

begin to infiltrate into the educational system of the country in that particular way. This is one aspect, again that is a problem that faces SEA today. Large minority groups, in spite of the fact that they have existed there for hundreds of years, are not culturally a part of the country in which they live. This is a common problem with which all SEA powers have to wrestle and the answer is still, of course, unknown. The foregoing remarks have touched upon the basic cultural similarities of SEA, the social forces that have affected the area, the demographic situation, and problems of a rising nationalism, particularly in regard to language and the threat of Communist China. It is hoped that this rather casual treatment will stimulate further study and a better understanding of an area which is becoming of increasing importance in the modern world.

DURKHEIM'S CONCEPT OF SOLIDARITY *

By SISTER MECHTRAUD, S. SP. S.

Introduction

Durkheim was a French social philosopher, well known in sociological circles by his works, such as *The Division of Labor in Society*, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, *Suicide*, and *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. In these works, the social philosopher treats of certain key concepts which are basic to his theories and which, at the same time, clarify his whole thought system on social causation, social anomy, social constraint, collective representations, and so forth. One of the basic concepts recurring again and again in Durkheimian writings is that of solidarity; mechanical and organic solidarity. The following presents an only sketchy outline of this concept which has been taken by many, particularly, modern sociologists, as one of their basic forms. They use it, especially, in their suggestions for a reconstruction of our society; they point to it as a powerful antidote against that social disintegration which threatens modern society as it reveals itself above all in the atomistic trends of modern social life.

Only a few names may be mentioned here, outstanding in the field and using the concept of solidarity in this connection. Lloyd Warner and his group strongly emphasize this concept. Mention may be made only of the latest book of the Yankee City Series: *American Life: Dream and Reality*. It is especially the phenomenon of social symbolism that attracted these writers. Warner mentions, for instance, the cross as a symbol of unity for the Christians. Needless to say, the cross is much more to Christians than a mere symbol; an actual reality stands behind it, a historical fact which cannot be overlooked and which elevates this "symbol" far above other categories of social symbols and signs. Another writer, referring often to the concept of solidarity is Rev. Fr. Fichter, S.J., who speaks of it as of the unifying bond among a certain group of people, especially in his latest book on the Southern Parish. His concept of solidarity differs, however, in essential points from that of Durkheim.

The Durkheimian Concept of Solidarity

The concept of solidarity itself refers to the social unity of the group. It tries to answer the question, "What is that thing which keeps a group together and makes them cooperate—makes them act as a unit in which they combine their efforts?" Some thinkers have attributed this group unity to the effects of symbolism as has been stated before.

Durkheim wrote much, and most of his works deal with the concept of solidarity. In his works he also often combines the concepts of collective representations and solidarity. We find in his writings many

* This article was originally presented as a talk before the Philippine Sociological Society on June 19, 1955. The *Review* staff revised and edited the material for publication.

conflicting ideas and theories. Durkheim, by his own definition a positivist, was influenced by Comte, the father of positivism. One of the greatest difference in Durkheim's works from those of Comte is the great attention given to the question of the individual and the society. Hence the two key terms in the analysis of Durkheim are "individual" and "society".

Durkheim's concept of solidarity is divided into two parts:

1. Mechanical solidarity
2. Organic solidarity

In connection with this mechanical concept he discusses social anomie which refers to social disintegration as it reveals itself in the ever growing atomization of individuals in society, in a greater social isolation. In his concept of solidarity Durkheim tried to approach it from two view points: from both the functional and structural views.

1. In mechanical solidarity Durkheim sees people as they group themselves together in a social unit or in an association. These people, have their own ideas and their own minds, their own *individual* minds. But for Durkheim this is not important. The individual minds are not considered as being so important as the group mind. He defines group mind as the sum total of the individual minds which are integrated into the group mind. It is this group mind which is of greatest importance for Durkheim. This group mind regulates all social importance and, at the same time, guards the individual from becoming independent or "individualized" and, thus, according to Durkheim's opinion, "outside" of the group. It is important to note that it is merely physical matter that makes these various people individuals. Durkheim speaks only of individuals and not of persons. The person-character is given to individuals only through society. It is at this point where we may find the root of the difficulty in understanding Durkheim's theories in their last analysis.

Basic to all social theories is the concept of man. So it is precisely the question; "what is Durkheim's concept of man?", which may lead to an understanding of thoughts which seem sometimes contradictory or falling out of a logical sequence. This concept of man crosses the boundaries of various disciplines; those of the speculative as well as of the factual sciences. A partial approach to this concept can only lead to a partial answer and to a partial result. Here, we may well say, lies the basis for the Durkheimian dilemma. By his own definition he is a positivist; hence, he denies all value to the speculative sciences. By doing this, he closes himself off from a truly realistic understanding of man—for him man is only an individual, set off from other individuals by matter only, by physical differences. Obviously, he can never reach the full human reality in his theories and because of this, these theories are bound to be contradictory and only partial. Therefore Durkheim wants to apply to his sociological research the laws that pertain to the physical sciences, and the definite laws of the natural sciences. Here he comes again into a dilemma. He definitely has to step into the metaphysical field, although it is against his own premises.

In this small world, people agree upon certain customs, mores and folkways. They symbolize them in certain ceremonies. These symbols keep the group together. People are, then, so integrated into their group

that they think like the group and act as the group wants them to act. These symbols, then, or collective representations, are nothing else than the overt expression of group thoughts and sentiments.

Mechanical solidarity is that thing which keeps the group together. It is sanctioned by repressive law. The individual is not supposed to think or act for himself at his liberty. The individual mind is ultimately merged into the group mind, which Durkheim conceived as an entity *sui generis*.

Durkheim also approaches solidarity from the historical and cultural perspectives. According to him, people become increasingly independent as they flock together around industrial power centers. This means that a great number of human beings find themselves outside of the regular group. They no longer have that feeling of belonging so essential in society. In other words, as the group becomes larger, mechanical solidarity begins to disappear so that the need for functional division arises. Here organic solidarity comes in.

2. Organic Solidarity—Mechanical solidarity seems to be impossible for these individuals, but then another system of social organization establishes itself which keeps the group together.

Durkheim looks at society as being like a great organism. What is important to him are the different functions which subdivide the large group into small groups. People are held together in groups because they fulfill various functions in this organic society. It is this division of functions in organic society that makes people dependent upon each other. It is no longer a feeling of group unity as such, but it is the feeling that others contribute something that others again need. Organic interchange of functions according to him should exist in organic society. This, then, would present another powerful check on the ever growing freedom of the individual members of society.

Two of Durkheim's famous statements are:

"Social phenomena are to be considered as concrete things; they can be dealt with very easily" and "As one Social fact arises out of another social fact, solidarity is a social fact, hence it should be considered as a thing." Here he comes again into a dilemma. First of all, the question may arise; what does Durkheim mean when he speaks of solidarity as of a "thing"? He nowhere in his theories clarified this point.

Solidarity is a fact arising from another social fact—but, here another difficulty comes in. Taking solidarity as basic to all social phenomena, one may rightfully ask the question; how is it possible that it arises from another social fact and—what is that other social fact? He wants to prove where solidarity comes from and at the same time he says that it is already a fact, (but he also says that it is a thing). People group together because solidarity is there. Solidarity comes only into existence after a group has been organized. He tries to prove the genesis, but actually he presupposes it to already exist. Obviously, the main difficulty is dodged here by a continuous begging of the question. Solidarity for Durkheim is purely something social. And, in addition to this, Durkheim makes moral evaluations of solidarity. For him solidarity is the essence of social organization and the cause of all morality. Take solidarity

away and no morality exists. Take solidarity away and society will be disintegrated from that very moment.

Durkheim shows that he is not in favor of restitutive law which is the sanction of organic solidarity. It is the theory of giving with an anticipation of getting something in return. His reasoning is as follows: "Why should one be rewarded for something he is morally obliged to do?" Repressive law seems necessary to him, but restitutive law is viewed as worthless, or, at least, lacking in the truly *social* aspect.

Other attributes of solidarity are the structural and functional aspects. Why does modern society seem to be so close to social disintegration? Many believe that there is an urgent problem because we do not have small groups between the individuals and the state. However, the concept of solidarity has no particular relevance to the question of working for the common good. Durkheim never discussed the question of the common good, since solidarity seemed to be everything to him. Nevertheless, he did seem to favor mechanical solidarity, which can only be effected in smaller groups.

Durkheim also speaks of dynamic density. The group which has mechanical solidarity is densely constructed. These individuals are therefore united by mechanical solidarity. This structure of smaller groups is based entirely upon the division of labor. Durkheim saw that groups are growing in size in the modern world, and so he held that smaller groups must be formed, since mechanical solidarity can not exist in large groups.

Durkheim speaks of social anomy in connection with his work on suicide. This idea is closely related to the concept of solidarity. At first people are in groups which possess mechanical solidarity. Then, when individuals begin to lose the feeling of belonging to a group, the social fact of anomy or of "rootlessness" arises. This condition of anomy will then, in turn, promote suicide. Durkheim is in favor of the heroic type of suicide, that is the giving up of one's life for the good of society, but he does not accept the other types of suicides. Thus, his view of mechanical and organic solidarity was also applied to a specific manifestation of social disorganization.

A Comparative Analysis

Obviously, the foregoing presents only a sketchy outline of Durkheim's concept of solidarity. As has been said, it actually is the key to his socio-philosophical theories and their basic contents. Since this concept has been taken by many sociologists of our time as a way to the solution of our modern social crisis, the question may arise, does solidarity as defined and described by Durkheim "work" in the social actuality? The answer to this question may be found in a comparative analysis. Others have used this concept also in their suggestions for a social reconstruction. Mention may be made only of the school of Solidarism in France with its greatest exponent, Bourgeois. But they understood solidarity more in the sense of "noblesse oblige," than in a more humanitarian sense.

It is, particularly, in the papal encyclicals where we find the term again and again. This brings us to another social philosopher, whose writings deal chiefly with the field of the socio-economic, Father H. Pesch,

S. J. A certain similarity between his writings and those of Durkheim is evident. His key terms are also; "individual" and "society," and emphasizing them he comes by necessity to the concept of solidarity. Striking, however, is the great difference in the premises between his and Durkheim's thought system. Man, the main agent is in the center, but man as he presents himself in the full reality of his being as a religious moral, social individual. Man deeply imbued with the dignity of his person—being. It is this man who is bound by that strong socially unifying bond of solidarity to his fellowmen. It is not the social association which brings about this bond—it grows out of human nature itself, is natural to man, as Pesch uses the term "*secundum naturam*" in this connection.

Thus, it is in a natural way that people group together, that they cooperate in their social relationships. It is precisely the teleological nature of man which orientates him also to companionship, to society, to solidary interhuman relations. Therefore, in Pesch's theories solidarity is not something coming from the outside, so to say, something which is to be imposed on man and to be safeguarded by repressive law. Man's social, teleological nature is the source of all solidarity, which finds its final explanation in man's final and existential ends. Not that Fr. Pesch was blinded to human reality. He faced this reality in the impaired human nature and emphasized strongly the "oughtness" of solidarity. But he did not find solidarity's moral character in a vague referring to a social genesis but in the final human end and in the precepts of absolute, unchanging principles. It is because of this that Pesch's definition of solidarity proves to be workable; it is firmly based on human reality itself. Hence, there is no need for him to look for explanations which might only obscure the concept more and even contradict each other as we have seen happen in Durkheim's theories. Pesch's socio-economic writings, particularly, as they refer to solidarity, reveal one logical sequence of thought. Since the *whole* human nature is considered in Pesch's theories, his concept of solidarity is truly referring to reality as such—one may say rightly in this connection: "it works that way." What Pesch is really telling the social thinker is that you cannot understand the purpose of social life and its institutions unless you understand the purpose and destiny of man. His concept of solidarity is solidly based on the concept of "final human ends." It is precisely the modern scientist's refusal to deal with these ends which renders him impotent in the practical order.

Durkheim's great contribution lies in his socio-cultural approach to the concept of solidarity and in his emphasis on its necessity and importance. But even this short comparison reveals already the limited aspect of the concept and its shortcomings in the Durkheimian theories. Much more could be said, and the field which both writers elaborate in their socio-economic writings is extremely broad. Hence the subject has only been touched upon within the limited space of this essay. But even this short sketch reveals the importance and the far reaching implications of the social phenomenon of solidarity, particularly, in any approach to a solution of the so-called social problems of today.