

## Analysis of Views on the Idea of Social Solidarity in World Political-Philosophical Doctrines

**Khudaynazarov Azamatjon Urinbaevich**

Chirchik State Pedagogical University independent researcher

azamatjon.200992@gmail.com

**Abstract:** The article analyzes views on the idea of social solidarity in world political-philosophical doctrines. In addition, the article presents the perspectives of Ibn Khaldun, E. Durkheim, A. Comte, and T. Hobbes regarding the idea of social solidarity in global political-philosophical teachings. The idea of social solidarity is highlighted as the unity necessary to ensure order, stability, and development in society.

**Keywords:** solidarity, social solidarity, society, social order, peace, stability, social system, developed society, value.



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

Unity is a concept that refers to the consensus of people on a certain idea or belief, as well as the spiritual closeness formed in the process of carrying out a specific activity. Unity is the mutual compatibility of knowledge, skills, labor, professional expertise, and work habits among a group of people. Social unity is not measured by material wealth; rather, its significance is invaluable in fulfilling spiritual needs. From a socio-political perspective, paying taxes on time, defending the homeland, and adherence to equality and social norms in areas such as the activities of trade unions are also required.

The concept of “social solidarity” generally refers to understanding, supporting, cooperating, and uniting people in a society toward a common goal. This phenomenon is formed on the basis of shared values, interests, and objectives among people. Social solidarity plays a very important role in the stability and development of society. If the members of a society are united, they can overcome their problems together, social conflicts decrease, and mutual trust is strengthened.

It is appropriate to analyze the philosophical and political views related to the idea of social solidarity in global political and philosophical teachings. In his “Muqaddima,” the renowned medieval Islamic historian and thinker Abdurrahman ibn Muhammad ibn Khaldun offers extensive reflections on the factors leading to the development and decline of societies, explaining the rise and fall of civilizations through the concept of “asabiyya” (social solidarity). His analyses detail the relationships between nomadic and sedentary peoples, economic processes, and the impact of political structures on the progress of society.

In his work “Muqaddima” Ibn Khaldun presents the following views on “asabiyya” (social solidarity):

“Group solidarity ensures protection and enables mutual defense, the pursuit of justice, and the implementation of all kinds of social activities. By nature, humans in any society need an individual who can prevent conflicts between members and promote reconciliation. This individual must possess superior solidarity compared to others; otherwise, his authority will not be effective. Such superiority is considered power. It stands at a higher level than ordinary leadership. Leadership means being at the head and being obeyed, but a leader does not have the power to force others to accept his decisions. Authority, on the other hand, grants superiority as well as the ability to rule and govern by force”[1].

When a person belonging to collective solidarity reaches the level of leadership, and people begin to obey his commands, and he sees that the path to dominance and the use of force is open, it is only natural that he will take this route. After all, power is a desirable goal. However, he can achieve his aim fully only with the help of collective solidarity. Because it is precisely this solidarity that compels people to submit to him. Thus, we see that solidarity naturally becomes a path leading to the dominance of power.

“Even if there are various households and diverse forms of collective solidarity within a nation, there will still exist an even stronger bond of unity that surpasses all others, encompasses them, and compels them to submission. In this case, all the smaller communities must come together to form a greater and unified collective solidarity. Otherwise, divisions will arise, leading to conflicts and disagreements”[1].

In this regard, if we look at the perspective of French sociologist David Émile Durkheim, Durkheim considered “Social solidarity as a certain unity of social life, collectivity, and, at the same time, the highest moral principle recognized by all members of society—the highest and most universal value.”

Durkheim presented his concept of society through mechanical and organic solidarity.

Mechanical solidarity is characteristic of underdeveloped, archaic societies. Here, solidarity is defined by the similarity of individuals who make up the society, as well as the similarity of the social functions performed by these individuals. Mechanical solidarity is realized through the community assimilating individuality. Mechanical solidarity corresponds to repressive law, whose role is to punish individuals who violate the law or customs. Mechanical solidarity is typical of traditional societies, based on shared values and types of work among the population (for example, in rural communities).

Organic solidarity is characteristic of developed societies, where each individual performs a specific function according to the division of labor. Because the division of labor has weakened collective consciousness, it becomes the main source of organic solidarity. Organic solidarity arises in modern, industrialized societies on the basis of the division of labor. Here, people perform different tasks, yet together they form a unified system.

Organic solidarity corresponds to restitutive law, whose function is to review the past in order to restore it to a normal state.

In his work “On the Division of Social Labor,” Durkheim demonstrated that the division of labor is a factor that creates and recreates the unity of societies in which traditional beliefs have lost their force [2].

According to the French philosopher and main representative of positivism, Auguste Comte, “Social solidarity is based on the multiplication and increasing complexity of the social organism as well as the division of labor, which develops the social instinct. In the family, on one hand, this

creates a sense of dependence on others as the main element of society. On the other hand, it involves a sense of self-awareness and the realization of the fulfillment of an important and essential social function. By uncovering the characteristics of each of these social institutions as fundamental conditions necessary for the existence of the social system, Comte reveals their inadequacy for the current stage of society's development. Thus, the idea emerges of the possibility to further develop a harmonious society based on the existence of two powers—secular and spiritual” [3].

O. Kont also believed that society develops through three stages: the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive. In the positive stage, according to him, the main driving force is social solidarity based on the interconnection of people and a rational understanding of social order.

As the basis of the Birdamlik community order:

Kont saw solidarity as a fundamental principle that ensures the stability and functioning of society. In his view, when people recognize their interdependence, they strive not for conflict, but for cooperation and harmony.

In a positive society, according to the doctrine, social solidarity is achieved through a scientific understanding of the laws of societal development. In such a society, governed by positivist scholars and philosophers, there exists a clear hierarchy in which each class fulfills its assigned function.

According to O. Kont, the interconnectedness of people in society is the main factor ensuring social solidarity. No one can exist in isolation, and recognizing this interconnectedness fosters cooperation and harmony.

O. Kont considered revolutions to be excessive in a positively functioning society. He regarded them as a pathology, as a deviation from normal development. O. Kant's theory of social solidarity had a significant impact on sociology and social philosophy. In particular, his ideas about human interdependence and the role of science in shaping social order were further developed and refined by later sociologists such as Emile Durkheim.

At this point, the English philosopher Thomas Hobbes's views on the idea of social solidarity, as presented in his treatise “Leviathan,” are discussed. According to Hobbes's concept, people, who were initially in a “state of nature” at war with everyone else, enter into a contract by transferring a portion of their rights to a sovereign (the state) in order to ensure peace and security. Thus, in Hobbes's opinion, solidarity does not arise from a natural inclination toward communication, but rather from rational calculations aimed at avoiding disorder and violence[4].

According to T. Gobbs, solidarity is not a natural feeling, but rather the result of the rational choice of people who understand that only a strong state can ensure their security and well-being.

T. Hobbes believed that social solidarity arises from the necessity of compulsory submission to a single authority for the sake of the social contract, safety, and survival.

In conclusion, the theory of social solidarity in the history of global political and philosophical thought is a concept based on a rational understanding of the interconnectedness of people and social order in society. In a positive society led by scholars and positivist philosophers, social solidarity eliminates the need for revolutions and serves as the foundation for comprehensive development and progress. The theory of social solidarity explains the unity necessary to ensure order, stability, and growth in society. This theory serves as a basis in state governance, political processes, the education and upbringing system, as well as in the development of social policy.

## References

1. Абдурахмон ибн Муҳаммад ибн Халдун “Муқаддима”. Toshkent, “TRUST AND SUPPORT” нашриёти, 2025. – 288-289 б.
2. Elektron manba: <https://studfile.net/preview/934219/page:9/> (Murojaat qilingan sana: 01.07.2025)
3. С.А.Батуренко СОЛИДАРИСТСКАЯ ТРАДИЦИЯ В ИСТОРИИ СОЦИОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ ТЕОРИИ: О. КОНТ, Э. ДЮРКГЕЙМ ВЕСТН. МОСК. УН-ТА. СЕР. 18. СОЦИОЛОГИЯ И ПОЛИТОЛОГИЯ. 2012. № 4. л – 86-87.
4. Левиафан / Т.Гоббс; [пер. с англ. А.Гутермана]. – М.: РИПОЛ классик, 2021. – 624 с. – (Лестница в небо).
5. O‘rinbayevich X. A., Universiteti O. M. Yangi O‘zbekiston siyosiy jarayonlarida yoshlar ishtirokining tuzilmaviy-funksional tahlili. – 2023. 46-51.
6. Urinbaevich K. A. Factors for Increasing the Activity of Youth of Uzbekistan in the Field of Science and Education //Middle East Journal of Applied Science & Technology. – 2022. – Т. 5. – №. 1. – S. 33-37.
7. Abdurakhmonovich S. B., Urinbaevich K. A. The Role of Reading in Increasing the Activity of Youth in Socio-Political Processes //Middle European Scientific Bulletin. – 2022. – Т. 23. – S. 222.
8. Urinbaevich K. A. YOUTH OF UZBEKISTAN AS A SUBJECT OF CHANGES IN POLITICAL PROCESSES //Open Access Repository. – 2023. – Т. 4. – №. 3. – S. 1455-1464.
9. Orinbaevich K. The Role of Youth Parliaments in Increasing Youth Participation (International and Uzbekistan Examples) //Jurnal ISO: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Humaniora. – 2024. – Т. 4. – №. 2. – С. 10-10.
10. XUDAYNAZAROV I. E. A. YOSHLAR ISHTIROKINI OSHIRISHDA YOSHLAR PARLAMENTLARINING O‘RNI (XALQARO VA O‘ZBEKISTON MISOLIDA) //News of the NUUz. – 2024. – Т. 1. – №. 1.12. – С. 250-252.