Chirot, D. and T. Hall. 1981. "World-System Theory." *Annual Review of Sociology* 8:81–105.
Coser, L. 1976. "Sociological Theory from the Chicago Dominance to 1965." *Annual Review of Sociology* 2:145–160.
Evans, P. and J. Stephens. 1988. "Development and the World Economy." Pp. 739–773 in *Handbook of Sociology*, edited by N. Smelser. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
Gleick, J. 1987. *Chaos: Making a New Science*. New York: Penguin Books.
Lyman, S. and A. Vidich. 1988. *Social Order and the Public Philosophy: An Analysis and Interpretation of the works of Herbert Blumer*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press.
Maines, D. 1989a. "Herbert Blumer and the Possibility of Science in the Practice of Sociology: Further Thoughts." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 18: 160–177.
———. 1989b. "Repackaging Blumer: The Myth of Herbert Blumer's Astructural Bias." Pp. 379–409 in *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, edited by N. Denzin. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
Meltzer, B., J. Petras, and L. Reynolds. 1975. *Symbolic Interactionism*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Morrione, T. 1988. "Herbert Blumer (1900–1987): A Legacy of Concepts, Criticisms, and Contributions." *Symbolic Interaction* 11:1–12.
———. (ed.) in press. *The Collected Papers of Herbert Blumer: Fundamentals of Symbolic Interactionism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Smelser, N. 1988. "Social Structure." Pp. 103–129. in *Handbook of Sociology*, edited by N. Smelser. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
Stryker, S. 1980. *Symbolic Interactionism*. Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin/Cummings.
Walton, J. 1987. "Theory and Research on Industrialization." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 12:89–1-9.

I

Introduction

The purpose of this book is to analyze critically the role of industrialization as a cause of social change. This analysis is undertaken because of a realization that current thought misrepresents and misunderstands the causal character of industrialization. As the following pages will make clear, there are pronounced confusion, great vagueness, and unwarranted premises in present thought on what industrialization is supposed to do to social life. These deficiencies and faults affect seriously the character of research, the nature of theoretical analysis, and the formulation of social policies with regard to industrialization. The deficiencies and faults are not casual or peripheral; they are not to be remedied by merely refining current conceptions or by tightening up on research procedure. Instead they are embedded in the basic way in which industrialization is conventionally viewed as an agency of social change. They stem from beliefs that are felt to be intrinsically true and that are taken for granted. For this reason scholars show little awareness of the deficiencies and faults, much less any disposition to deal with them. The axiomatic character of the underlying beliefs insulates them from question and examination. The result is that scholars cling to a fixed, even though vague, image of industrialization as a causal agent. In ordering research and theoretical analysis in terms of this image, they are led unwittingly to direct research to dubious problems and to conduct theoretical analysis along questionable lines. The discussion in this monograph will consider the fundamental difficulties that beset study and thought on the alleged social effects of industrialization. It is hoped that an understanding and appreciation of these sources of basic error will contribute to clearer perceptions and lead to more fruitful inquiries.

The analysis will center on "early" industrialization, namely, industrialization that is introduced into industrially underdeveloped areas. Such early industrialization has become a major object of study today. It

poses vividly the general question of the social effects of industrialization. We propose to analyze the role of early industrialization in social change. However, the main conclusions of this monograph apply generally to industrialization wherever it is being treated as an agent of social change.

The reader should be reminded of the important place that is customarily assigned to industrialization as an agent of social transformation. Industrialization is commonly regarded as a major factor, if not the most important factor, in the profound alteration undergone by Western civilization in the last two centuries. It is recognized to be a radically different type of economic production, based on the utilization of physical power such as steam and electricity, the replacement of hand labor by machines, and the development of a factory system. Appearing and developing as a new type of economy, it has moved group life from an agricultural base to an "industrial" base. In this movement multitudes of people have been shifted from rural to urban conditions of existence, torn away from old modes of living, and ushered into a new organization of life. A wide proliferation and unending series of social changes are commonly conceived as resulting from this shift: changes in work organization, changes in the kinds of groups in which people live, changes in social relations, changes in residence, changes in institutions, changes in standards of living, changes in interests and objectives, changes in values and ideals, and changes in problems of social control. Viewed historically, these changes in Western countries appear extensive and profound.

Such social transformations are continuing today. Obviously, the course of industrialization has not come to an end. Instead of slowing down, industrialization is accelerating. Today, it is undergoing worldwide growth and vast inner transformation.* One might say that industrialization has become the major commitment of modern civilization. To develop basic industry, to build factories and mills, to construct dams, to build generating plants, to multiply and transmit motor power, to extend means of transportation and communication, to devise and introduce new machinery, to develop and employ technical experts, to provide instruction in technical skills, to develop science and engage in research on behalf of industrial development—these represent increas-

*Editors' Note: This assessment of industrial growth was accurate when written, but was before the period of decline and intense foreign competition in the U.S. during the 1970s and 1980s. We recognize it as an overstatement, as would have Blumer, but have left it in the text to preserve its originality and as a rhetorical device in which Blumer emphasizes the importance of industrialization wherever it occurs. We feel the significant thing, moreover, is that Blumer's formulation can retain its original character and form whether a society is experiencing industrial growth, decline, or stagnation.

ingly the goals of national policy, the implicit aims of industrial life, and the lines of development of modern civilization. However much advanced nations, such as the United States and the Soviet Union, differ in their respective ideologies and national ideals, they are alike in a profound commitment to industrialization. The less industrially advanced countries, the new nations, the countries comprising the so-called underdeveloped regions of the world, are also developing such commitments. Whether correctly or not, these latter countries are coming to look on industrialization as the means of combating their agricultural poverty, of meeting dire problems of excessive population, of raising the standards of living of their people, of reducing their economic dependency on a precarious world market, of acquiring a place of strength and power in the international scene, and thus of gaining status and respect.

All of these diverse manifestations suggest that industrialization has been elevated to the status of a major "motif" or cardinal theme of modern life. It is in the air as an intellectual doctrine, it is present in high-level national and international policy, it becomes increasingly a responsibility of governmental practice, and it is an intrinsic self-developing feature of modern economy. Industrialization has all of the basic characteristics of a true ideology—it represents a way of action, it has a goal, it constitutes a faith, it is a working policy, and it is something on which fundamental dependency is placed. In many ways it is *the* ideology of modern civilization. The future of industrialization is vast expansion and accelerated development. Impelled forward by its own motivations, abetted vigorously by deliberate state policy, and utilizing more and more the dynamic resources of research and technological discovery, industrialization seems destined to shape increasingly the framework of human group life.

As a new form of economy that is undergoing prodigious growth and spreading its domain, industrialization is perceived as a major agent of social transformation. A perusal of the literature shows an imposing, indeed a spectacular, array of social changes that are commonly attributed to it. Let us mention only a few of the more important items of this array: the migration of people; the disintegration of rural villages; the growth of cities; the tearing down of authority systems and traditional leadership; the undermining of moral codes and established values; the disorganization of families and communities; the creation of urban problems, such as congestion, unhealthy living quarters, crime, delinquency, and individual demoralization; the formation of new class structures; the transformation of existing institutions, such as the family, religion, education, government, law, and the arts; the development of new forms of social mobility; the development of new standards of living; the cultivation of new tastes, wishes, and aspirations; the stimulation of

unrest and discontent; the introduction of industrial conflict; and the incitation to radical and revolutionary movements. The foregoing list is sufficient to show the extensive influence that is commonly assigned in scholarly thought to industrialization. It is evident that industrialization is viewed as a massive agency of transformation. It is regarded as a powerful force pushing out along diverse lines, undermining established forms of group life, occasioning disorganization, and forcing institutions and social life into new molds. Scarcely any phase of group life is seen as immune to its touch. Almost always its influence is taken as profound.

This general view of industrialization as an agent of social change shapes the way in which scholars approach its study. Three features of this view as it affects scholarly pursuit need to be noted. The *first* of these is the practice of treating industrialization as a unitary force. However complex may be its depiction and however varied may be its forms, industrialization is handled as having a singular character. This disposition to treat it as an entity is clearly shown in usage, as in the innumerable instances of declaring that industrialization does this or that thing to group life. A *second* feature is that industrialization is endowed, either explicitly or implicitly, with causal influence. It is regarded as producing effects. The *third* feature is that industrialization is thought to lead to specific results. The itemization of social changes and happenings that has been given above illustrates this disposition to tie industrialization to specific effects. This, then, is the image of industrialization that one finds in scholarly work that is concerned with the general question of what industrialization does to group life. The occasional disclaimer and the occasional employment of noncausal terminology actually do not alter the imagery. Let us consider briefly these seeming qualifications.

One position is that industrialization does not operate by itself but in combination with other factors; thus, given social happenings are not to be attributed solely to industrialization. This position does not change the picture of industrialization as a causal agent. Insofar as the position is adhered to, it means either a specification of the conditions under which industrialization leads to given social happenings, or else a distribution of the "causal influence" among several factors, of which industrialization is one. In either case, industrialization retains its status as a causal agent producing specific effects.

A second disclaimer is to assert that one's interest is merely to establish "correlations" between industrialization and other happenings, as for example between industrialization and urbanization. This seeming escape from attributing causal agency to industrialization is rarely achieved. Almost always industrialization is placed in a temporally prior

position and the given correlated happening is viewed as an ensuing consequence. In the light of the established correlation, it is held that the introduction of industrialization will result in the given happening; never is it asserted, as far as I can find, that because of the correlation the introduction of the correlated social happening will lead to industrialization. Thus, in the correlation between industrialization and urbanization there is the implicit thought that if industrialization occurs urbanization will follow; there is not the thought that if urbanization occurs first, industrialization will emerge to an extent suggested by the correlation. The imagery of industrialization as a causal agent still lurks behind the correlation formula.

Finally, there is the attempt to revise the picture by using different terminology, such as the current tendency to speak of the "social implications" of industrialization in place of the "social effects" of industrialization. So far as I can ascertain, this new terminology does not change the basic imagery. It is still assumed that industrialization does something; the central interest is to find out what this "something" is. Stated otherwise, the "implications" of industrialization refer to and are constituted by its results; they are not the implications of these results. In this important sense the work under the new terminology is still guided by the underlying image of industrialization as a unitary force operating to bring about a variety of specific social happenings. This imagery clearly saturates past and present scholarship dealing with industrialization.

In the writer's judgment, this view of the causal efficacy of industrialization is not a result of critical assessment. This may seem to be a strange, indeed an unwarranted, statement in the light of the considerable amount of scholarly study devoted to industrialization. Nevertheless, as subsequent discussion will make clear, the picture of industrialization as an agent producing specific social effects has not come from careful and meticulous analysis. Instead, it has arisen from vivid impressions that led observers spontaneously to view industrialization as producing a wide variety of social happenings. For example, an observer views a preindustrial community with a given organization of inhabitants, carrying on a given round of life; a factory system is introduced into it; all kinds of significant changes take place—changes in kinds of work, in residence, in family life, in class relations, in the contentedness of people, in their ideas and hopes in the operation of their local institutions, and so forth. Such changes seemingly stare one in the face. What is more natural than to attribute them to the industrialization that has entered the community? The sheer perception of the changes following upon industrialization gives rise automatically to the belief that industrialization is responsible for them. This is the way, it seems to me, by which the picture of industrialization as a causal agent has come into

being. My interest at this moment is not to protest the validity of the picture, but only to point out that the picture has not been developed as an outcome of careful analysis. Instead, it has arisen spontaneously from seemingly self-evident observations.

The image of the causal efficacy of industrialization has become embedded so deeply in scholarly thought that its truth is taken for granted. Today, scholars assume that it is obvious that where industrialization is introduced it is responsible for such happenings as urbanization, the formation of new class structures, the disintegration of an earlier family system, the formation of new tastes and wishes, the appearance of unrest and discontent, and the formation of radical movements. The idea of the influential agency of industrialization has come to be axiomatic. Being shared by seemingly all members of the scholarly community, it is constantly reaffirmed in their mutual discourse, and thus escapes the discordant notes of criticism that might compel an examination of it. Implanted in the recesses of thought it is taken for granted and thus comes unwittingly to order the direction of perception, study, and analysis.

In common with many collective beliefs, which are felt to be intrinsically true, the notion of industrialization as a causative agent is very vague and confused. This vagueness and confusion stems, first of all, from a lack of concern with the task of identifying industrialization and specifying its character. In reading the literature one rarely finds a reasonable clarification of what is being referred to in speaking of industrialization. Usually, the term "industrialization" is taken for granted as having a self-evident meaning. It would appear that most of those who use it feel that its nature is intuitively conveyed by its label, so that there is no need to specify its character. One result, as the following chapter will make clear, is that industrialization is merged and hence confused with a shifting variety of other things. If an author is led to move beyond reliance on a self-evident meaning of the word, he is likely to do little more than to give a broad characterization of it that remains vague. Or he may refer to an historical instance, such as the familiar "industrial revolution" of Great Britain, feeling that such a reference is sufficient to convey an adequate understanding of what the term stands for. Or, again, he may select some item—such as a concentration of factories in a city or the use of certain kinds of machines—to stand for industrialization, without clarifying the nature of the industrialization that the item is presumed to represent. Indeed, very few scholars who treat industrialization as a causal agent even bother to make clear what they mean by it. Since the word serves the purpose of ordinary discourse, the common disposition is to take its meaning for granted. Such usage serves as a cloak for vagueness and confusion.

There is an even greater dearth of clarity with regard to how industrialization is supposed to operate to bring about the social changes attributed to it. Little if any attention is given to tracing the way or ways by which industrialization produces its alleged effects. The customary procedure is to assume that changes that are seen to follow in the wake of industrialization are due to industrialization. The "subsequent" is taken as the "consequent"; then, as the next step, industrialization is viewed as the cause, and the "consequent" is viewed as the effect. This failure to trace the process of alleged causation closes the chief avenue to an understanding of industrialization as an agent of social change. Our later discussion will show that this failure is the main reason why industrialization is misunderstood and misrepresented.

Scholars concerned with industrialization as a causative agent have been singularly insensitive to the two forms of vagueness indicated in the two foregoing paragraphs. That the concept of industrialization is not given any reasonably precise empirical reference occasions, seemingly, no misgiving. Nor, apparently, is the failure to trace the alleged causal action of industrialization any source of bother. This lack of concern is probably not so much an expression of indifference; it is more likely a result of not being aware of the two sources of vagueness. The image of industrialization as a powerful agent producing specific social results is so strong and seemingly so self-verifying that no need is perceived to specify the character of industrialization or to trace its mode of operation. Instead, one can take its nature as known and accept its causal efficacy as self-evident.

As I have said, it is through the filter of such an image that scholars perceive industrialization at work, stake out problems for study, organize research, make analyses, and fashion interpretations. In doing these various things they are guided by the idea that industrialization is a cause and that specifiable things that follow its operation are its effects. The effects may be conceived as all-encompassing as in the case of the Marxian idea of total social transformation resulting from capitalistic production. Or the effect may be given a restricted form as in the contention that industrialization produces a new and discontented class of industrial workers. There may be significant differences between scholars as to what are the effects of industrialization. This disagreement does not challenge the underlying premise that industrialization has specific social effects; it merely sets a problem of ascertaining what are the genuine social effects. Indeed, the primary goal of scholarship in this field is to find out what are the effects wrought by industrialization; both research and scholarly reflection are devoted to this end. The task becomes that of finding out what industrialization *does* to social life, irrespective of whether the concern is with a given country, a given

time, or a given area of group life. It does not matter, further, whether the study is historically oriented, whether it seeks merely to find out what industrialization is doing in a specific locality, or whether the study aims at a "scientific" or generalized proposition on industrialization as a causal agent producing specific social results. Thus, however much scholars may differ in their ideas of what are the effects of industrialization, or in the areas of effects with which they are concerned, or in the kind of knowledge which they seek, they are alike in holding to an image of industrialization as a causal agent. They treat industrialization as a unitary factor that acts as a steady pressure on group life to undermine specific parts of it, to set specific problems, and to mold it into specific forms.

The meaning of the previous statement that this image of industrialization shapes research and fashions interpretation should now be clear. The objective of research becomes the identification and specification of the effects of industrialization. Irrespective of the methods of study used, the student seeks to tie certain social happenings to industrialization. Industrialization is accepted as a determining agent, and given social happenings are treated as the results of its operation. Interpretation or explanation takes the form, basically, of a coupling of industrialization with such results. Knowledge, whether it be a simple proposition or an elaborate theory, is reducible to an assertion that industrialization causes, produces, induces, leads to, or brings about "such and such things" in group life. This underlying formula is followed in both investigation and interpretation. Clearly, the formula gives a definite and fixed character to research and to theoretical interpretation. It commits the research student or theoretically minded scholar to a fairly well defined procedure: First, he satisfies himself that he is dealing with a case or cases of industrialization; next, he turns to the central task of ascertaining and identifying what happens as a result of the presence or operation of industrialization; and, finally, he casts his findings or reflections into the form of assertions that industrialization has such and such consequences, effects, or results.

It may seem presumptious to inquire whether this formula is correct or valid. Most readers would say that the formula could not possibly be wrong. Their feeling would be that if it were wrong, the error could exist only in some remote or pedantic sense that has no practical significance. It is the belief of the author that the formula is erroneous, and that the significance of the error is considerable. The error introduces bias in the selection of problems, in the organization of inquiry, in the identification of relevant data, in the lines of analysis, and in the modes of interpretation. The error affects the accuracy of scholarship, the validity of knowledge, and the usefulness of social policy based on such knowledge.

The present monograph is addressed to the question of what is the character of industrialization as an instrument of social change. The monograph examines critically the concept of industrialization as used in scholarly thought. It seeks to inquire carefully into the way in which industrialization enters group life and presumably affects group life. In doing this it analyzes and evaluates conventional patterns of study. Further, it considers the implications for research of its most central finding—the somewhat startling point that industrialization is neutral as an agent of social change.

A critical analysis such as that attempted in the present study is particularly in order at the present time. We witness today a marked increase in scholarly interest in the social effects of industrialization. Research studies in this area are multiplying and will undoubtedly be much more numerous in the years immediately ahead. Similarly, there is an expansion and proliferation of the theoretical and interpretative literature on the social role of industrialization. This growth of research and scholarly interest is a reflection, of course, of the enormous development and expansion of industrialization in our contemporary world. In addition, it comes from a concern with an array of practical problems attending present industrialization. Formerly, scholars were inclined to treat industrialization as an historical happening that occurred in the recent past. Today, they view it more as a contemporary process from which is erupting a variety of pressing problems of practical importance. This shift in interest results not only from a growing effort on the part of scholars to explain what is happening in our world today. It is also a response to a growing demand for information and analysis that may serve as a basis of social policy.

Nowhere is this increasing concern with the influence of industrialization on group life more evident than in the case of the present-day industrialization of so-called backward areas. Such industrialization is expanding rapidly, not only as a result of the efforts of individual industrial entrepreneurs, but as a result of deliberate governmental policy. Today, it is the rule for governments of preindustrial areas to pin faith on industrialization as a sovereign remedy for grave economic and social ills. Many advanced industrial nations and several international agencies are contributing vast sums and appreciable technical assistance to the industrialization of economically retarded areas. This industrialization taking place before our eyes in underdeveloped regions has raised questions and set problems of serious practical import. These problems concern not only scholars, but also statesmen, governmental officials, institutional heads, and a variety of interested laymen. Let us note the more important sets of these practical problems:

A. *How can the industrialization of underdeveloped countries be spurred and helped along?* This question presupposes that there are social

conditions—such as prevailing attitudes and values, institutional patterns, social practices, and sets of social relations—that deter the initiation of industrialization or thwart its development after being implanted.

B. *How can the destruction of cherished values and institutions be prevented in the case of societies undergoing early industrialization?* It is recognized that early industrialization may undermine codes of morality, codes of personal integrity, systems of authority, esthetic values, religious values, and forms of respect that give character to a traditional order of life. The problem of protecting and preserving such values and forms in the face of industrialization has come to be seen by many as very important.

C. *How can serious social problems presumably connected with industrialization be prevented, restricted, or controlled?* There is a host of such problems: exploitation of workers; unhealthy and dangerous working conditions; congestion of workers in poor living quarters; absence of adequate housing, sanitation, medical care, and schooling; breakdown of family and community controls; crime, delinquency, and public disorder; personal and social disorganization; and various forms of industrial conflict.

D. *How can the political disruptive forces incident to early industrialization be avoided or contained?* Many students believe that in its early stages industrialization stimulates and releases new, powerful, and irresponsible political forces that threaten order and security locally as well as internationally. They view industrialization as conducive to social unrest, discontent, agitation, emotional disturbance, the rise of radical movements, demagoguery, and dictatorial leadership. They perceive these kinds of consequences particularly in the case of recent colonial peoples who are being subject to rapid industrialization.

Each of these four classes of practical problems has caught the attention of social scientists and has led many of them to undertake studies of the industrialization of underdeveloped areas. The result has been a great deal of theorizing, a stream of interpretative essays, many official inquiries, and a variety of research studies. As industrialization expands in underdeveloped areas, as practical social problems mount up, and as governmental agencies become more concerned with the consequences of their planned efforts, there will be increasing resort to studies to find out what industrialization is doing to group life.

In addition to the interest aroused among social scientists by the kinds of practical problems that have been mentioned, there are strong interests stemming from the traditional theoretical concerns of their disciplines. The profound changes seemingly wrought by industrialization in Western society have been objects of study for some time. In the hands of scholars as Marx, Weber, Sombart, and Durkheim, such studies have

ies have given rise to classical analyses. The new wave of early industrialization over the globe is reawakening theoretical interest among social scientists in industrialization as an agency of social change. Vital theoretical problems are posed with vigor, relating to such things as the transformation of traditional structures; the emergence of a new social organization with new values and norms, new institutional arrangements, new stratified relations, and new structures of authority and power; and the play of process of change represented by migratory movements, social mobility, secularization, social disorganization, and the "massification" of society. It is not surprising that with such disciplinary interests an increasing number of social scientists have turned their attention to the current transformation taking place among so-called underdeveloped peoples.

In view of this growth of scholarly interest in the practical and theoretical problems of early industrialization, the present analysis may be found to be timely.

One final observation needs to be made in these introductory remarks. We wish to call attention to the different character of present-day study of industrialization. Earlier study was primarily historical, using various kinds of documentary materials and relying chiefly on historical reconstruction. Today, study has shifted considerably to the investigation of industrialization in current operation. This new concern permits a wider use of the extensive arsenal of research techniques that have been developed by social science. It also benefits from the richer body of concepts and principles that make up the theoretical knowledge of social science. Today, research is likely to involve field investigation, the use of questionnaires, the carrying out of different kinds of interviews, the making of systematic surveys, the use of various kinds of census data, and the inspection of various kinds of contemporary records. These forms of research may be conducted on a high level of sophistication and expertness, observing all the canons of scientific procedure that have been developed in the respective disciplines. Further, the research is likely to be guided by the analytical thought that has accumulated in the given social sciences. The concepts, established principles, and theoretical schemes of the disciplines allow for greater sophistication in framing problems, in selecting data, and in analyzing findings.

This newer character of research, with its first-hand contact with what is actually going on, its use of a variety of tested techniques, its use of a richer stock of analytical concepts and principles, and its stricter devotion to scientific study, would seemingly assure effective answers to the question of what industrialization does to group life. Yet, paradoxically, this assurance is not given. Despite the superior character of present-day study along the lines that have been mentioned, such study still

remains under the control of an image, or set of premises, of doubtful validity. Apparently, the difficulties of this underlying imagery are not overcome by enlarged first-hand observation, by the improvements in techniques of inquiry, or by the refinement of conventional conceptions. What seems to be called for is a new perspective.

Our inquiry will begin with an examination of the nature of industrialization. Subsequently, we shall consider the crucial question of how industrialization operates in leading to social change.

II

Ambiguity of the Concept of Industrialization

To study industrialization effectively one must be able to identify it clearly. To make reliable declarations about what it does one must be clear as what it refers to. Such a clear identification is a first and certainly a cardinal prerequisite to meaningful scientific study and to sound scholarly interpretation. Only a clear specification of the reference of the term enables one to identify whether a given occurrence in the empirical world is or is not an instance of industrialization. Further, it is only with such a clear specification that it is possible to separate what is genuinely industrialization from what seems like it but is logically different from it. Still further, such a clear specification alone makes it possible to bring together the findings of divergent studies with the confidence that such findings are contributing to an increase in knowledge of a common thing. These observations are so commonplace that there should be no need to say them. Yet the term "industrialization," as it is used by practically all students interested in the social effects of industrialization, is markedly deficient in meeting this requirement of a clear and discriminating identification of what it refers to.

A perusal of the literature dealing with industrialization as an agent of social change or an examination of current research seeking to ascertain the social effects of industrialization shows that the term "industrialization" does not have a clear, discriminating, or common reference. A few scholars, notably several economic historians studying the development of modern industry, reach a definite and empirically grounded conception of industrialization. Their conception is rarely reflected in the writings or research undertakings of students concerned with industrialization as an agent of social change. In the case of these writings and research undertakings one finds, typically, that the term, "industrialization" is either undefined, vague, confused, or given a precision that is superficial and misleading.

sion into this interaction of developments from outside it imparts further occasion and impetus to a rearrangement of the situation. While the situation acquires temporary states of fixed form, these are results of a prior formative process; furthermore, the fixity is tenuous in view of the possibility of new developments and new assessments. It is unnecessary to point out that the period of early industrialization is particularly productive of such developments and assessments.

The same kind of picture that we have briefly sketched for the factory situation will be found at the other points of contact of the industrializing process with preindustrial societies. Whether the situation be the industrial community with its residential assemblage of workers, the recruitment and allocation of industrial personnel, the development of a class of industrial workers, the competition between manufactured goods and handicraftsmen's products, the quest for power and prestige on the part of industrial owners, the use of industrial income or the rearrangement of consumption patterns in response to available manufactured merchandise, we note the same significant conditions. These conditions are: a process of formation, an interaction between what is initially presented by the industrializing process and what is present in the social situation, and the entry of other factors into the situation during the process of formation. The initially constituted factors do not determine the process of formation; instead they are modified and altered in interacting with each other and changed in response to new factors that emerge to influence the course of the process. The determinate social changes are an outcome of the process of formation and not a result of the originally designated factors.

Our discussion of the process of formation that intervenes between the initially constituted factors on one side and the formed social results on the other side points to the basic deficiency in the idea that a combination of the industrializing process and the social setting is the proper way to account for determinate social conditions and happenings. As I have sought to suggest, while the combination launches the process of formation, it does not determine the development or course of the process. The process of formation has to be studied and analyzed in its own right. An appreciation of its place and function adds a final decisive support to the thesis of the neutral role of the industrializing process.

In the following chapter I wish to consider the important implications for research and social policy that follow from the neutral character of the industrializing process.

VIII

*Implications of the Neutral Role of Industrialization**

I propose in this chapter to trace out the implications of the neutral or indeterminate role of industrialization as an agent of social change. These implications are of two sorts: (1) those referring to the scholarly tasks of studying, analyzing, and explaining the social role of industrialization, and (2) those referring to the practical problem of seeking to guide and control the social changes that develop in the wake of industrialization. The discussion will consider these two lines of implications as they pertain to early industrialization.

A. Implications for Research and Scholarly Study

1. Recasting of Research Perspectives

Obviously, the major implication of our thesis is the need to recast the fundamental approach that dominates inquiry into the social influence of industrialization. The traditional approach rests on the premise that industrialization is a causative agent that produces specific kinds of social consequences. From Karl Marx to the present, scholars have usually assumed that social changes that are noted to follow upon industrialization are to be attributed to industrialization. Industrializa-

*Editors' Note: We speculate that perhaps one reason Blumer never published this book is that this last chapter clearly is not completed. While it closes the analysis on issues Blumer wished to address, and in that sense functions as any concluding chapter should, it is rather truncated and underdeveloped in comparison with earlier chapters. This is especially apparent at the end of the chapter which closes abrubtly and in a seemingly premature manner, leaving the reader wanting more.

tion is taken as a causative agent and the given changes are treated as its effects. Research and scholarly study are organized and directed on the basis of this simple and beguiling scheme or formula. Industrialization, or some phase of it, is treated as an independent variable, and certain social conditions or happenings are treated in their turn as dependent variables. One sees this imagery deeply implanted in scholarly thought. Thus, industrialization is held up before our eyes as producing such things as urbanization, the formation of a new kind of class structure, the disintegration of the traditional order, the formation of a discontented and insecure working class, the formation of a nuclear family, the undermining of traditional values, the breakup of the established authority system, community and personal disorganization, urban problems, a shift from "status by ascription to status by achievement," the emancipation of women, strikes and riots, aggressive labor movements, and revolutionary movements. Indeed, many scholars would seem to regard the very character of modern life as being the consequence of industrialization, as is seen in the common characterization of modern societies as industrial societies.

With this fundamental idea of industrialization as an agent of specific social consequences, the scholar or research student is led in his study to make some sort of identification of industrialization and to treat certain social conditions or happenings as products of that industrialization. In this type of approach, research and scholarly concern are focused on the beginning and end points of a process, that is to say, on industrialization on one hand and on alleged social results on the other hand. The process that lies in-between is almost always ignored, or when studied it is analyzed inadequately. The student seems to feel no need to do more than to identify industrialization and certain alleged end products. There is little, if any, concern with what intervenes between the beginning and terminal points.

It may be helpful to illustrate this characteristic approach in research and scholarly treatment. A student may wish to study the "effects" of early industrialization on such matters as internal migration, urban growth, insecurity among new factory workers, the development of a discontented working class, or the political ascendancy of new industrial owners. The typical procedure is to select an area or areas in which early industrialization is occurring, and then to obtain data on the suspected consequences—migratory movement, urban growth, worker uneasiness and insecurity, discontent and protest movements, or the political power of the new industrial ownership group. If positive relations are found (for example, that internal migration or urban growth has increased with industrialization, or that there is estrangement and insecurity among the factory workers who are studied, or that there is labor discontent and political unrest among the industrial proletariat, or that legislation favorable to industrial owners is being enacted) it is believed that the study has established the causal influence of industrialization. The given conditions that are found are regarded as the product of industrialization.

Yet, as I have sought to show in previous chapters, there are two basic deficiencies in this typical form of research and scholarly study: (1) a failure to take account of the factors that may produce by themselves the social conditions attributed to industrialization, and (2) a failure to understand properly what happens at the points where the industrializing process enters into contact with existing social life. The two deficiencies are so decisive in requiring a shift in research perspective that I wish to elaborate the significance of each of them.

The first of the deficiencies is not inherent in the traditional and current scheme for studying industrialization. Yet it occurs very generally as a part of research and scholarly study. Because of the strong disposition to regard the social happenings that follow in the wake of industrialization as due to industrialization, there is usually little effort to see whether the given social happenings might have been produced by factors other than industrialization. Many scholars easily neglect the play of factors that by themselves might produce the given social conditions. Illustrations of this neglect are bountiful. Thus, urban growth may be attributed to industrialization without regard to the play of such possible factors as rural impoverishment, changes in land tenure, taxation policies, the development of cheap and easy transport to cities, the premium placed on urban residence, the attractiveness of the services and facilities offered by city life, and the pull of relatives, friends, and acquaintances residing in cities. Similarly, to attribute unrest and discontent in the new working class to industrialization may easily overlook the play of such factors as the formation of new conceptions of rights and privileges, unsatisfactory living conditions outside factories, inflationary monetary conditions because of the fiscal policies of the government, agitation on behalf of radical ideologies, corrupt and inefficient governmental actions at the expense of industrial workers, and the growth of a nationalistic spirit. Or, to regard industrialization as responsible for the political ascendancy of an industrial ownership group may lead one to ignore such factors as the lack of solidarity among previous political elites, the conditions of power struggle favoring alliance with new industrial owners, the deliberate policy of a central government under the stimulus of nationalism to abet industrial expansion and to favor industrialists, and the adroitness of industrialists in capturing powerful political parties. Careful scrutiny of the social effects commonly attributed to industrialization will show that almost every one of them could occur as a result of factors that are not part of the industrializing process.

Confirmation of this observation comes in noting that most of the

social changes usually ascribed to industrialization may occur in regions that are not subject to industrialization. I refer to such social conditions as urbanization, internal migratory movements, disintegration of a tribal system, deterioration of an established agricultural system, breakup of extended families, deterioration of traditional village life, the entrance of a wage and money economy, changes in established status and authority system, shift from status by ascription to status by achievement, availability and use of manufactured products, formation of wishes for a higher standard of living, development of new conceptions of rights and privileges, breakdown of family and community controls, the rise of urban problems, and the formation of radical and revolutionary movements. These are the kinds of social happenings that are commonly thought to result from early industrialization. The fact that they may take place in regions with no industrialization or with trivial industrialization should make scholars wary and careful. The forces that lead to such developments in regions without industrialization can easily be present in regions undergoing early industrialization.

Accordingly, the student of early industrialization should take extra care to note and separate the nonindustrial forces that may bring about the social conditions that he is prone to attribute to industrialization. This separation of the industrial factor from nonindustrial forces is rarely undertaken. There are two reasons for this. One of them is the failure to identify clearly the industrializing process. Generally, students operate with only hazy ideas of what industrialization refers to and covers and hence are poorly prepared to distinguish it from nonindustrial forces. The second reason is the common and conspicuous tendency, previously noted, for scholars to assume that the social happenings that follow industrialization are due to industrialization. This tendency leads them away from diligent effort to see whether nonindustrial factors are at work to produce the social happenings. Scholars should guard themselves against these two conditions.

The deficiency that we have been considering—the failure to take into account the nonindustrial factors that might produce by themselves the social conditions attributed to industrialization—could conceivably be corrected under the conventional research approach by more careful scholarship. In contrast, the second deficiency that we wish now to consider requires a rejection of the conventional research approach.

As I have said above, this second deficiency comes from a failure to note properly what happens at the points of contact of the industrializing process with on-going group life. The central contention of this monograph is that at each such point of contact there are alternative possibilities of social development and that the industrializing process is not responsible for the given alternative that comes into being. The

industrializing process, so to speak, sets the stage for social change at the given point of contact but does not determine the form of that change. To illustrate this contention once more, I remind the reader of what may take place in the factory situation that is introduced by early industrialization. The experiences of the workers and the social relations that come into being in the factory are affected profoundly by such factors as the labor policies of management, the cultural and ethnic composition of the labor force, the expectations with which workers enter employment, the traditional codes of authority, the living conditions outside the factory, the nature of labor legislation, and the state of the local political climate. A wide range of variation may exist in the case of any one of these factors, leading to great differences in the social relations that develop in the factory. The industrializing process is indifferent to, and has no responsibility for, the variety in the case of any of the factors. Accordingly, the given set of relations that emerge in the factory are not to be explained by the industrializing process. One finds a similar condition at every other point of contact that the industrializing process makes with group life. People may meet in divergent ways the situation that is introduced at the point of contact. How they meet it or how they define it depends on factors that lie outside the industrializing process.

It is in this sense that the formula guiding conventional research and scholarship on industrialization as an agent of social change is fundamentally in error. One misreads what takes place if he treats the social developments that emerge at the points of contact as being the products of the industrializing process. Various nonindustrial factors intervene between what is introduced as situations by the industrializing process and what arises as social developments in them. The greater the distance between the initial industrial situations and the social developments tied to them, the greater is the intervening play of nonindustrial factors. Thus, the case of developments such as the establishment of a new class structure, the emergence of a new type of family, or the rise of a revolutionary movement—all of which presumably require long periods of time after the beginning of the industrializing process—the play of nonindustrial factors is extensive. If one wishes to study industrialization with faithful respect to the empirical world, one cannot afford to ignore the social process that intervenes between the industrial situations that are introduced and the subsequent social conditions that are formed. These subsequent social conditions are the products of an intervening process of development, and not the products of the initial industrial factors.

This basic nature of what takes place where the industrializing process enters group life requires a significant shift in the perspective underly-

ing research and scholarship. Instead of regarding the industrializing process as determining or coercing certain social results, the industrializing process should be seen as introducing situations that are the occasions for people to develop their activity, their relations, and their institutions. People meet the situations with varying schemes of interpretation and sets of expectations, inside a framework of traditional and contemporary pressures. The activity that is fashioned is an outgrowth of what is brought to bear on the situations—a formation that results from how the situations are defined by the people who have to act in them or with regard to them. Since people may bring to the situation different perspectives and be led to define the situation differently, the activity they fashion in the situation may differ considerably. To attribute to industrialization the activity that is fashioned is to misconstrue what has taken place.

The industrializing process should be seen as taking place inside a larger social process in the life of the group. In its gross outlines this larger social process consists of the play of the traditional social structure, the operation of forces of change that enter from the outside world, and the play of inner developments in the given society. In part, this larger social process operates independently of the industrializing process to produce the kinds of social results commonly attributed to early industrialization. More importantly, the larger social process plays on and into the industrializing process, opposing it at points, facilitating it at other points, setting lines for its developments, and particularly fashioning the changes that arise from the industrializing process. The role of early industrialization as an agent of social change can be understood only in terms of its position in the larger social process.

Starting from the recognition that industrialization is neutral with regard to the nature and form of the changes that develop in its wake, I wish to consider what such a view presupposes for research and scholarly study.

B. Research Procedure under the New Perspective

For purposes of convenience in discussion I shall number the central requirements that need to be observed in the study of industrialization as an agent of social change.

1. Identification of What Is Meant by Industrialization

To be able to study industrialization one must be able to identify it. I would not make this banal remark were it not for the fact that such

identification is far from common among scholars. As earlier discussion in this monograph has pointed out, there is astonishing vagueness and confusion in what is meant by industrialization. It is identified with such divergent matters as nonagricultural economic pursuits, mechanization of agriculture, commerce, economic growth, technological development, urbanization, modernization, and indeed modern civilization itself. In addition to such forms of confusion, the term as used by most scholars is essentially vague—a vagueness that self-perpetuated because its meaning is regarded (erroneously) as self-evident. Obviously, any scholarly inquiry proposing to study industrialization as a factor in social change should be clear as to what industrialization is. The failure to respect this simple requirement is one of the glaring weaknesses in the literature on industrialization.

I have suggested in the early pages of this monograph that industrialization be viewed as an industrializing process in the form of the manufacture of goods through the use of power-driven machinery, with an attendant apparatus for the procurement of necessary materials and for the distribution of products. This suggestion is in accordance with the views of students, such as economic historians, who have studied industrialization most closely as a special kind of production or economic system.

2. Identification of the Industrializing Process

It is highly desirable to know the form taken by the industrializing process with which one is dealing. The industrializing process may appear in many different forms in regions undergoing early industrialization. The industry may be light or heavy; may consist of small establishments or large establishments; may employ high-skilled workers or low-skilled workers; may be scattered or concentrated; may be owned by local residents, by absentee aliens, by the government, or by employees; may be administered in many different ways, may follow very different labor policies, production policies, marketing policies, and fiscal policies; may have very different kinds of labor forces—local workers or migrant workers, workers of the same cultural background or of different cultural backgrounds, workers of different ethnic makeup or of the same ethnic makeup, and so forth; and may manufacture goods for local markets or for foreign markets. These are a few of many dimensions along which the new industrial pattern may vary. It should be obvious that the industrial patterns that are introduced under early industrialization are not uniform. To view or treat early industrialization as homogeneous or uniform is without empirical warrant. Students

should be aware of the particular form taken by the industrializing process in the early industrialization with which they are concerned.

3. Identification of the Major Points of Contact of the Industrializing Process with Group Life

The industrializing process exercises influence on group life by entering into contact with it. This simple statement is made only because scholarship, in general, curiously ignores the point. In their concern with the effects of industrialization, students usually pass or leap from industrialization to end results. Industrialization is viewed or studied in relation to some terminal result in group life instead of in relation to its initial points of contact with group life. Yet, it should be clear that whatever influence is exerted by the industrializing process on group life arises at and radiates from these points of contact. Industrialization does not meet, so to speak, on-going group life in its entirety. Instead, industrialization makes contact with group life only at given points. To study its influence it is necessary to ascertain these points of contact.

In Chapter III, I have identified nine points of entry by the industrializing process—nine important arenas in which industrialization is highly likely to induce change in the behavior, relations, and social organization of people. These nine points of entry should not be thought of as covering all points of contact. I believe them to be the most important points of contact. At any rate, the student of the "social effects" of industrialization must identify the arenas in which the industrial process is introducing or evoking social change.

4. General Awareness of the Larger Social Process

The student should have a knowledge of the larger social process inside which the industrializing process takes place. Such knowledge can be of great help in his study of what happens at the points where the industrializing process enters group life. By the larger social process, I have in mind the structure and course of life in the group. As I have indicated in earlier discussion, this larger social process can be conveniently regarded as consisting of three sets of forces: the pressures of the traditional social structure, the forces of change entering from the outside world, and the play of inner developments in the society. I wish to say a few further words about each of these three sets of forces in order to suggest their importance in the study of early industrialization.

Very clearly, the composition of traditional society will affect the nature and extent of social changes that may take place around the

industrializing process. We can appreciate this by recognizing the significant differences in the traditional structure between regions subject to early industrialization. The regions may be distinctly rural, may consist of villages or small towns, or may have large established cities; the regions may be sparsely populated or densely populated; the regions may have a tribal system, a caste system, a feudal system, or an egalitarian system of small landowners; the regions may have a system of transport and developed domestic markets or be devoid of such transport and markets; the regions may have a rigid system of traditional life or a flexible system; the regions may have different authority systems, some strong, some weak, some in the hands of a traditional elite, and some in the hands of a newly emerging elite; the regions may have different kinds of bureaucratic systems; the regions may have strong internal religious and ethnic tensions or may be devoid of them. These are only a small number of many important ways in which traditional structures subject to early industrialization may differ from one another. Such differences will have a significant differential effect on the social changes that take place under early industrialization.

Similarly, we should keep in mind that regions undergoing early industrialization may be subject to the entrance of nonindustrial forces, which may wield great weight in fashioning social life. As illustrative of such forces let me mention the following: the introduction of medicine and systems of sanitation; the adoption of the models and standards of public education from other countries; the importation of schemes of government and systems of administration; the importation of new conceptions of rights, privileges, and freedom; the importation of new standards of living; the importation of new political and social ideologies. These few instances will suggest the varied kinds of influences that may enter alongside the industrialization process to induce and shape social changes.

Finally, we should note the inner developments of a nonindustrial character taking place in a region or country undergoing industrialization. Such developments may exercise great influence in shaping life and social relations. I have in mind such internal developments as the construction of highways and the improvement of the transport system; development of communication systems, especially media of mass communication; migratory movements; demographic changes; promotion of public education; deterioration or improvement of agriculture; changes in land ownership and tenure; prosperity or depression in commerce; the rise of political movements; inner struggles for political power; various pieces of legislation, such as that pertaining to wages, factory legislation, labor syndicates, and social security; the taxation and fiscal policies of the government; monetary policies, particularly as they may

relate to inflation; deterioration or improvement of a foreign trade position; development of nationalism; the development of governmental bureaucracy; and political crises.

The three sets of forces, such as have been suggested, intertwine to produce the ongoing group life inside which the industrializing process enters and operates. The sets of forces lead independently to developments that many scholars are prone to assign to industrialization. More importantly they play upon the industrializing process and interact with it. It is difficult to understand how a student having a faithful regard for the empirical world could ignore them in his studies of industrialization. Reasonably good knowledge of them is a prerequisite to effective study of early industrialization.

One needs to be cautious at this point. In recognizing that the three sets of forces are in operation alongside the industrializing process, most students would be led to believe that industrialization could be studied and analyzed by merely combining it with the three sets of forces. Taken together, the forces would be treated as a set of factors or variables that would be adequate in appropriate combinations to account for given social changes under industrialization. Thus, to imagine a single illustration, a student might advance a formula such as the following: Given (a) a background of traditional independence of workers, (b) the importation of a radical social ideology from abroad, and (c) the presence of a militant political movement on behalf of underprivileged classes, the imposition of (d) a factory regimen of strict discipline and rigid managerial control would produce labor unrest and protest. Many students like to use combinations of gross factors of this sort to account for given social changes and to forecast future changes. In addressing the problem of the social effects of early industrialization their disposition would be to select appropriate factors from the traditional social structures, the forces of change introduced from the outside, and the significant inner developments, and link these with some forms of the industrializing process to explain a given social change connected with industrialization. Certainly, such an approach would be a striking improvement over a scheme that presupposes that industrialization acts by itself to coerce certain social results. It would also be superior to a scheme that limited itself to the two factors of industrialization and traditional social life.

However, even though the approach be superior to what is customarily used it would still be crude, only approximate, and subject to serious error. These inadequacies and weaknesses exist because the approach would tend to bypass what happens at the points of contact of the industrializing process with group life. In not knowing what is taking place at the points of contact, the approach is in danger (a) of

postulating factors from the four sets of forces (traditional social structure, outside forces, inner developments, and the industrializing process) that are not in actual interaction with each other, (b) of overlooking factors that actually are in interaction, and (c) of ignoring what I have spoken of previously as the important process of development that intervenes between the situations set by the industrializing process and the subsequent social changes. This leads me to specify a fifth requirement in the study of industrialization as an agent of social change.

5. Identification of What Takes Place at the Points of Contact

One can see the industrialization process actually at work only at its points of contact with the group life into which it enters. Hence, the observation of what happens at these points is a crucial step in the study of industrialization as an agent of social change. I wish to indicate the advantages that are yielded by this form of study—advantages that make this study indispensable.

First, the study of what occurs at the points of contact enables one to learn whether, indeed, the industrializing process is actually initiating social change. A knowledge of the industrializing process does not supply this information. The industrializing process introduces situations; the process neither tells nor foretells what people will do in the situations. Thus, it does not indicate if lines of social change are started. Nor can one say reliably that the industrializing process has led to given social changes, by noting that social changes have appeared in the life of the group subsequent to industrialization; such changes may be due to factors other than the industrializing process. When I say this I have distinctly in mind the kinds of social changes so commonly attributed to industrialization—urbanization, mobility, a new class structure, labor unrest, the breakdown of established authority systems, a shift to status by achievement, family disorganization, and militant social movements. The only way one can be sure that industrialization has, in fact, initiated social changes is to study what takes place at the only points at which such changes arise, namely, at the points of entry of the industrializing process into group life.

If the situations that are introduced by the industrializing process are akin to those to which people are already accustomed they are not likely to require new forces of behavior or of social relations. Conversely, if the situations are significantly different in this respect, they set the occasion for change. Thus, a society with a system of monetary and contractual relations would be less disturbed by this phase of industrialization than would a society with little experience in such relations; a society with appreciable inner migration will be less affected by the movements of

workers occasioned by industrialization than a society marked by fixed and stable residence; a preindustrial society with no urbanization will be affected by urban growth induced by industrialization in a manner different from that of a preindustrial society that already has considerable urban development; an industrial system of allocating workers that follows traditional status relations will induce less change in this area than an arrangement that departs from traditional codes. Scores of other differences of these sorts could be mentioned. Clearly, one has to examine the situations at the points of contact in order to see whether, in fact, the industrializing process is inducing social change.

In a similar manner, study of such situations is necessary to learn what lines of change are actually initiated and to form an estimate of the extent of the change. The situations introduced by the industrializing process impose demands and expectations, provide opportunities and set problems. The behavior and social relations that emerge in the situations result from the ways in which people respond to the demands, use the opportunities, and handle the problems. Neither of these two crucial matters—what is presented by the situation and the responses to what is presented—can be identified except through a study of the situation and what happens in it. The industrializing process does not tell what kinds of demands, opportunities, and problems will be set; variations in the elements entering into the structure of the situation and the policies used to shape the situation cannot be derived from the industrializing process. We can see this, for example, in the case of the factory situation. The factory situation may be structured by such elements as the type of management (native or alien), the composition of the work force (homogeneous or culturally diversified), the division of labor (segregated or overlapping posts), working quarters, and government regulations. The industrializing process may have no responsibility for any of these matters which shape the situation it introduced. In addition, the factory situation may be given decisive form by the various policies used, for instance, by management. The factory situation will have a different character if the policy of factory operation is efficient or inefficient, exploitative or benevolent, or marked by rigid discipline or by friendly consideration. Again, one cannot derive these policies from the industrializing process. These few words should be sufficient to make clear the fact that the character of the factory situation cannot be inferred from the industrializing process but can be ascertained only through study of the situation. The same observation must be made in the case of the other situations introduced by industrialization. In order to know the demands and opportunities for new social activity and social relations that are set by industrialization one has to study the situations that are introduced.

Of even greater importance, the situations or the points of contact must be studied to see how people respond to the demands and opportunities that are set in the situations. The demands and opportunities do not coerce uniform or fixed responses. Instead, people may bring to bear on such demands and opportunities different sets of views, values, and expectations, leading them to define or interpret the situation in different ways. For example, they may accept the factory situation with enthusiasm, with reluctance, with dismay, with hidden resentment, with a sense of helplessness, or with determination to change it. These differential responses can be identified through the study of what takes place in the situations; they cannot be inferred from the industrializing process.

Let me restate the points of importance. Any social change that arises from industrialization can originate only at the points of contact of the industrializing process with ongoing group life. Hence, the study of what takes place at these points is of central importance. We observe that industrialization introduces situations that make demands and set opportunities for new activities, new social relations, and new functioning arrangements. Whether industrialization induces social change depends on the nature of these demands and opportunities. The way in which people respond to the demands and opportunities sets the initial kinds of social changes that come into being. Neither the demands and opportunities that are introduced nor the definitions that lead people to respond to them in given ways can be deduced from the industrializing process. Nor can they be inferred from a mere a priori knowledge of the ongoing group life (the larger social process); instead one has to see how the larger social process plays into the situations introduced by the industrializing process: This can be done only by studying what happens in these situations of contact.

These same observations apply to subsequent social changes that are set in motion as a result of the initial changes that take place at the points of entry of the industrializing process. Obviously, the social changes that occur at the points of entry are very likely to induce change in other areas of group life. The proper picture is one of lines of change ramifying outward from the initial points of contact of the industrializing process with ongoing group life. We may choose as a convenient illustration the ways in which the factory situation may exercise influence of the families of the new industrial workers. Obviously, there are many possible lines of such influence. Thus, the separation of the workers from their homes may occasion changes in family routine, in the management of children, and in the relations of parents; similarly, instability of employment in industrial establishments may introduce insecurity into the household; dissatisfaction or despair with regard to conditions of indus-

ment in industrial establishments may introduce insecurity into the household; dissatisfaction or despair with regard to conditions of industrial work may occasion various kinds of psychological strain in the family; opportunities for occupational advancement and the steady receipt of industrial income may lead to the reorganization of the family in terms of organizing careers of children, changing the physical household, and nurturing status ambitions; an awareness of the low status of one's occupation in the factory may filter back into the self-conceptions of members of the family; ethnic dissensions between factory workers may lead to restrictions on the range of association of their children. It is evident that the character of the factory situation may play in many different ways into the family life of the industrial workers, inducing therein different forms of behavior and of social relations. Again, such altered behavior and relations cannot be deduced from the factory situation, much less from the industrializing process that gave rise to the factory situation. Such alterations can be reliably identified only through the study of the situations in which they arise.

These observations with regard to the factory situation as a source of change in other areas of social life apply equally to the other kinds of situations introduced by the industrializing process. Divergent lines of influence may flow from the new occupational structure, the schemes for recruiting and allocating industrial personnel, the ecological arrangement of industrial establishments, the development of new group interests, the emergence of new groups, the development of monetary and contractual relations, the introduction of new products, and the gaining of industrial income. To identify the lines of change emanating from these situations it is necessary to study the situations; to determine the changes brought by these lines of influence it is necessary, in turn, to observe what takes place in the secondary situations, such as the family, into which the influences enter. As one pursues these lines of successive change one gets further and further away from the direct influence of the industrializing process.

The import of the foregoing discussion of the five requirements of research procedure should be clear. The observance of the five requirements brings research into grip with what actually takes place in the process of industrialization instead of allowing research to be directed to artificially conceived matters. The observance compels one to see what one is studying under the rubric of "industrialization," to observe how industrialization enters group life, to note the occasions for social change that are set, to note what forms of behavior and relations come into existence, and to trace the influence of such new behavior and relations on other areas of group life. Studies of the social effects of industrialization tread treacherous ground when they start with a vague

or confused idea of the industrializing process, jump to assumed terminal results of the process, neglect the large context of forces in play during periods of industrialization, and ignore the actual happenings that intervene between the entry of the industrializing process into group life and subsequent happenings. There is no shortcut procedure, aiming to secure reliable scholarly knowledge of industrialization as an agent of social change, that can ignore the five requirements that have been specified.

Before ending our discussion of the research implications of the neutral role of industrialization as an agent of social change, some special consideration should be given to (a) the method of comparative study and (b) the ideal type method of analysis. I wish to say a few words about each in the light of our foregoing remarks.

C. Comparative Study of Industrialization

Present day scholars concerned with industrialization as an agent of social change are especially hopeful that the comparative study of divergent instances will enable the extraction of the fundamental social consequences of industrialization. This hope is particularly high in the study of early industrialization. It is thought that a comparison of a variety of preindustrial societies that are undergoing industrialization will allow scholars to strip away what is unique to each instance and thus to reveal what is common to all of them, or at least to different types of such societies. In this way scholars will attain the generalized knowledge they seek, i.e., a series of propositions that the introduction of industrialization under specified conditions will lead to given kinds of social results.

The comparative study of instances of early industrialization (I shall confine my remarks to early industrialization) should clearly be encouraged. As of the present, there is a clear need of extending such studies far beyond the limited number that have been made. Above all, there is need to improve the quality and coverage of the separate accounts that are to be used for comparison. However, the comparative study of industrialization as an agent of social change needs to observe several of the points that I have dwelt on in my foregoing discussion. Since there is pronounced failure to take them into account when undertaking comparative studies, it is advisable to specify them briefly.

First, scholars should be aware of the need to include in their comparison instances of preindustrial societies undergoing social change that, however, are not subject to industrialization. Many forms of social

change that are commonly attributed to industrialization take place in traditional societies as they are brought inside the orbit of the modern world. I refer to such varied matters as internal migration, urbanization, change in rural communities, disintegration of established authority systems, change in family structure, the development of new aspirations and wants, the rise of new conceptions of rights and privileges, characteristic forms of social disorganization, and the rise of radical social movements. The careful scholar employing the comparative method in his study of the social effects of industrialization will wish to avoid the trap of assigning to industrialization certain social happenings that occur in similar societies that have no industrialization. As the literature discloses, it is very easy to fall into this trap. I wish then to stress the need to include in one's comparisons instances wherein industrialization is not in play, in order to avoid attributing to industrialization social happenings that may be due to other factors.

Second, in making comparisons of instances of early industrialization there is need to include the larger social process inside which industrialization takes place. The failure to do this is the most glaring deficiency in the ordinary use of the comparative method in the study of industrialization. Usually, the scholar in the interest of being specific and precise will select from the instances he is comparing (1) a given feature of industrialization, and (2) a given form of presumed social consequence, and note the relations between the two in the different instances. These two items of concern are isolated from their social context. This mode of procedure, which is so dear to scholars interested in precise relationships, would be legitimate if the larger social process did not share in the relation. However, irrespective of the wishes of the scholar, the larger social process enters in a firm and unavoidable way into the play of the industrializing process within group life. As indicated previously, the three major sets of influences represented by the traditional order, nonindustrial influences from the outside, and the run of inner events help to shape the form of the industrializing process, to set the situations that arise, and to affect the behavior and relations that are formed in these situations. Because they are so integral to the social developments that occur in industrialization, they should be included in any meaningful use of the comparative method. In other words, the comparison should not be confined to the industrializing process and certain presumed social consequences but should also embrace the larger social process that contributes to the formation of such social consequences. To exclude the larger social process from what is selected for comparison is to misread the nature of industrialization.

Third, comparison of instances of early industrialization must seek to cover the process of formation that intervenes between the initial entrance of industrialization and whatever subsequent developments the student is concerned with. As our major discussion has sought to show, this intervening process is the core of the social development that takes place in response to industrialization. The kinds of situations introduced by the industrializing process, the occasions they set for social change, what people bring to the situations, how they meet the demands and opportunities for change, and how their responses to these demands and opportunities affect, in turn, other areas of group life—these are the crucial steps in the operation of industrialization inside group life. Any comparative study aiming to identify relations between the industrializing process and given social developments that ignores this intervening process should be regarded with grave suspicion, since it leaves out what is of most importance in the formation of the relations. Admittedly, only a few original accounts of early industrialization depict this intervening process. Thus, severe limits are placed at the present time on a meaningful use of the comparative method in this area of scholarly concern. The current need is not so much for the extension of the comparative method as it is for the preparation of original accounts that will permit the fruitful use of the method.

D. The "Ideal Type" of Analysis

The ideal type of analysis is used extensively, even though superficially, in the study of industrialization as an agent of social change. Reliance on the ideal type is shown in the widespread readiness of scholars to regard industrialization as bringing about inevitably certain kinds of social results—the assumption underlying this usage is that industrialization has an intrinsic character that logically calls for and produces given social developments in a society in which industrialization operates. That most of this usage is superficial is shown in the fact that rarely are efforts made to isolate and characterize the essential elements that make up the "inner logic" of industrialization; the disposition is to take for granted that it possesses an inherent makeup that leads naturally to certain social developments. The sophisticated and careful use of the ideal-type method is rare in the study of industrialization as an agent of social change.

A good a priori case can be made for the need and value of ideal-type procedure in the study of the social effects of industrialization. Let us note the considerations that seemingly combine to call for the use of this method. First, we have to reckon with the fact that industrialization exists as an empirical matter and that seemingly characteristic social

changes follow upon its operation. This indicates that industrialization has a "being" and suggests that the character of its makeup is such as to bring about typical kinds of social developments. However, if one seeks to study industrialization concretely in the actual instances of its operation one gets lost in a plethora of varying empirical details. Industrialization is complex and takes on all sorts of different concrete forms in the broad area over which it operates. Further, its operation takes place in complicated social contexts, each of which has its own unique or particular character. Thus, to study industrialization concretely and inductively in its empirical forms is to lose sight of the forest in becoming preoccupied with the trees. What is needed is a high level of abstraction, which will enable one to disengage what is logically essential to industrialization in its "pure" form. Such an abstraction would trim off what is adventitious, accidental, incidental, and unique in the empirical instances in which industrialization operates. The residue would consist of what is basic and logically intrinsic to industrialization, a "pure form" that need not correspond to any of its empirical instances. This pure form or ideal type supplies a manageable and penetrating tool that could not be gained from a preoccupation with the concrete details of the empirical instances of industrialization. The ideal type permits one to introduce simplicity into complexity, and to give order to the chaotic profusion of concrete differences. Dealing with the essential features of industrialization on an abstract level the ideal type enables the scholar to deduce the kinds of social developments for which these essential features logically call. In indicating the basic lines of social development to which industrialization logically leads, one may form penetrating insights into the empirical operation of industrialization and, similarly, have an important set of guidelines for social policy. In the light of these considerations the use of an ideal-type analysis seems to be very appropriate to the study of industrialization as an agent of social change.

My interest is merely to point out two basic needs that should be met in using the ideal-type method in the study of early industrialization as an agent of social change. A first need is to identify clearly the essential features that constitute the industrializing process in its pure or ideal form. This is not an easy task. It requires not only a close familiarity with industrialization in its empirical character but a special competence in using this familiarity to extract what is basic to the makeup of industrialization. Early industrialization is far from being the homogeneous matter that it is commonly assumed to be. Earlier discussion has sought to show the numerous lines along which it may vary. Many of these lines of difference are of fundamental importance, for example, level of technology, types of occupation, size and organization of labor force, character of establishments in which productive processes are lodged, patterns of location of such establishments, ownership and managerial ideologies, reception to manufactured products, and patterns of using industrial income. To extract what is essential is not easy, particularly in a form that is meaningful and useful. The kinds of features identified by differing scholars as essential to industrialization are more or less familiar. I have in mind such essentials as an increasing occupational specialization and division of labor, the shift to industrial occupations demanding skill and sophistication, the transfer of productive processes to the factory, attachment to and dependence on machines, a rationalization of perspective, the appearance of a labor market, a high ratio of capital per employee, an increase in the per capita ratio of power energy, and a per capita rise in income. It is doubtful that many of these features always appear in early industrialization and hence that they are logically intrinsic to the process of early industrialization. Further, even in the case of those which seem to be intrinsic and essential, legitimate questions may be raised as to their significance for understanding the social developments that take place under early industrialization. My interest here is not to discuss these doubts and questions. I am merely concerned with pointing out that if the ideal-type approach is to be used it is necessary to identify with some accuracy the logical essentials of early industrialization and to have some assurance that the essentials that have been identified are relevant to the kinds of social changes that take place under early industrialization.

A second need in the construction and use of the ideal type in the case of early industrialization is to accommodate the larger social process inside which industrialization takes place. The inclusion of the larger social process in an ideal type of early industrialization may seem to contradict the very purpose for which ideal-type procedure is designed. Yet, such inclusion is unavoidable if one is to have a meaningful ideal type. The larger social process enters so forcibly into the social developments under early industrialization that it cannot be left out of consideration. There would be little value in designating the essentials of industrialization—such as a transfer of productive functions to the factory—unless one were able to infer the social consequences of these essentials. Yet, as the entire argument of this monograph has sought to show, social consequences do not flow from the essential features of industrialization but arise, instead, from the way in which people respond to these features. If the ideal-type procedure is to explain or illuminate the social consequences of industrialization, it is necessary to include, in some manner, the factors that shape the responses of people to industrialization. In asserting, for example, that the transfer of pro-

ductive functions to the factory has a given effect on the family, one necessarily has to have a knowledge of the prior organization of the family, some knowledge of its current course of development, and some knowledge of the nonindustrial forces acting on it to shape its makeup. The family may respond in diverse ways to the transfer of productive functions to the factory—kinship bonds may be strengthened or weakened, the family may become more firmly united or may tend to fall apart, parental control may be tightened or become more lax, and authority may shift from one to the other of the parents. The ideal-type advocate who asserts that the transfer of productive functions to the factor will logically have "such and such" an affect on the family presupposes in his assertion a certain kind of prior state of the family and a certain kind of prior organization of forces in the family. He necessarily has to presuppose, even though unwittingly, an "ideal" picture of the prior state of the family and indeed of its prior situation. This same observation applies equally to any line of social consequence that the scholar proposes to trace out from any of the essential features of his ideal type of industrialization. In inferring social consequences from an ideal picture of industrialization or of any part of it, the scholar cannot avoid, in my judgment, forming an ideal picture of the social object or social situation that he believes to be affected.

It is precisely this need to introduce an ideal type of the social setting, or of what I have termed the larger social process, that sets crucial difficulties for the ideal-type method of studying the social effects of industrialization. It is difficult enough to think of the essentials of "pure" industrialization, whatever they may be; but to think of the essentials of the "pure" social setting in which early industrialization operates is, I suspect, to impose on oneself a fictitious and hence insoluble problem. The makeup of preindustrial societies varies so much in total form, in constituent parts, and in forces operating in them that I cannot conceive how one could construct an ideal or pure form of the makeup. The task would be made easier by constructing a *series* of ideal types of such societies, which would catch major differences between the larger social processes that operate within them. We do not have such a typology and the prospects of developing it are dim. Yet, as I have said, the effective study of the social consequences of early industrialization through the ideal-type method requires one necessarily to form an ideal picture of the social setting in which the industrialization takes place. To unwittingly assume an ideal picture of the social setting is no credit to careful scholarship. To conscientiously develop such an ideal picture is a necessary task for the scholar who wishes to use the ideal-type procedure.

E. Implications for Social Policy

In the remaining pages I wish to consider some of the implications of my discussion for social policy. The central idea that I have been developing is that there is no fixed or locked relation between the industrializing process and specific social happenings. It is precisely this neutral character of industrialization that elevates social policy to a strategic position in the process of social change under industrialization. Social policy may intervene between the industrializing process and the social changes that emerge, to supply direction to such changes and to exercise control over them. One may easily note this important role of social policy when one examines the actual operation of early industrialization. Social policy intervenes at innumerable points to shape the situations with which people are confronted and to guide the ways in which they meet such situations. Thus, employers develop a range of social policies with regard to such matters as the organization of a work force, wages and working conditions, systems of discipline, recruitment and allocation of workers, training of workers, promotional systems, etc. The central government may follow an array of policies touching on such things as the promotion of industry, the development of transport systems, organization of labor unions, and schemes of social benefits for workers. Local governments may follow policies with regard to the housing of industrial workers, provision of transport, provision of utilities, establishment of schools, and supply of social services. Organizations such as labor syndicates, industrial groups, social movements, and political parties may develop policies setting their lines of operation in the industrial scene. These few random references are sufficient to indicate the extensive play of policies that intervene to aid in shaping the social changes that take place under early industrialization.

One may say correctly that the process of industrialization and the lines of social change that emanate from it are mediated at innumerable points by policy decisions. Were there a fixed relation between the industrializing process and specific social consequences, such policy decisions would serve merely to facilitate or temporarily obstruct the relentless movement toward the inevitable ends. The neutral position of industrialization provides a different function for social policy. Social policy may be used to affect the amount of social change, to set its direction, and exercise guidance over its formation. Theoretically, the entire range of social changes that are commonly thought to flow from industrialization may be profoundly influenced by social policy. Policies of industrial location may affect ecological arrangements; recruitment

policies may affect the composition of the work force; municipal polices with regard to housing and living facilities may affect the character of residential life; factory policies may affect relations between workers, and between workers and management; training and promotional policies may affect career lines and family organization; governmental polices devised with reference to newly emerging industrial interests may affect profoundly the position of interest groups and their relations; fiscal policies may affect significantly the use of industrial income; excise and taxation policies may affect profoundly the purchase and consumption of manufactured articles; policies of rural aid and rehabilitation may affect the structure of rural neighborhoods and villages in the face of industrialization; institutional policies, including those of the central government, may affect the adjustments of traditional society to whatever occasions for change are introduced by industrialization; and, finally, policies of strategically placed groups and agencies may exercise great influence in shaping or controlling the so-called problems of transition and social disorganization. Precisely because no social happening is predetermined by industrialization but depends instead on the ways in which people mobilize themselves to respond to industrialization, social policies may play an effective role in shaping the social happenings, whatever it might be or in whatever area it might lie.

The import of this observation of the strategic role of social policy (a role, let me repeat, that flows from the neutral character of industrialization) should be clear. In place of preoccupation with a dubious problem of the social effects of industrialization, concern should turn to the problems of how social policies may be effective in guiding and controlling social changes under industrialization. This much more realistic and salutary concern applies just as much to scholars of early industrialization as it does to statesmen, governmental officials, and institutional administrators who are faced with problems incident to early industrialization. The task of the scholar, stated broadly, should be that of studying the place of social policy in shaping social developments under early industrialization. The task of the officials who have to deal with social change incident to early industrialization should be that of getting the information necessary to the formulation of realistic social policies. Let me say a few words about each of these tasks.

I am suggesting that the study of the role of social policy should be one of the major interests of the student of early industrialization. The situations that arise under early industrialization should be scrutinized to see how the application of divergent policies structure the situations and set lines of response to them. Careful and sustained study of this sort should lead to a valuable body of knowledge. The knowledge would undoubtedly take a number of different forms—indications of

how different kinds of policies lead to different kinds of social change; indication of the kind of information needed from each type of industrial situation to provide a basis for formulating social policies; analysis of the effects of conflicting policies emanating from different sources; analysis of the conditions that limit the possibilities of developing or applying social policies; and schemes for identifying the incipient conditions that may develop to check the execution of social policies. The pursuit of such knowledge has scarcely begun to attract the scholarly study it so richly deserves. In my judgment such scholarly study would throw much more light on the process of social change under early industrialization than will be yielded by the questionable task of trying to identify the specific social results of industrialization.

It is scarcely necessary to add that the kinds of knowledge that could be supplied by the scholarly study of the role of social policy are precisely those needed by officials who have to cope with social changes under early industrialization. In the face of the tasks that confront them, such officials stand to gain little from studies grounded on the premise that the industrializing process produces specific social results. Their need is to guide the process of social change under early industrialization and not to resign themselves to the position that certain social changes are inevitable because of the nature of industrialization. An appreciation of the neutral role of industrialization should open to them a broader vista of opportunities and of responsibilities.