tiryakian reminds us how innovative Durkheim was in suggesting the 'corporation' – or the professional group – as the antidote to anomie (the individual disconnectedness that undermines both the subject and the larger social order). The corporation Durkheim advocates is not that of corporate capitalism, but rather the locus of collective responsibility that Tiryakian sees as still relevant. Although dated in parts, the fundamental tenets of the classic work can thus be upheld.

General Texts

Durkheim thought that even where divisions were deep, as was seemingly the case in advanced societies, new ways to govern the social order could and would take hold: the division of labour might beckon a modern or industrialized society well on its way to capital relations as an operative mode of functioning, but it would not necessarily signal atomization as had been assumed. *The Division of Labour in Society* is also a work that considers the role of the individual in modern society, in an early analysis of whether the agent really can pull apart or away from his or her social structure in the face of modernity. Durkheim argues that the individual does not: while an advanced social form may be increasingly organized around individual or group specializations in labour and in other realms of society, it will still collectively adhere to – and is indeed supported by – the shared moral principles that guide it. The collective consciousness (*conscience collective*) is that which the division of labour is able to sustain and uphold. These fundamental ideas of the Durkheimian canon – the relation of the individual to society (Adorno 2000 [1993]); the generation and sustenance of moral consciousness (Bellah 1973 and Alexander 1982); the seeming difference (at superficial levels, if not at fundamental levels) between primitive societies and advanced or modern ones – all appear in seedling form in his earliest text, and are developed throughout his later work. Giddens 1971 assesses Durkheimian theory in relation to different social systems – and as emerging from specific intellectual lineages; LaCapra 1972 places Durkheim's work into the historical and political context of his own lifetime.

Adorno, Theodor W. 2000 [1993]. *Introduction to Sociology*. Christoph Gödde, ed.; Edmund Jephcott, trans. London: Polity Press.

In this transcription of lectures given in 1968, Adorno both critiques and praises Durkheim on the tangibility of social facts. Adorno argues that Durkheim cannot make concrete a society that is greater than the individuals who constitute it, and that he failed to realize that the division of labour would eventually become the sameness of labour. But he , acknowledges that Durkheim was more aware than even Weber of the relative nature of truth.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. 1982. *The Antinomies of Classical Thought: Marx and Durkheim. Theoretical Logic in Sociology, Volume Two*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

In his contribution on Durkheim in his exhaustive four-volume discussion of the masters of sociological theory, Alexander takes up the question of evolutionism, but more significantly he traces the source of Durkheim's insistence on collective morality. Alexander charts the transition from Durkheim's 'unsuccessful' attempt to find an agent-based or voluntary moral imperative to a collective or social one, and then explains how such a structure can be reconciled with individual autonomy.

Bellah, Robert, ed. 1973. *Emile Durkheim on Morality and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Bellah reminds us how committed Durkheim was to understanding not only the mechanism but also the very essence of society, the source of human life, and ethical being. With a brief biography and an intellectual history accounting for Durkheim's influences, Bellah explores how Durkheim presented himself in his own lifetime, and offers a nuanced analytic of the core elements of his work, particularly *The Division of Labour in Society*.

Giddens, Anthony. 1971. *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory: An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

With a detailed account of the thinking that influenced Durkheim at the time of his writing, including Darwinian thought as well as the French and German organic theories of the time, Giddens explains how Durkheim's work emerges from an intellectual milieu that was expressly interested in understanding how the various elements of society could be scientifically understood to constitute a moral whole that was greater than the sum of its parts.

LaCapra, Dominick. 1972. *Emile Durkheim: Sociologist and Philosopher*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. LaCapra places Durkheim's writings into his own historical context, raising the questions of the Dreyfus Affair and mobilizations around the Third Republic. He offers an overview of Durkheim's works, attempting to set them in their context, and points out that history in the sense of real social change is conceptually replaced in Durkheim's writings with an abstract form of social evolution. He also gives some attention to the reception of the main texts in Durkheim's own lifetime.

Social Solidarity, Morality, and Social Theory

Durkheim uses the division of labour as a way in to the problem of how societies cohere, or establish their solidarity. By definition, the ways a society defines itself and finds the terms of its internal cohesion also speaks to the ways individuals participate in the whole that is the social order – as well as the ways in which they do not. Thus, the division of labour is one way that Durkheim (and sociologists after him) understood the mechanisms of social cohesion, social structure, and social exchange. It is also the starting point for analyses of alienation, conflict, and rupture, since these are cases where, conversely, the divisions of society start to pull at the seams. Ultimately, *The Division of Labour in Society* is a text that attempts to understand the emergence and construction of morality in its multiple cultural forms (Alexander 2003; Watts Miller 1996). Durkheim's concern with the nature of the social bond would form the basis for his later work on religion (1995 [1912], which draws on the idea that collective morality depends upon the nature of representation (Bloor 2000). Many commentators have developed theoretical work on how social groups sustain their links, through establishing boundaries (Douglas 1966), or cultivating networks (Granovetter 1983), for example. How the individual fits into – emerging from but also contributing to – the social order is also a perennial theoretical concern, and is the subject of such classic texts by Parsons 1949 [1937], Goffman 1959 [1956], and Etzioni 1994 [1993], all of whom focus on the way the individual conceives of and presents him or herself in light of his or her consciousness of the collective.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. 2003. *The Meanings of Social Life: A Cultural Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alexander derives from Durkheim's uses of penal law as that which confirms a moral order through the articulation of a collective consciousness how the distinction of good and evil come to be the operative terms of a society. He thus promotes the kind of analysis that he calls 'cultural sociology' or an unpacking of the structures and meaning that underscore social life: following Durkheim, he reminds us that morality is not natural, but socially constructed.

Bloor, David. 2000. Collective Representations as Social Institutions. In *Durkheim and Representations*, W.S.F. Pickering, ed., pp. 157-166. London: Routledge.

Bloor traces the relation between collective ideology and individual thought in Durkheimian thinking to *The Division of Labour in Society*, but he asks where, exactly, collective thought resides. He suggests that institutions – 'self-referential' networks – serve this purpose, or locus. The thought of the thing and the thing – the symbol or the representation, on one hand, and the referent, on the other – cohabit in the institution.

Douglas, Mary. 1966. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge.

Pursuing a Durkheimian analysis of social solidarity as based upon shared moralities, Douglas shows how groups use collective representations to define themselves. In her classic study, she demonstrates how collective prohibitions (in this case the rules of Leviticus) emerge

through a larger set of classifications from which certain elements are symbolically excluded, thus determining the shared or collective moral action for that society.

Durkheim, Emile. 1995 [1912]. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Karen E. Fields, trans. New York: The Free Press.

Durkheim's last major work takes up his earlier theme on the nature of moral collectivity, fine-tuning his understanding of the mechanisms of human thought. Binary classifications, he argues, create the shared conceptual categories that constitute sociality, or religion, and from which, in turn, social solidarity emerges.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1994 [1993]. *The Spirit of Community: The Reinvention of America*. New York: Touchstone.

Etzioni considers the balances between individual responsibility and state action that are required in communal life, and points to a number of locations – schools; families; associations – where community may productively be found. In advocating communitarianism, he reminds us of the uses of the division of labour; in the Durkheimian spirit, he suggests that individuals need to be mindful of the whole.

Goffman, Erving. 1959 [1956]. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

In this classic study inspired by Durkheim, Goffman shows how individuals perform to others, or in public, in such a way as to confirm their role as members of a given society or civil sphere. These performative actions in turn act to reassert the moral values of that public; Goffman's account explains how it is that, by acting as individuals in society, those individuals come to create society itself.

Granovetter, Mark. 1983. The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited. *Sociological Theory* 1.1: 201-233.

Granovetter returns to his classic theory on how looser ties allow individualization through larger, more dynamic, and more complex social networks, compared to a tight network with strong ties – that leads more readily to diffusion or breakdown. He clarifies that those weak ties that are strongest are those that serve to link micro-networks to each other, thus enabling larger, looser circles of contact and circuits of information.

Parsons, Talcott. 1949 [1937]. *The Structure of Social Action*. 2nd ed. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Inspired by the great works of Durkheim, Weber, and others, Parsons sets forward his own theory of action. He reminds us that the seeds of Durkheim's thought are all found in *The Division of Labour in Society*, and in particular the way morality (or the 'conscience collective') is constructed by human groups. Parsons' action thus focuses on the conscious agent who is psychologically embedded in a social system.

Watts Miller, William. 1996. *Durkheim, Morals and Modernity*. London: Routledge.

Watts Miller applies the questions of morality in the division of labour to the modernist present. Durkheim wished to investigate divisions as a social scientist not as a prescriptive ethicist, but Watts Miller reminds us that a study of morality was never far from being an ethical treatise for Durkheim. Durkheim wanted not to judge morality but to explain it, and understood the source of human ethics as solidarity – and vice versa

Law

To compare the different kinds of social solidarities that emerge in variable sorts of societies, the social scientist needs a measuring tool (Vogt 1993), or an 'external index', which in this case can be found in the law, and the different kind of social sanctions societies produce. In general, primitive societies, which are characterized by sameness among members, focus on penal law, or punishment, when someone runs foul of the social order, and which, Durkheim argues, serve a 'repressive' function. Industrial societies, on the other hand, which are more organically characterized by diversity among their member, focus on civil law, and serve a 'restitutive' function, or an attempt to put the moral order as a whole back together again. In the former case, the emotional bonds between members of a society (in a well-developed and sustained *conscience collective*, or conscience, or consciousness) are such that repressive punishment is an act of reasserting the collective commitment to the social order. In the latter case, where individualization necessarily brings about a more dispersed conscience, the larger social order is still able to cohere because groups are linked through the interdependence of the division of labour: occupational groups, or specialized sectors, serve as a middle-ground, whereby an individual remains in social contact while free to pursue his or her own agenda. Cotterrell 1999 places the social thought of the Durkheimian school back at the heart of a legal analysis that prioritises the adjudication of morality; Engel 1998 offers an intellectual history of the notion of legal consciousness. Hart 1957 and Foucault 1995 [1975] both challenge the Durkheimian premise, however: Hart disputes that a legal code is indicative of the complex morality of any society; Foucault suggests that penal institutions shape consciousness in a disciplinary, not a productive, fashion. Lukes and Scull 1983 consider whether Durkheim's theoretical work imposes a uniformity on the multiple legal and moral systems that he wishes to explore.

Cotterrell, Roger. 1999. *Émile Durkheim: Law in a Moral Domain*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Law, in Durkheim's work, Cotterrell reminds us, is the social expression of a moral order, and the codification of a set of ideals that both unites a group and makes it operable in the everyday sense. Durkheim's legal theory supports his aspirations for sociology, with implications for the state, political action, moral reckoning, and family law; Cotterrell shows how he uses law as both a measurement of and a frame for social solidarity.

Engel, David M. 1998. How does Law Matter in the Constitution of Legal Consciousness? In *How Does Law Matter*, Bryant G. Garth and Austin Sarat, eds. pp. 109-144. Evanston, IL: Northeastern University Press.

Analysing the question of 'consciousness' (or 'ideology' in some renderings), the question of power, and the very question of culture, Engel demonstrates how the collective construction of meaning is tied into the law in the multiple cases. Institutions, officials, and legal literacy all play a role in the cultural competence necessarily to take up the law, and to sustain (or critique) its cultural authority and power.

Foucault, Michel. 1995 [1975]. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Alan Sheridan, trans. 2nd ed. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault takes up Durkheim's central theme of punishment and interrogates the cultural logics of the production of crime, especially the legal, spatial, and conceptual processes of incarceration. On one hand, he takes up the Durkheimian notion of the variable construction of morality (and in particular the effects of penal law); on the other, he is deeply suspicious of the role of the state and the ways legal formations shape collective consciousness.

Hart, H.L.A. 1967. Social Solidarity and the Enforcement of Morality. *University of Chicago Law Review*. 35.1:1-13.

Legal theorist Hart analyses and critiques as too singular the 'disintegration thesis', or the idea that a social order must adhere to and abide by a shared set of morals in order to sustain itself and prevent its collapse. Durkheim's work, Hart argues, promotes such a thesis by suggesting that a society uses its law as a mechanism for upholding the moral consensus upon which it rests, thus sustaining society itself.

Lukes, Steven and Andrew Scull, eds. 1983. *Durkheim and the Law*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.

Lukes and Scull draw attention to the twin theoretical focuses on social cohesion and collective consciousness. The law is where these two spheres come together, as the expression of shared social ideologies and also the way of putting them into place: it is the concrete and systematic representation of those values held dear by a society, articulated in terms that are more specific than the 'diffuse' moral order it sustains.

Vogt, W. Paul. 1993. Durkheim's Sociology of Law: Morality and the Cult of the Individual. *Emile Durkheim: Sociologist and Moralist*. Stephen P. Turner, ed., pp. 69-91. New York: Routledge.

Vogt reminds us the Durkheim uses law as both the measuring tool (or index) and the building block of morality and a social moral order. It is the most organized form visible in societies, and can be understood as a modern society's equivalent to the religion that would characterize social solidarity in a simpler (or more elementary) society. Vogt reviews Durkheim's consideration of crime, and the implications for his sociology of law more broadly.

Exchange

The units of a social order sustain relations through a shared morality, but the division of labour also implies actions between the constituent parts of a group that together create enduring links, most

notably through exchange. Classic exchange theory in the Durkheimian school begins with Mauss 1990 [1950], Durkheim's nephew and student demonstrates how giving and receiving between individuals produces social bonds and obligations. Sahlins 1972 pushes further, exploring different modalities of exchange as core to social relations; Graeber 2011 explores social debt in particular. Economic relationships between sub-groups in a social order are also core to the premise of the division of labour; Steiner 2011 [2005] traces the use of economic theory in Durkheim's work; Barber 1983 and Turner 2000 look at how social units create systems of trust. Strathern 1988 and Weiner 1992 assess economic systems with the question of gender in mind, particularly the way women participate in exchange relations.

Barber, Bernard. 1983. *The Logic and Limits of Trust*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

If actors and institutions are understood in relation to each other, where does social coherence arise? Individuals' expectations of each other, and the ways they act in order to fulfil those collectivized ideals, are the core of both organizational sustenance and, at a broader scale, social sustenance. Barber takes up professional specialization as one kind of trust, and fiduciary obligation as a second, implicated in (and expressive of) the moral values of a social order.

Graeber, David. 2011. *Debt: The First 5,000 Years*. Brooklyn: Melville House.

Taking economic anthropology to its logical extreme, Graeber traces a cultural history of that which has come to seem natural, but is at its very essence cultural: the notion of obligation. Socially or economically, debt is a way that human societies create – and define – their ties. Graeber reviews the ways money and morality have been constructed as interconnected, and the different kinds of economies that can emerge to sustain (or undermine) social solidarity.

Mauss, Marcel. 1990 [1950]. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. W.D. Halls, trans. London: Routledge.

In this classic study of the nature of economic exchange, Mauss shows how social solidarity can be maintained through the transfer of material objects: gift-giving and receiving constitute the complex mechanisms through which individual interests are upheld in the context of larger 'social phenomena'. Economies, like social orders, are culturally variable and shifting, not timeless and natural; they serve rather to establish the modes of collective obligation, morality, and connectedness in every case.

Sahlins, Marshall. 1972. *Stone Age Economics*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.

In this foundational text in economic anthropology, Sahlins demonstrates again (after Mauss's essay on *The Gift*) how the relations embedded in material exchange – in all societies, universally – are indicative of (and indeed create) the larger social and moral order. Reviewing modes of production, reciprocity, kinship alliances, and trade – human economic modes –

Sahlins considers how the ways human beings exchange goods and money establishes who they are in social terms.

Steiner, Philippe. 2011 [2005]. *Durkheim and the Birth of Economic Sociology*. Keith Tribe, trans. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Steiner investigates how Durkheim's work was received by the economists of his time, and explores how the development of sociology is implicated in the development of economics, through the work of Halbwachs, Mauss, and Simiand. Steiner points out that Durkheim was reading the work of economists – who were integral to the early *L'Année Sociologique* – as he developed the ideas in *The Division of Labour*, and reminds us that notions of the market are fundamental to the way Durkheim constructs morality through occupational groups.

Strathern, Marilyn. 1988. *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Strathern explores the idea that alienation in labour is local to Western societies, and suggests that the Melanesian case offers evidence for a sexual division of labour as core to the internal workings of a domestic relationship. Labour, in these cases, is productive and does not eclipse the agent but may enable her (even if it also defines her identity, for better or worse), in multiple spheres; thus must the nature of kin-based exchange in the South Pacific be contextually understood.

Turner, Jonathan H. 2000. *The Formation of Social Capital: A Multifaceted Perspective*, Partha Dasgupta and Ismail Serageldin, eds., pp. 94-146. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Turner offers the sociological contribution in a volume assessing the then-new concept of social capital, or the idea that people may make economic strides through their networks and institutions of affiliation. He draws upon the idea of the division of labour to show how 'corporate units' can establish the trust and authority to facilitate social capital across multiple spheres of society (law, religion, etc).

Weiner, Annette B. 1992. *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping-While-Giving*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weiner wishes to challenge classic exchange theory by inserting the question of gender back into the analysis. Claiming that women's acts of exchange and possession have been inadequately considered by social theorists, Weiner critiques the unilateral value of reciprocity, and suggests, by contrast, that members of social orders can also retain power when objects are not meant to be circulated, or are meant to be returned to their givers.

Gender, Family, and the Sexual Division of Labour

Durkheim's characterisation of the gendered division of labour is uncharacteristically regressive, suggesting that more advanced societies ensure greater differentiation between men and women

(such that marriage evolves and women stay home), and even relies on ostensible biological evidence to suggest women's brains are smaller in some societies. But his theoretical notion that society – or a sub-part, such as a family – sticks together through a parsing of tasks undergirds much work across the world analysing culturally and regionally variable models of family, households, and domestic work. Rather than list case studies – part of the Durkheimian point is that variable arrangements will sustain different groups in different places and times – the texts that follow take up the theoretical premise that social groups are ordered and defined in part through questions of gender, which is one of the few universals that will always have to be negotiated in social life. Radcliffe-Brown 1965 [1952] is a classic Durkheim-inspired work on the way social orders are sustained and articulated through marriage systems. Lévi-Strauss 1969 [1949] suggests that the heart of kinship relations depends on the transfer of women from one group to another; Rubin 1975 critiques the model – conceptually and on the ground – as a result of patriarchal thinking, and hierarchical acting, both of which subordinate women. Ortner 1974 wonders how it is that a seemingly universal differentiation between men and women correlates to the consistent ranking of men as dominant. Becker 1991 takes up the sexual division of labour on the domestic front from an economic perspective; Rubery 1993 argues that institutional presumptions about women's domestic work lead to the undervaluing of women's labour in the workplace. Both Lehmann 1994 and Pederson 2005 critique the absence of women in Durkheim's work, but wish to reclaim his analyses with gender in mind.

Becker, Gary S. 1991 [1981]. *A Treatise on the Family*. Enl. ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Economics Nobel Laureate Becker analyses the division of labour within the family as primarily about time allocation (a model begun in his 1976 *The Economic Approach to Human Behavior*). The biological difference between men and women, Becker argues, means that less conscious specialization is needed. In these works, Becker uses the sexual division of labour to develop the notion of human capital, and shows how the choices to invest time in particular activities (and thus specialize) can be usefully economically modelled.

Lehmann, Jennifer M. 1994. *Durkheim and Women*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

While acknowledging Durkheim's lack of attention to feminist issues of his day, Lehmann wishes to reclaim Durkheimian thinking for the contemporary theoretical agenda of feminism, and argues that it is possible to do so. Although Durkheim was writing in patriarchal context – and views women as outside the (mainstream) social order in no uncertain terms – his body of social thought may still be able to help us critique the sexist and gendered structural implications of capitalism.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1969 [1949]. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. James Harle Bell, Richard Von Sturmer, and Rodney Needham, trans. Rev. ed. Boston: Beacon Press.

Drawing on Durkheim's exploration of the social group and Mauss's exploration of social solidarity as elicited through the exchange of gifts, Lévi-Strauss suggests that families – and whole cultures around them – are constructed through the exchange of women. Marriage is

thus both the solid foundation of a given society and based on a fundamental social act of exchange. Dependent on the sexual division of labour, exogamy (marrying out) becomes the way that all societies ensure social differentiation.

Ortner, Sherry B. 1974. Is Female to Male as Nature is to Culture? In *Woman, Culture, and Society*, Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere, eds., pp. 68-87. Stanford: Stanford University Press. In this classic study of sexual differentiation, Ortner asks whether a universal categorisation of gender is the correlation of women to nature and men to culture – or that which can transcend nature. Such a division of identity affirms the difference between genders and thus appears to justify male domination pan-culturally and pan-historically, although it is precisely a symbolic representation.

Pederson, Jean Elisabeth. 2005. Confronting the Canon in the Classroom: Approaches to Teaching the Significance of Women, Sex and Gender in the Work of Emile Durkheim. In *Teaching Durkheim*, Terry F. Godlove, Jr., ed., pp. 187-212. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pederson admires Durkheim's insistence that the sexual division of labour is a social construction but worries that it is also the mark of an advanced society. She suggests that the role of women in Durkheim's work merits more attention– consider how conjugal solidarity serves as an exemplary case of the natural quality of the division of labour. Thus might Durkheimian sociology be productively recuperated from the stark exclusion of women.

Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. 1965 [1952]. *The Structure and Function of Primitive Society: Essays and Addresses*. New York: The Free Press.

Inspired by Durkheim's discussion of law as a way to understand the social structures of primitive and modern societies, Radcliffe-Brown turns his analysis to the rules that govern marriage and morality. Using Durkheim's ideas of society as an organism, whereby the structure of a social order will reveal its internal workings, this anthropological classic links the form of a society to the customs it upholds as a mutually constitutive dialectic.

Rubery, Jill. 1993. The Economics of Equal Value. *Labour: Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations*. 7(3) Autumn:117-131.

Why has women's work been underpaid? If women's work and men's work is valued differently, it will remunerated at different levels. If women generally occupy lower-ranking positions, there may be a 'bias' towards paying women less. Thus the assigning of less value to women's work is cyclical: women occupy lower-ranking jobs that pay less, and jobs that pay less may be considered more suitable for women. Such systems are thus self-replicating, and institutionally entrenched.

Rubin, Gayle. 1975. The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy" of Sex. In *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, Rayna R. Reiter, ed., pp. 157-210. New York: Monthly Review Press.

In her radical critique of Lévi-Strauss's theory of exchange, Rubin challenges a construction that suggests that the exchange of women must be the heart of culture. The division of labour between men and women may ensure hierarchical social differentiation through gender (and thus sustain marriage, families, and culture) in some contexts, but Rubin both argues with this unilateral interpretation, and asks how we can achieve a culture without strictly differentiated sexual roles.

Caste, Class, Power, and Occupational Groups

If the division of labour naturally arises in a larger and denser population – any society may be seen as a moral collective by nature, whether mechanical or organic. It is almost as if the division of labour that comes about as a society grows in size and density makes up for the loss of intimacy (and the moral codes that must accompany so as to sustain it) that is naturally within a smaller collective. The division of labour is that which allows for a smaller-scale group to emerge once again within the larger confines of a growing society. And these sub-groups do not replicate each other, but naturally find their own place so as to organically support the whole from which they came. How these occupational groups are defined, how they come into relation with each other, and the ways they form the social whole of which they are a part will vary across history and culture, but the principle of subdivision on the basis of labour is the core of Durkheim's theoretical work. Durkheim himself does not explicitly take up the study of power, but the intellectual fulcrum of *The Division of Labour in Society* paves the way for later theorists to consider who might be in the position to assert power and who to assert change from within – or without – a given social structure. Rueschemeyer 1986 explicitly brings up the power question. Wolf 1970 and Hawkins 1994 analyse the occupational group as a critical division of a social order; Dumont 1980 [1966] assesses caste in India not as a backwards or primitive institution but in some sense as an ideal case study in which to see the dynamics of occupational interdependence. Grusky and Galescu 2005 suggest that a class analysis is present in Durkheim's work all along, if unacknowledged. Braverman 1998 [1974] shows how the alienation of the working class from the labour process is the result of 20th century capital relations, while Smith 1987 incorporates the voices of workers themselves. Lucassen 2006 collects a series of labour histories from across the globe.

Braverman, Harry. 1998 [1974]. *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

In laying out his own classic theory of the labour process, Braverman furthers the Marxist analysis of how capitalism produces a working class whereby the labour power of one group is purchased by another, managerial class. He thus distinguishes between the social division of

labour, where occupations are kept whole, and the division of labour 'in detail', which dangerously breaks up the work of a single occupation for the sake of capital.

Dumont, Louis. 1980 [1966]. *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and its Implications*. Mark Sainsbury, Louis Dumont, and Basia Gulati, trans. Revised Eng. ed. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Dumont offers a complete assessment of caste in India as an ideal representation of a living system characterized by occupational groups. He suggests that individual consciousness is subsumed by the particular group to which one belongs; the system of castes upholds Indian social life as a whole. Dumont shows how, in exemplifying the division of labour, the Indian caste system (hierarchical though it may be) is perfectly indicative of the organic solidarity propounded by Durkheim.

Grusky, David and Gabriela Galescu. 2005. Foundations of a Neo-Durkheimian Class Analysis. In *Approaches to Class Analysis*, Erik Olin Wright, ed., pp. 51-81. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grusky and Galescu suggest that Durkheim's analysis of a division in labour precisely contains the underpinnings of class analysis, although both Durkheim and the concept of the division of labour have been ignored by Marxist theorists and class analysts. In particular, the authors focus on the "small classes" that correlate to Durkheim's occupational groups, which, they suggest, become both the base for particular cultural lives and the source of authority, thus constituting class at the "local level".

Hawkins, M.J. 1994. Durkheim on Occupational Corporations: An Exegesis and Interpretation. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. 55:461-481.

Hawkins reviews the history of Durkheim's thought on occupational corporations. If the social division of labour was, for Durkheim, indicative of the evolution of human groups such that a new form of collectivity was required to counter the expanding role for the individual in modern societies, Hawkins pinpoints the role of the organization, or corporation, ('occupational group') as a middleman: the individual may act within a less regulatory body, but is still contained in the moral universe of a smaller-scale collective.

Lucassen, Jan, ed. 2006. *Global Labour History: A State of the Art*. 2nd ed. Bern: Peter Lang.

This edited volume traces labour histories from all regions of the world, across the last three centuries, thus affording detailed cases and productive comparisons. It also is able to contextualize labour at local or national levels, and transnationally, considering regional and global dynamics of labour markets, migrations, and changing policies, across caste, class, and period. Multiple industries are considered across space and time, making for a comprehensive view of labour across the ages that is also detailed in locality and case history.

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. 1986. *Power and the Division of Labour*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Rueschemeyer explicitly introduces the idea of power into the study of the division of labour, which he argues articulates the form of a particular society. Structural shifts need to be understood as a product of the efforts of the most powerful – those who have special interests in a particular outcome – to effect those changes. Emphasizing political, state, and economic power, Rueschemeyer reminds us that market relations, domestic worlds, and organizational structures all emerge from specific power relationships.

Smith, Chris. 1987. *Technical Workers: Class, Labour, and Trade Unionism*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Education.

In an ethnographic-style study of technical workers, Smith includes the voices of British computer technicians as a way of understanding their own view of class, especially their variable relationship with manual workers. Using 'mental' work, they are positioned slightly higher in the class hierarchy than manual workers, but without oversight of others, they too are 'wage labourers': the relation between wage-earners and managers is the critical determinant of class.

Wolf, C.P. 1970. The Durkheim Thesis: Occupational Groups and Moral Integration. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 9.1:17-32.

Wolf confirms the methodological rigour and logical coherence of *The Division of Labour*, and reminds us that morality is, for Durkheim, a corollary of social organization. He argues that Durkheim's understanding of the variability of moral codes provides a conceptual apparatus that can explain the emergence of core principles in multiple forms. Wolf also shows how occupational groups serve as the professions that demarcate communities within the larger society.

Nation, Nationalism, and Transnationalism

Durkheim considered the formalization of the collection in the modern form of the nation-state; he distinguished between nations, states, and peoplehood, or 'political society', and he argued that states must not dominate. While national fervour might pose dangers, the collective consciousness produced by national sentiment might also be the source of shared morality that is core to the Durkheim theoretical and ethical project. Transcending the nation and the state, however, is the contemporary system of labour relations: the division of labour in global economics now depends upon transnational labour flows. Llobera 1994 takes up the implications of *The Division of Labour* for ethnic, community, and national processes of identity formation, defending the kind of nationalism Durkheim thought of as moral; Dingley 2008 demonstrates their context as aspirational. Zhe 2013 too defends the possibility of a morally Durkheimian state, but cautions against the forced solidarity of civic society. Transnationally, and returning to the division of labour as a technical form rather than a theoretical condition of society, Anderson 2010 demonstrates how a precarious labour force is produced through state policies on immigration, and Hoang and Yeoh 2015 show how the family has changed as labour migrants cross

national borders. Finally, Xiang 2007 explores how the units of social relation and labour have become abstracted through global migration.

Anderson, Bridget. 2010. Migration, Immigration Controls and the Fashioning of Precarious Workers. *Work, Employment, and Society* 24(2):300-317.

Anderson challenges the claim that immigration controls protect both national jobs and foreign workers, arguing that they function rather to shape labour relations. Immigration controls create a particular kind of labour market, one that depends on the production of younger migrants who will engage in temporary and more precarious work. Rhetoric about migrants taking jobs, and the dangers of migration, serve instead to create 'precarity' in the labour force.

Dingley, James. 2008. *Nationalism, Social Theory and Durkheim*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dingley explores Durkheim's notions of the state with particular historical reference to his own political aspirations for the France of the Third Republic. Advanced societies, in Durkheim's thought, Dingley reminds us, are more malleable – or the product of having changed, and herein lies the possibility for larger (or unified) shared ideals beyond the state, even if they were nurtured in the form of the nation to begin with. Dingley also provides a concise, helpful overview of 20th century sociological theories on nationalism.

Hoang, Lan Anh and Brenda S.A. Yeoh, eds. 2015. *Transnational Labour Migration, Remittances and the Changing Family in Asia*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

This collection traces the global dynamics of labour migration, including the impacts of monetary flows and the changing configurations of families. Contemporary labour transactions are considered through multiple dimensions: flows across national boundaries, types of economic exchange, and notions of a nuclear family are all challenged. Multiple case studies from the region indicate how gendered these dynamics are, as well as how enduring – if malleable – the family unit is.

Llobera, Josep. 1994. Durkheim and the National Question. In W.S.F. Pickering and H. Martins, eds. *Debating Durkheim*, pp. 134-158. London: Routledge, with the British Centre for Durkheimian Studies.

Llobera argues that Durkheim's use of the concept of 'nationality' – that level of consciousness achieved by commonality – is justified. His definitions caused consternation at the time, but Llobera critiques those positions that would see a unilateral nationalism in Durkheimian thinking and posits instead that the unmitigated emphasis on moral values redeems him as a thinker on the dynamics of nationhood and national identity.

Xiang, Biao. 2007. *Global "Body Shopping": An Indian Labor System in Information Technology Industry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Xiang traces the contemporary configurations of labour with a detailed ethnography of Information Technology (IT) workers from India but who are placed globally by agents. He suggests that global processes of labour placement contribute to a dislocation of the individual. Ethnic and national networks may still be employed to sustain various social systems, but the result is an increasing 'abstraction' of the market, capital, and labour as a human endeavour.

Zhe, Ji. 2013. Return to Durkheim: Civil Religion and the Moral Reconstruction of China. In *Durkheim in Dialogue: A Centenary Celebration of The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, Sondra L. Hausner, ed., pp. 47-66. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Using the notion of 'civil religion' –that shared group of beliefs that grounds a collective identity– Ji explores the moral order of contemporary China, and its politicization. If a society is to be governed from the vantage point of 'moral consensus', the careful calibration of individual rights in balance with collective needs is imperative. Ji reminds us that a just society allows morality to emerge organically from its constituent parts, not be imposed from above.