An essay which answers in 1,500 words the question;
What are the similarities and differences in Marx and Durkheim’s respective accounts of historical change? Which one can be argued to be more convincing?

There are many similarities and differences between Marx and Durkheim’s respective accounts of historical change, however I believe that depending on the view point either could be argued to be more convincing than the other. Simply, Durkheim saw that historical change was and is gradual and evolutionary, whereas Marx saw that historical change is violent and revolutionary (Mandle, E. 1979). The hardest point to establish is what historical or social change actually is and what counts as historical change, more so at the time of Marx and Durkheim (Mandle, E. 1979). The differences of accounts of historical change is often comes to weather historical and major social change comes down to both semiotic and postmodernism capability of human consciousness being able to distinguish reality compared to pseudo reality or reproductions of reality.

Durkheim supposed that all societies would be able to be placed on a scale of evolution he believes that the main aspect of historical change is based heavily on belief as to apply to everyone. This aspect for historical change is an organic society, societies with a higher percentage of variety and individuality within the society and a higher tolerances for differences in society will have a higher chance for sociological historical change. These changes arose in social diversity because the societies grew larger in size, meaning that these societies would have been forced to come into contact with other societies. Eventually Durkheim saw that these societies would develop and form frames of life and work mostly based on divisions of labour.

This is not often a smooth process as when society changes quickly individualism will become more prominent within the society. Old ties in the society will become weekend and new ones will not be prominent in the society. This unease of historical change can cause bad social outcome, such as rises in suicides or anomie which is an “instability resulting from a breakdown of standards and values or from a lack of purpose or ideals” (Encyclopaedia Britannica n.d.) Eventually social order should be maintained but for this to happen the society must in all restart itself, so that within this society values that have been newly established will allow people to bond and become closer as an understood society. All in all the state or government had little roles in this development however it did have one main role. The government or state would have to preserve order in the society by lowering viable inequalities in the society, safe guarding people who fell behind or could fall behind whilst this change is occurring.