CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

In pre-industrial societies, the majority of the labour force is employed in the extractive industries such as mining, fishing, forestry, agriculture. Life is basically a game against nature. Pre-industrial societies are primarily agrarian having traditional structures in terms of routine and authority. The adoption of agriculture is particularly important in that it effects the change from a nomadic to a sedentary society.

The characteristic that reveals the simple nature of pre-industrial economy is archaic technology, employed in various production activities and having the following three features:

1) the use of natural energy, such as animal power, or the force of wind and water;

2) the use of tools, which are a direct extension of the limbs of the human body;

3) the use of simple weapons such as axes and arrows.

Simplicity of pre-industrial economy has become possible due to a very elementary division of labour which generally consists of the distribution of tasks between the sexes and among age groups.

Archaic technology and an elementary division of labour leads to the emergence of a subsistence economy on account of low
productivity. This subsistence economy is a form of pre-industrial society. Only goods that are required immediately for survival and defence are produced. As a result of the unavailability of means of transport, society's sphere of contact is circumscribed. The population cannot grow rapidly as environmental equilibrium is likely to breakdown. Paradoxically, in this type of society, the kinship system effects social differentiation and also promotes social integration.

There are some common characteristics by which we can differentiate between pre-industrial society and industrial society. In case of the industrial work force we see the pulverization of the stratification of specialized workmen in pre-industrial society and the levelling of skill. The industrial society requires continual training of the work force as the objectives differ from that of the traditional society. It is noteworthy that industrial society has a proclivity to radically change the educational system of the pre-industrial society. The high level of technical and general education required in an industrial society has great importance in the context of political life. The structure and shape of the labour force of an industrial society is heterogeneous in distinction to the homogeneous labour force of the pre-industrial society. The work hours in an industrial system are different from those of agricultural societies. Unlike the pre-industrial societies operations have to continue into the night. The workforce and the community has to adopt to nocturnal
operations. Even holidays and religious days generally observed in pre-industrial societies are not excluded.

Urban dominance is manifested by the growth of cities and pervasiveness of urban ways. In pre-industrial societies the importance of cities was in the character of commercial and religious centres. Industrial society can be differentiated from a pre-industrial society in terms of art and music as well. It is to be noted that in place of conventions, taboos, and customs of a pre-industrial society, and industrial society has a more elaborate and complex set of detailed rules in the form of government, establishments etc. As a result of industrialization, the work rate and exercise of personal responsibility based on the incentives of individual self-interest is much faster in comparison to pre-industrial societies.

The resemblance between industrial societies is marked in spite of differences compared to pre-industrial societies.

The Concept of the Industrial Society

The Industrial Revolution has effected great changes in the structure of societies. The 'achieving society' ought to be regarded as one model of the social processes determining and sanctioning individual status. This model has come to be regarded as a normative model, which is described by Kluth as follows:

In industrial societies, a sort of value monism has deve-
developed under the veneer of a pluralism of values. Apparently 'performance' is not simply a regulatory and distributive norm for economic work, but rather it is the value principle that regulates all areas of life, and is often the exact expression of an equivalent.

The functional importance of the achievement principle lies in the fact that an increasing proportion of the work process is carried out in only indirect contact with the market; the peculiar type of work is bound within an organized social institution.

In an achieving society, the social status of an individual is directly related to his status in the sphere of production, which in turn depends upon his performance.

Status dimensions that define the position of an individual within a hierarchical system, is based upon the principle that an individual can be formally recruited to an occupational position or be given a different income or work task, or even formal authority only if he achieves a level of performance determined by an objective criterion.

A discussion on the independent dimension of achievement must be preceded by a clarification of the question of what are the real or alleged social functions which are supposed to emanate from the conception of the achievement principle, which give the achievement principle the character of a legitimate
criteria of rank in societal labour and also in such areas as art and sport.

Four functions may be distinguished which will show the nature of those organizations in which status is dependent upon performance, and which, furthermore, claimed to be the most 'just' and the most 'rational' forms of organization.

1) The compensatory function

In an organization where status is determined by performance, the individual has to be compensated for the subjective and objective costs, incurred in the course of work. This expenditure may vary from worker to worker.

2) The principle of equivalence

The ideal of 'equal pay for equal work' precludes irrational discrimination leading to a specific type of social egalitarianism.

3) The productivity principle

According to this principle the level of wage rate is determined by the marginal productivity of labour in accordance with the wages theory of economics.

4) The allocative function

The achievement principle induces in every individual the urge to produce the maximum under the pressure of the requirements.
Two different concepts of performance can be discerned in the above-mentioned functions. In function 1 and 2 performance is evaluated in terms of its subjective costs, while in functions 3 and 4 performance is evaluated as a measure of the economic yield from work.

The achievement principle is based on the premise that the requirements of the different work roles of an organized system have few similarities which enable them to be represented on a hierarchical continuum.

**Characteristics of Industrial Society**

According to St. Simon, industrial societies have two aspects. Knowledge and organization. Industrial societies have the following common characteristics:

1) The construction of cohesive nation-states built around the common language and culture.

2) The commercialization of production and the subsequent vaporization of a subsistence economy.

3) Automation and the organization of production.

4) The decline of agricultural labour population.

5) The urbanization of mass society.

6) The institutionalization of politics and mass parties alongwith the enfranchisement of the population.
7) The predominance of scientific application in all areas of life and industrial production in particular.

8) Rationalization of social life.

A close link exists between industrial societies and mass societies. Western Europe and North America underwent industrialization during 1815-1914. There was, however, a substantial difference in the rate of change of individual societies.

Whether industrial societies are co-operative or conflictual, adoptive or self-destructive is of polemical interest. According to the structural functional view industrial society should be regarded as a highly differentiated and coherent social system. The Marxian sociologists, however, are of the opinion that in such societies conflict is inherent on account of the contradictory interest of labourers, capitalist owners and managers. Unlike sociologists who regard both capitalism and socialism as forms of industrial societies, Marxists look upon industrial society as a specific aspect of capitalism. In order to support their contention they adduce the essentially exploitive nature of capitalist relations. To the Marxists, automation in industrial societies serves to separate the workers from the means of production, production of commodities by wage labour, and the realization of an economic surplus in the
form of profits, subsequently giving rise to class struggle and imperialism.

An exegesis of industrial societies is not merely concerned with the question of the conflictual and adaptive aspects. The necessity of a Marxist analysis for providing was conceded both by Max Weber and J. M. Keynes.

Considering Aron's critique, an industrial society may be defined as a society in which large scale industry is the characteristic form of production. Keeping this definition in mind a number of features of an industrial economy might be discerned:

1) The enterprise must not be confused with the family.

2) Technological division of labour constitutes an important feature of modern industrial society.

3) Accumulation of wealth is the direct offshoot of an industrial society. Empirical evidence shows that the accumulation of capital is not merely typical of capitalist societies, but of all industrial societies. Marx's famous words 'Accumulate, accumulate, this is the law and the prophets' which were meant to describe capitalist societies, typifies all industrial societies.

4) Economic calculus for making continuous calculation for purposes of profit maximisation is an essential
feature of an industrial society.

5) The issue of the ownership of the means of production gives rise to the problem of the relations between owners and workers characterized by conflict.

The features of an economic system may be evaluated in different ways to facilitate a more strict analysis of capitalism as a type of industrial society. The idea of 'economic' is difficult to define. Economic activity may be those that satisfy individual needs. However, needs such as sex do not come within the gamut of economic activity. It is, therefore, impossible to define human needs exactly. The satisfaction of basic needs is as essential as the need for recognition, prestige and power.

The second kind of definition is concerned with the administration of scarce resources or with the relation between means and ends when means are scarce and have alternative uses.

Defining economic on the basis of behavioural pattern is satisfactory for developed societies in which individual needs are numerous and explicit. The use of money especially, exhibits alternative ways of spending resources and a wide variety of objectives. Money is the means whereby a man can achieve his cherished goals.

The difficulty of defining economic activity in terms of
administration of scarce resources is that in primitive or small societies it is not easy to isolate economic calculations or a rational consideration of the use of scarce resources. In such societies custom or religious beliefs determine objectives to a great extent. Economic behaviour, therefore, cannot be specified as conventions and religious dogmas seem to lie out-light the economic sphere.

The difficulty in defining economic activity in these two ways can be mitigated if we keep in mind the fact that supra-historical concepts are of a formal character, and therefore, in order to comprehend particular historical situations we have to give these concepts a definite content. It is palpable that to survive man has to satisfy certain basic animal requirements. However, when men live in societies they urgently demand the fulfilment of other non-biological needs.

Reiteration of some of the features of an industrial economy is required to differentiate between a socialist and a capitalist economy. The enterprise is secluded from the family resulting in a new type of production, a technical division of labour, an accumulation of capital and a progressive economy. The economic calculus is a necessity and a concentration of worker takes place. The above mentioned features are common to both the economies. The difference however, lies in the fact that (1) in a capitalist economy the means of production are owned by private individuals, whereas in a socialist economy
the state is the owner. (2) The methods of regulating the distribution of resources in a capitalist economy depends upon the decisions of individual in the market based upon conjecture. In a socialist economy, however, the balance between supply and demand is determined by the planning authority.

Apart from the two major differences mentioned above, the other features of a capitalist economy are enumerated below:

1) The instruments of production are privately owned.

2) The regulation of the economy is not determined by planned decision, but piecemeal and pragmatically in the market.

3) Employers and employees are segregated as the employers own the means of production and the employees have merely their labour power. The wage earning class emerges as a result.

4) Profit maximization is the dominant motive.

5) Prices fluctuate in each part of the market and the economy as a whole on account of the forces of demand and supply which is not regulated by any planning authority.

These fluctuations, polemically referred to as capitalist anarchy, often produce crises, as a result of the disparity between total demand and total supply. It should, however, be noted
that no economy is completely capitalist. In France, a sizeable industrial portion is publicly owned. Again, it is not wholly correct to say that in all capitalist set-ups profit maximization is the only motive.

Types of Industrial Society: Capitalist

Society and Socialist Society

The existence of the profit motive in a capitalist society cannot be denied. This, however, should not lead us to an unqualified condemnation of capitalism.

First, we should take into account the extent to which profit serves as an incentive to individuals. Secondly, we should see to what extent the profit motive serves an economic function within the firm. In a capitalist society where individuals try to increase their monetary gains there exists a correlation between prestige of an occupation and income derived from it. There are, however, many occupations in which prestige does not directly correspond to the income level. In journalism, for instance, many of the best paid specialists do not enjoy high prestige. In contradistinction to journalists high civil servants draw modest salaries but enjoy high social positions. Again, above a certain income level the profit motive diminishes. For instance, outstanding managers of private firms frequently enter state services although they receive lesser salaries in doing so. Thus the profit motive is not always the guiding factor in capitalist economies.
In a capitalist industrial society the profit motive cannot be discounted. But this profit motive is a universal phenomenon of all economics. In public enterprise may undergo losses which may help to reduce the price of some commodities and services, thereby encouraging industrial development. If, however, a great many industries undergo losses the implication would be that the productivity of the entire economy is unsatisfactory. Thus it is necessary that all firms should show an excess of income over expenditure at the end of the year. The desire to increase monetary gains is as much a feature of the capitalist economy as the socialist type in spite of the fact that non monetary motives such as social honours, medals etc, are of considerable importance as far as encouraging workers to make greater efforts is concerned. High money income is directly associated with prestige as well as the coveted things of life.

The concept of profit differs in the two types of economies. In a socialist economy vast resources can be devoted to a branch of industry which is not making a profit as the distribution of national resources is determined by the planning authority without necessarily taking into account the margin of profit. In a capitalist society, on the other hand, profit indicates demand and helps to determine the distribution of national resources. In planned economies too allocation of resources is influenced by a consideration of the consumers.
preferences and response which is reflected in the amount of profit. Another contention against capitalist societies is that they create vast differences in the distribution of incomes. In some capitalist industrial societies inequality in income distribution has been reduced to some extent. Individual ownership of the instrument of production, however, invariably leads to unequal distribution of capital. The inequality of capital can perhaps be reduced by inheritance or death duties or other forms of taxation. This system nevertheless stands to be condemned.

Concentration of capital in the hands of a few entails very high incomes regarded as condemnabile by proponents of equality of income. Redistribution of this capital income, however, will not bring about an increase in the general level of salaries.

Inequality of remuneration is as much a feature of a planned economy as a capitalist one. In a planned economy the complete abolition of inequality in wages is palpable. For instance, during the early years of the Soviet system the incomes of communist Party members were restricted to a fixed level determined in relation to the wages of a skilled worker. This possibility is, however, vague.

In the early fifties the difference of income between a Soviet private and a Soviet general was said to be greater than in the United States. The inference is that inequality in a
capitalist regime exists in accordance with the spirit associated with individual activity, while in a planned economy the extent of inequality depends upon the planners. Inequality of wealth has a few deplorable consequences. First, the accumulation of large fortunes allows a fraction of the population to live without working. Secondly, the possession of large quantities of wealth involves the transmission of wealth which is the source of inequality. In a socialist economy, on the other hand, everything depends upon the individual's function.

The slightest inference that can be drawn from these facets is that the aspect of inequality cannot be finally determined as good or bad. A measure of inequality is an invariable aspect of all complex societies. In such societies a degree of inequality is necessary to encourage production and to ensure that a small segment of the population is able to pursue higher activities. Inequality of ownership of wealth may be considered as a guarantee of minimum independence for the individual in relation to the community.

The fourth contention against capitalism is called 'capitalist anarchy' which implies lack of a plan, price fluctuations, instability in production etc. The determination of the extent of this anarchy poses a problem, how far will planning enable a system to function smoothly.

At this juncture a few basic points ought to be considered.
All industrial economics are invariably complex involving the distribution of workers in all the ramifications of production, ever changing methods of production and a numerous firms. The phenomenon of continuous structural transformation, which is an essential aspect of economic growth, is common to both the Soviet and the capitalist system. This transformation is unfortunately characterized by lacunas and occasional failures. The efficiency of an economic system is not always harmonious and perfect. Both in capitalist and socialist economics the full utilization of all instruments of production, machines or labour is not always possible.

In discussing the different facts of industrial society Aron began with an inadequate definition, mentioned the major characteristics of an economic system and sketched an abstract model of the capitalist system and of the planned system. He went on to deal with the contentions against capitalism and tried to show that the alleged flaws are characteristic of all modern economic systems.

1. Aron pointed out the preliminary arguments against a planned economy which is that political democracy cannot get along with a planning authority. He showed that greater concentration of authority is the consequence of central planning. However, in theory economics planning does not always exclude the competition of parties for exercise of power and, the nece-
ssary aspect was possibly the dichotomy between the aspirations of the governed and the will of the rulers.

2) If a political authority seeks to accelerate industrialization against the general resentment of the populace, and alter the basic methods of farming, it is constrained to adopt despotic measures as the governed will not accept such decisions spontaneously. According to Aron, from these palpable remarks, however, one cannot pass on to the general formula that all economic planning is incompatible with competition between parties and with democracy.

Another form of this contention is that law is necessarily a universal rule which is relevant to all citizens, and not merely individuals or groups. The planned state is involved in the detail of economic life much more than a state which merely concerns itself with chalking out the rules of economic competition. This too is supported by empirical evidence and not by theory.

The complexity involved in a system of total planning is that the entrepreneur must respect the laws and execute the plan at the same time. These two contradictory obligations make the execution of the plan a complex affair, as the entrepreneur is expected to receive the labour and raw materials which if delayed, the manager has to choose between non-execution of the plan and disregard of law. Empirically, managers
of Soviet undertaking have no scruples in disobeying the laws as they consider execution of the plan to be of greater importance.

The second line of argument against a planned economy is that the economic calculus is not applicable in it. Aron does not go into the complexities of this argument and merely mentions some of the related ideas. He points out that the early socialist thinkers did not wholly comprehend this contention and it was the liberal economists particularly the re-liberals such as L. Von Mises and Hayek, who laid stress on the problem of a rational economic calculus when there is no market or any true prices. The early socialists had to think of ways of managing without the price mechanism. Many of them initially thought that a planned economy could function without money, distribution commodities directly among its members irrespective of the free choice of consumers on the market.

Four basic characteristics of the capitalist economic system distinguish it from the Soviet type:

1) Property, in capitalist economic systems, of our day are of various types. This diversity is conspicuous in the maintenance of family ownership in commerce and agriculture.

2) Capitalist systems must function in accordance with the requirements of external trade consequently.
national economy cannot be separated from world economy.

3) Distribution of national resources is determined by the consumers behaviour in the long run.

4) Trade unions are independent entities free of the state.

An evaluation of the Soviet system as already distinguished from the capitalist system will be appropriate at this juncture. However, we must bear in mind that the Soviet economic system does not typify all planned economies, being only an instance of the type having a few typical characteristics, and which is at a particular juncture in its economic development.

In the sphere of production, the foremost aspect is the introduction of collective ownership of large scale production in all sectors such as industry, agriculture and commerce. An examination of the achievement of different sectors reveals that the most noteworthy achievements have taken place in the basic heavy industries. In contradistinction agriculture has exhibited the most dismal performance. Socialist theories are, however, not applicable to all sectors.

Two kinds of collective ownership in agriculture, the true collective ownership called the Sovkhoz, and the alleged co-operative ownership the Kolkhoz are to be found in the Soviet
According to Stalin, the 'Kolkhoz' was a transitional phase in economic development while the 'Sovkhoz' was the true Marxist form. Stalin, however, did not specify the time of transition.

In the sphere of exchange and trade the Socialist economies have primarily utilized the prices in capitalist economies to ensure equity in their international exchanges. Prices in capitalist economies have enabled the Socialist economies to reach an honest compromise.

In the context of the regulation of the system and consumption the main objectives of the Soviet systems have been rapid industrialization, and expansion of national power by heavy investment and concentration of investment in heavy industry.

Criticisms of the basic principles of the West and Soviet economies

Aron examined some criticisms of the basic principles of the Western and Soviet economies and draw a profile of the principal criteria that characterize the two types of society. In Western societies the capitalist firm is the main form of enterprise. Firms differ greatly in size and juridical form. All the same, individual preferences, to a great extent determine production. Trade Unions lie outside the periphery of state control in most Western societies. The state intrudes into the
Aking of the economy to alter distribution of income and maintain full employment. However, the authority of the planners is limited to their own frontier as the national economies cannot be separated from the international market. It should be noted that freedom of trade unions and state intervention to regulate the economy were not features of capitalist societies in the nineteen century. Aron also analysed the main characteristics of the Soviet type of economy and the introduction of collective ownership, large-scale enterprise in agriculture, commerce and industry.

Theoretically a complete deletion of consumer sovereignty is not an essential feature of a planned economy. However, it is understandable that at a certain juncture of economic development, planners might take into account consumer's preferences in determining the prices of consumer goods, and vary the distribution of resources accordingly.

In a capitalist system profit encourages production while in the Soviet system profit merely induces the manager to perform at his best. In a Soviet system profit does not influence the allocation of resources between sectors of production.

Soviet society may be considered in three ways:

1) as a planned economy;
2) as a certain of revolutionary party which enjoys monopoly of power and ideas, or as part of the
Aron points out that the beginning of Clark's and Fourastié's theory of growth is that technical progress is the primary characteristic in this process, that is, one hour's work produces greater value in our times than a century earlier.

Classical theorists of growth distinguish three sections. In this context Colin Clark's easiest classification places agriculture in the first category, industry in the second, and everything else in the third.

Considering the satisfaction of primary needs of the population of a society, we must point out that on condition that the increase in population does not outstrip the speed of technical progress, the agricultural populace continues to decrease in modern progressive societies.

**Industrialism**

The industrialism thesis begins where the theory of industrialization stops. Moore, Rosalitz and Nash dealt with the lower and middle stratum of the process of industrialization.
Industrialism is the ultimate outcome of this process. The question we will try to answer: What does an industrial society look like? This question also involves a distinction between industrialization and industrialism. Industrialization is the process while industrialism is the culmination of this process incorporating all the aspects of a developed industrial society. The major theorists of industrialism are Clark Kerr, John Dunlop, Frederick Harbison and Charles Myers whose influential book, Industrialism and Industrial Man has been a subject of discussion.

Dahrendorf dealt with institutionalization of class conflict. Clark Kerr concerned himself with the diminishing rate of strikes along with the progress of societies towards industrialism. The affluence of capitalism enabled the middle class to include the proletariat. The industrialism thesis puts forward the view that industrialization is an interplay between the unique, the related and the universal. There is prodigious variety among societies which are in the process of industrialization. Each society is unique from the cultural as well as historical point of view and the incept of its industrialization variety in these aspects does not prevent societies from being 'related' by ideologies and strategies of the elites along the path to industrialization. The pervasiveness of science and technology unites these different societies with a common objective, namely, pluralistic industrialism.
Fundamental features of pluralistic Industrialism

The primary aspect, concern with the character and allocation of power in industrial society helps us to differentiate between pluralistic industrialism and industrialism. Power in pluralistic industrialism will be neither monistic nor atomistic. The state plays an important role in ensuring that the infrastructure is maintained, and pressure groups do not go beyond tolerable limits. The state determines the rules and implements them as well.

The industrial society does not imply elimination of all conflict but raises the questions: Who will conflict with whom, over what issues? The answers to these questions involve a deviation from Marx. First, conflict will exist within a broad system of consensus over major objectives and directions. The foundations of the system will remain intact as conflict will be restricted to gaining dominance, a greater share of power, privilege and control over economic resources, rather than annihilation of opposing groups.

In an industrial society conflict will not assume the proportion of open warfare on account of the nature of the conflicting groups. The precondition for class Warfare that is the polarization of society into two great classes, will be replaced by a large number of pressure groups. The class structure will conform to the Weberian rather than the Marxian model.

The
principal difference between the two models is that according
to Marx, a person's rank in the production system determines
his class; he is either a member of the capitalist class or
the proletariat. Weber, on the other hand, maintained that
a person's class is determined by his market position.

**Industrialism Reconsidered**

The authors of industrialism reconsidered their thesis
ten years after it was first published in 1960. They retained
their opinions on several important aspects but made three
major modifications. First, they conceded that they had over
emphasized the power of cultural barriers in the industriali-
zation of newly developing societies as diverse cultures have
not hindered industrialization. Second, the industrialism
thesis distinctly emphasizes the role of technology in chang-
ging society. From this a deterministic relationship in which
social structures and institutions are constrained to adopt
changing technology, may be inferred.

The authors of industrialism pointed that the influence
of technology would be greatest in areas closest to the produc-
tion process. The occupational structure would have to be in
keeping with the demands of technology. The impact of tech-
ology is not so great in spheres away from the production pro-
cess. The educational system and the religious system will
admit even less of the impact of technology in comparison to
the occupational structure. The final contention deals with the convergence between societies in the process of industrialization. Pluralistic industrialism implies equal allocation of power between the state, the enterprise and the individual in his different capacities. The capitalist society gives a little more power to the enterprise, and the socialist society to the state. This, however, does not contradict the concept of pluralism.

A Critique of Industrialism

Industrialism thesis seeks to incorporate the experience of all industrialized and industrializing societies that is the gamut of human society within a single theoretical framework. A few dominant contentions against the kernel of the theory, which can be divided into three broad categories, have to be taken into account.

The first category of criticism deals with the character of human society. Critics contend that the concept of a pluralistic industrialism is often regarded as the final objective of all societies, which mistakenly purports to state that social change will cease after the attainment of the said objective. Society can, however, never be static and immutable. Korr and his colleagues have said in response to this criticism that the theory of industrial society has attained its final objective that of pluralistic industrialism which is a dynamic
equilibrium and not a static one. The concept of pluralistic industrialism implies that the parts of society are turned to the demands of technology. Another contention against industrialism is that it will lead to an advanced form of social egalitarianism. Kerr and his colleagues, in this context had a prevision of a levelling of incomes in the middle stratum and the emergence of middle-class society.

It must be noted, however, that even in the middle stratum an increasing income does not always involve a rise in social position. Empirical studies, particularly in England have shown that a middle class income does not necessarily guarantee a middle-class status, as there are other criteria such as values, attitudes, style of living, position in the authority structure that determine class position. The control and exercise of power, according to Kerr, is an important criterion for distinguishing between the middle-class professional and the manual worker.

The professed ability of industrialism to bring about equality has often been impugned on the grounds mentioned above. Kerr, however, strongly maintains that equality will come to all industrializing societies, inspite of the lack of an explicitly egalitarian ideology. The most caustic criticism of the industrialism thesis is that industrialization will produce a world society made up of essentially similar industrial nations. The converging influence of industrialization constitutes the third sphere of criticism.
Within this framework, one criticism deals with the time dimension. The second criticism relates to ideological differences between societies which allegedly heighten divergence rather than convergence. Kerr gives economic factors more importance than political causes in shaping society. The predominance of political decision over economic factors makes us doubt the premise that power in industrial society is either monistic or atomistic. Kerr asserts that totalitarianism and industrialism are incompatible. In Russia, however, the two co-exist. Alex Inkles has conceded that while there has been a reduction in economic inequality in Russia, the power distribution continues to be concentrated in the hands of a minority. The most substantial contention against the critique is that the sort of convergence, Kerr and his associates envisaged, will never materialize. Kerr was convinced about the unifying power and the homogenizing impact of technology, which, is true at a general level.

Moore held that significant differences will persist within the overall framework of convergence. Japan can be adduced as an instance of persistent pluralism. Dore regarded the Japanese system as 'organization oriented', in contradistinction to 'market-oriented' British system. Taking into account the importance which Kerr attaches to industrial societies being market societies, the continuance of a non-market employment system in Japan must be seen as a major area of divergence.
Dore imputes the provenance of divergence to the belated development of that nation. He opined that 'The Institutional acquired by Britain as the pioneer of industrialization, may slow down the adaptation of institutions to the existence of the giant corporation and to the growing strength of egalitarian ideas... curiously, Dore points out that Britain and not Japan will have to transform itself to a non-market form of organization.

Post-Industrialism

The post-industrialism thesis is strongly connected with Daniel Bell who forwarded some theories on industrial society too. The post-industrial society differs radically from the industrial society in the economy and social structure. The main difference lies in the axial principle. The axial principle of the industrial society is machine technology whereas that of post-industrialism is theoretical knowledge, which can be acquired from universities and research institutions — the axial structures containing the strategic resource of the new society. The technology changes along with the basic resource which brings about a change in the nature of the product, which is primarily service as distinguished from goods. This change also engenders a transformation in the occupational structure of the society. White-collar office workers constitute the single largest group in the labour force. This group of white-collar office workers are dominated by professional, technical and scientific groups.
The post-industrialism thesis is, to a great extent, based upon macro statistical data. Employment figures provide the most significant evidence. In the nineteen-fifties, the United States became the first country to have a majority of its working population employed in the tertiary sector, which grew rapidly and had risen to about 60 percent by the seventies. England underwent a similar pattern of change in the sixties and other countries are expected to undergo a transition from a manufacturing to a service economy in course of time. Thus, the contribution of the service sector to the gross national product is increasing rapidly. Consequently, the distribution of finance towards higher education and research is increasing steadily, implying that theoretical knowledge is the main organizing principle of such societies.

Dell puts forward the idea that post-industrialism is a panacea for many of the ills of industrial societies. The primary aspect about work in a post-industrial society is that individuals interact with one another rather than machines. Post-industrialism is allegedly different from industrialism in its impact on people. Industrialism created alienation along with material affluence. Post-industrialism, on the other hand, offers a solution to the alienation of the individual by offering work that is not dull or monotonous. This optimistic vision has been strongly criticized. Firstly, Marxists will not concede that the phenomenon of alienation can be removed within
a capitalist set-up as alienation stems from the private ownership of the instruments of production, and post-industrialism does not imply an escape from capitalism.

Secondly, Bell’s main contention that employment in the service has increased at the cost of employment in industry, has been opposed. It has been argued that the expansion of the tertiary sector has been achieved at the cost of agriculture and not industry. Bell’s assertion that the number of professionals among the white-collar is increasing, has also been called into question. It has been alleged that professionals in the service sector do not enjoy freedom or exercise knowledge discretion and ingenuity to any great extent. Most of these professionals perform regulated jobs at someone else’s directions. The staff of scientific and technological research institution may be adduced to show that such professionals are given impressive titles such as scientists, research investigator, draftsman or engineer, although their actual job is to perform experiments, collect data and produce drawings according to stipulated specifications.

**Industrialisation**

Human society has been radically changed by large-scale factory production resulting in the recognition of ‘type of society having its characteristic mark — the industrial society. The major dichotomy in the world is between industri-
lising and industrialised societies. Industrialising societies are desperately wanting to catch up with the industrialised societies. Consequently, societies are left with no alternative and industrialization seems inevitable.

Industrialization implies persistent economic growth involving inanimate provenances of power and mechanization of production. Industrialization was initially confined to factory production and later on spread to agriculture and services compared with pre-industrial organization, it contain division of labour, new social relations of production between the owners of capitals, managers and workers, urbanizations and the geographical concentration of industry and population, and a transformation of the occupational structure. Industrialization is not only restricted to capitalist economies. A comprehension of the nature and impact of industrialization and industrial society is fundamental to sociology.

The great effects of industrialization have penetrated into all places where machine-technology has been introduced. There is, however, a basic difference between the early and late developers. In England, the United States and Western Europe, development of machine technology spanned a century approximately.

Indian industrialization is now more than a hundred years old. India had some elements of industrialism, such as
highly refined craft skills, tradition of urban life and production for a market, even before the inception of industrialism. Gadgil considers Indian industrialization to be evolutionary rather than revolutionary. Some of the Gulf countries such as Iran, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait etc., can be cited as examples of a pre-industrial society trying to adopt the latest industrial technology, despite the fact that their social institutions and the demands of industry are incompatible. Although we know very little about the effects of industrialization in these societies, they will undoubtedly go through a process of traumatic social change.

The two dominant dimensions of social consequences of industrialization are: (1) the dichotomy between developing and developed societies, (2) the political division between the Western free market economic systems and the Soviet-type economic system. There have been two distinct stages in the erudite comprehension of the consequences of industry. The first was the consideration of industrialism as a process and the second was related to the consideration of industrialism as an end-product of this process. The earlier generation of scholars such as Hoselitz and Moore attempted to detach the social preconditions and consequences of industrialization. They viewed industrialization as a process of social change which was facilitated by certain pre-conditions. The social change had some consequences. In the second stage of comprehension scholars
tried to out-line the social structure of the fully evolved industrial society, called industrialism.

**Pre-conditions and consequences of Industrialization**

Paradoxically, the consequences that emanate from the industrialization process are also its preconditions. The implication is that the social institution and patterns of behaviour that emerge as a consequence of industrialization, pre-exist in a society in order to facilitate industrial development. It does not, however, follow that industrialization cannot be achieved unless these pre-conditions are met. In spite of that a society may set out on the part of development, although its course may be marked by vicissitudes.

**Pre-conditions**

A committed labour force is a pre-requisite to industrialization. Commitment means an acceptance of the values of industrial society and its manifestation in the behaviour of workers who must regard industrial work as a desirable occupation. In view of the protean nature of industrial technology, the labour force must be able to adopt successfully as far as skill or craft is concerned.

Political stability is also essential for industrial growth. The value of rationalization is of paramount importance in this form of economic organization. The embryonic stage of the Industrial Revolution in England should be regard
ded as corresponding to the birth of modern values in the middle of the sixteenth century rather than the great inventions that occurred a century later. The role of entrepreneurship in industrialization has been considered to be greatly important by both economists and psychologists. David McClelland's contention that economic development is dependent upon the existence of a 'need-achievement orientation' in society, is noteworthy.

**Consequences**

Industrial employment brings about a specific form of relationship among fellow workers, superior and machines. Social scientists have observed that the factory is a community besides being a place of work, marked by informal relations among workers as a consequence of constant interaction. The industrial organization is overtly hierarchical. The level of technology and the size of the enterprise influence the impact of industry. Large industries using complex technology have a pyramidal structure of authority with clearly outlined spheres of competence at every level outside the work place. Industrialization brings about far reaching changes in the economy. The workforce shifts from subsistence to commercial activity. Commercialization implies the mobility of labour and capital in terms of skill and occupation as well as geographical position. The offshoot of commercialization is a consumer society and urbanization. Mobility is essential to an industrial society and extended kin-
ship obligation hinder mobility. The Kinship group must be therefore, small. Talcott Parsons has proposed that the structurally isolated nuclear family is conducive to the industrial society. The industrialization theory regards traditional conventions as retarding economic development.

A polemical aspect is the argument that the extended family is dysfunctional in an industrial society, and therefore, the evolution of a new Kinship system based on the nuclear family must take place. In India, the joint family has persisted in spite of urbanization and industrialization. The extended family is also the primary provenance of managerial personnel, and people required for the expansion of industry. Sheth has argued that employment in industries assists migrant workers to better fulfil their obligations to the extended family. According to the industrialization theory, industrial development is not compatible with subsistence peasant economies. The major obstacle underlying the industrialization thesis is that the correlates of industrialization have been developed primarily on the basis of western empiricism. The premise that the consequences of Western industrial development will correspond to the experience of developing societies as well required to be re-examined thoroughly.

The Logic of Industrialization

Every country has been caught in the vortex of indus-
trialization which has substantially changed pre-industrial societies. The main directions in which pre-industrial societies are likely to change can be ascertained from the existing character of industrialized societies. The common features of industrialization may be delineated as skilled manpower, particularly in the technical, professional and managerial strata as a precondition. Creation of demand for new skills to replace of obsolescent ones and the structuring of the work force along a hierarchy of skills and reward which is determined accordingly. A general elevation of educational standard of the society as the only way of upward mobility may be observed.

Social institutions will also change in a definite direction. Infrastructural facilities such as transport, communication, housing, banking and educational institutions in cities and metropolises lead to a concentration of industries. The main characteristic of the industrial society apart from being an urban society is the large organizations producing goods and services. The authority structure of the organization will divide power to command and responsibility to obey. Rules are increasingly being formulated on a consensus between the managers and the workers, with governmental assistance. The government is therefore, an intermediary between the rulers and the ruled and not simply an organization for pandering to bourgeois interests as contended by Marx. The industrial society evolves a system of values which lays stress on individual mobility,
hard work, scientific and technological knowledge and the recognition of merit.

Post-Industrial Society

The concept of post-industrial society was first formulated and propounded by Daniel Bell in 1962 and later expanded in *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society* (1974) to incorporate economic and social changes in the later half of the twentieth century. Society may be divided into three parts for purposes of analysis: the social structure, the polity, and the culture.

Economy, technology and occupational system constitute the social structure. The polity allocates power and serves as the arbiter in the conflict of demands of individual and groups. The culture is the area of expressive symbolism and implications. The division of society on these lines is convenient as each group is dominated by a different axial principle. In modern Western society the axial principle of social structure is economizing—the manner of distributing resources according to principles of least cost, substitutability, optimization, maximization etc. The axial principle of modern polity is 'participation', sometimes regulated and demanded from below, and that of culture is the craving for self-aggrandisement.

The concept of post-industrial society is basically concerned with alterations in the social structure, the mode of transformation of economy and the reworking of the occupational
system are also the new relations between empiricism and theory particularly science and technology. A facet of post-industrial society - the increasing bureaucratization of science and the increasing specialization of intellectual work into minute parts, exemplifies a part of the concept of the post-industrial society.

The concept of the post-industrial society is a broad generalization which can be understood more easily if five dimensions, or components of the term are distinguished:

1) Economic Sector the production of services rather than goods,

2) Occupational distribution: the dominance of professional and technical class.

3) Axial principle: the dominance of theoretical knowledge as the provenance of innovation and its importance in policy formulation for the society.

4) Future orientation: technological control and technological evaluation.

5) Decision-making, the creation of a new intellectual technology.

1. The creation of a service economy

Colin Clark, in his conditions of Economic progress divided the economy into three sectors for exagetic purposes —
primary, secondary and tertiary. The primary sector was principally agricultural, the secondary was industrial and the tertiary consisted of the services.

The primary feature of a post-industrial society is that a majority of the labour force is engaged in the tertiary sector incorporating services such as trade, finance, transport, health recreation, research, education, and government. In Africa and Asia, the primary sector engages more than 70 percent of the labour force. In Western and Northern Europe, more than half of the total employment is in the secondary sector. The United States is the only nation in the world in which the service sector employs the majority of the population and accounts for more than half of the gross national product. In a post-industrial society the emphasis is on a different kind of services: health, education, research and government, and not the personal services, business or transportation, communication and utilities, which is the decisive factor for this type of a society.

2. The pre-eminence of the professional and technical class

Another way of defining a post-industrial society is on the basis of the change of occupational distribution that is the place of work and the kind of work they do. The enlargement of the tertiary sector has resulted in a shift to white-collar occupations.
3. The primacy of theoretical knowledge

Industrial society is the coordination of technology and personnel for the production of goods. Post-industrial society is built around knowledge with the objective of social control and regulation of innovation and change, leading to the emergence of new social relationships and edifices which have to be managed politically.

Knowledge is essential to the functioning of any society. The post-industrial society is, however, distinguished by the change in the character of knowledge. All our major industries such as steel, electric power, telegraph, telephone, automobile, aviation may be regarded as nineteenth century industries as they were primarily the creation of inventors.

The strategic provenance or the axial principle of a post-industrial society is theoretical knowledge and the intellectual institutions—universities, research organizations where theoretical knowledge is systematically arranged and expanded, are the axial structures of the society.

4. The planning of technology

Modern industrial economics came into existence only with the creation of new institutions such as Banks, Insurance Companies, equity capital through the stock market etc. and mechanisms such as government levies to build up savings for investment. The ability of re-investing at least percent of
G.N.P. became the foundation of what W.W. Rostow has termed the "take-off" point for economic growth. But a modern society has been impelled to open new technological frontiers in order to avoid stagnation or "maturity" and ensure higher standards of living.

5. The rise of a new intellectual technology

Alfred North Whitehead pointed out that the greatest invention of the nineteenth century was the method of invention itself. The dominant intellectual and sociological problems of the post-industrial society are the management of complex systems with a view to achieving specific goals.

Significance of Post-Industrial Society

The importance of post-industrial society are enumerated below:

1) It augments the function of science and cognitive values as a primary institutional necessity of the society.

2) The scientist or economist is more directly brought into the political process as decisions are more technical.

3) By furthering existing proclivities towards the bureaucratization of intellectual work, it produces a requirement for redefining values and concepts of intellectual pursuits.
The expansion of the technical intelligentsia raises questions of importance regarding the relation of the technical and literary intellectual.