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Considering that the Webbs attempt to observe and point towards the significant forces operating in the industrializing process of one country, the authors of "Industrialism and Industrial Man" attempt to perform a similar task for the entire world. The Webbs convince of an evolutionary process whereby industry and labor movement toward an ideal middle class-socialistic goal. Kerr, C. et. al., seem to hold up the same dream for all nations. Ideologically the Webbs confessed their commitment to Fabian Socialism. The authors of "Industrialism and Industrial Man" make no confessions, but not surprisingly their utopia takes the form of technocratic United States.

The main thesis of the four men who authored this book can be condensed in the following ways: Science and technology are the dynamic creative forces of the modern world. These forces break into history at a time when the structure and development of human society reflect an almost infinite variety. Industrialization, however captures the allegiance of all types of societies and transforms them. The vehicle through which this transforming process operates is the "industrializing elite" of which there are five types. Cultural factors, educational systems, labor organizations and economic constraints may resist and cause some conflict, but they are all absorbed, as it

were, into industrialism so that eventually a unifying, common ideology and value system become adopted on a national and an international scale. The five type sof elites decompose in time into two—the middle class and the revolutionary intellectual type—and then gradually these accommodate to each other and merge into one, with the middle class type getting the best of it.

After this main line of thrust or historical process is recognized it is then appropriate to talk about such matters as the labor movement, development of management or industrial relations for all of these matters are deeply dependent upon the industrialization process and the particular stage of that process in which the nation is presently located. The industrial relations systems and the "web of rules" for industry under a colonial elitist society and those for a society led by a revolutionary-intellectual elite can be expected to be different, but as the types of industrial societies tend to converge into one another, likewise a convergence of industrial relations systems can also be predicted. The concept of industrial relations systems and the web of rules is to be considered in the next. Here let us restrict ourselves to the authors' "world view" or concept of history. That they should see the force of industrialization as the major creating stream of modern history is not surprising. The importance and movements of that process have been plotted by many scholars before them. Perhaps the unique proposition suggested by this book is that as technology becomes more sophisticated and complex, it eliminates fundamental conflict of structures, values and ideologies and establishes in their stead an integrated uniformity.

Karl Marx looking at the industrialization process a century earlier also saw a great universal convergence going on. History was moving toward a utopia of communism and the industrializing process was

### The industrializing elites and their strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic concepts</th>
<th>Dynastic</th>
<th>Middle-Class</th>
<th>Revolutionary-Intellectuals</th>
<th>Colonial Administrators</th>
<th>Nationalist Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central strategy of the elite</td>
<td>Preservation of traditional society.</td>
<td>Individual self-advancement.</td>
<td>Forced-draft industrialization</td>
<td>Servicing the &quot;home country&quot;</td>
<td>National independence and progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central characteristic of the society</td>
<td>Paternal community.</td>
<td>Open market.</td>
<td>Centralized State.</td>
<td>Alien system under alien control.</td>
<td>State &quot;guided&quot; development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of variations in the approach</td>
<td>Nature of external and internal pressures.</td>
<td>Origin in class or classless society; or in rapid industrialization.</td>
<td>Comparative responsiveness to ideology, or to masses.</td>
<td>Segmental or total approach; and absence of presence of &quot;settlers&quot;.</td>
<td>Negative or positive stage of development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the instrument through which this was to be achieved. But for Marx industrialism forced into existence two universal classes, not five classes of elite: the capitalists and the proletariat. They were mortal enemies, but not because one was for industrialization and one was against it. The two would fight to the death for power to control industry. The nature of industrialization, however, is on the side of the proletariat classes for industrial development gives birth to new structures that capitalism can not constrain. In Capital Marx says, Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property is sounded. The expropriators are expropriated.\(^5\) The new means of production create the integrating integrating forces of social structure and thought. The class that controls it controls society and the future. As industrialization goes on the proletariat increase in strength and finally revolt against the oppressive capitalist classes that had heretofore ruled society through its "ownership" of industry.

Marx and the "Clark Keer, John T. Dunlop, Frederick H. Harbison and Charles A. Myers" both accepted the creative and integrative thrust of industrialization; both see that political power has its source in control of industry and science; and both observe that certain ruling classes emerge to control direct society. It might ever be possible for the industrialism and industrial man scheme to include a Marxian revolution as one step in the industrializing process. They part company on two issues: For Marx the Industrializing process, by its very nature, leads not in the first place to an integration of everyone into an harmonious whole, but to the creation of two hostile camps preparing for Armageddon. Harmony appears only when the

enemy is eliminated. Kerr, C. et. al., might be willing to accept Marx into their system, but Marx could accept them only as enemies. Marx sees history as drawing lines and making moral judgements for and against. The “Kerr, C. et. al.” are syncretists, willing to include everybody and everything.

But when we look at the second issue we see that their syncretism is only apparent. Ultimately the question for both Marx and for Kerr, C. et. al., comes down to which class will control science and industry, which class will prevail. Marx adamantly proclaims that the proletariat will triumph. The “Kerr, C. et. al.” veer off from any statements about political cataclysm, but and their book on the triumph of the middle class elite. The acceptance of the five groups of elites, which includes Marxists, is only a momentary compromise. In the end “their kind of world” wins out.

Marx posited his view of the future on the premise that the capitalists will become increasingly oppressive and their control of industry too narrow and selfish. Therefore the tensions with the working classes would continue to mount until they would explode. Modern day capitalism and planned economies attempt to release the tension and thereby prevent a blowup by resort to a variety of welfare programs, legal protection of unions and the use of “human relations techniques” inside the industrial relations system.

In our attempt to understand the realities of less developed countries such as Korea can we assume that the welfare approach to development has indeed pulled the teeth from Marxian revolution? And if it has, is gradual evolutionary passage into the great uniformity of “middle classism” the only option?

Central to Marx’s two class analysis of society is the observation that there is a ruling elite which controls industry and the means of production. Worker alienation from his job and society is in large part due to the oppressive acts of this group. It is also quite coincidental that four of Kerr’s five elite types are basically authori-
tarian regimes. Only the middle class type escapes that stigma. And 
if we are to give any credence to the recent critiques of the American 
social structure, this system too has at its heart an authoritarian 
bias. Furthermore, in what may be a plagiarism of Marx, the ruling 
elite can remain in charge of their society only as long as they are 
able to hold reign over the industrializing process. When it becomes 
 too complex. then the colonial, the dynastic and nationalistic rulers 
are shucked off and a higher stage of elitism takes over. Like unto 
Marx the elitist groups gain their power from their ability to con- 

In a developing country who are the elitists or the oppressive 
authoritarians? In terms of Kerr, Dunlop, Harbinson and Mayers. 
Korea seems to have progress through a colonial rule to a dynastic 
centered elite, and now has moved into a nationalistic regime. This 
process of whereby the elites emerge or are superseded by another 
is not defined by Kerr. But the present ruling group of Korea fits 
the typology of the nationalitis elite perfectly: They are soldiers, 
old politicians, and new capitalists who profess no ideology. They 
are pragmatic and increasingly reserve all prerogative to the state. 
Centralized planning is their god. Conflict in society, such as dis- 
putes between labour and management are strongly discouraged. 
Where does their power come from? Kerr, C. et. al., pay inadequate 
attention to this question of the bases of power of the elite. But 
in the Korean situation the elites power initially came from military 
control of the nation. In the last decade this base has been expanded 
to include three additional elements: 1) party-government control of 
industry; 2) centralized economic planning which controls the factors
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of production, the market apparatus and the very rhythm of the industrialization process, and 3) the utilization of traditional Confucian, monolithic structures and values to perpetuate and legitimize their use of authority. Modern ruling elites attempt to draw heavily on the past since the structures of tradition exhibit the same nature of authoritarianism which they seek to exercise. Rather than being in opposition to industrialization, tradition is an important ally to the entrepreneur, the capitalist and the politician.

The next question to be asked them is, has the process of industrialization that now is in its fifth or sixth decade produced a situation more comparable to the one predicted by the "Karr, C. et al.," or one more in keeping with what Marx would have predicted? One thing is certain. Industrialization has produced a consensus of the entire community about the desirability and necessity of rapid industrialization. Everyone has been awakened to its great promises and everyone yearns to participate in the fruits of the new world as soon as possible. A middle class, affluent society symbolized by the United States has become the goal at which to shoot. The planners and politicians attempt to keep this goal constantly before the eyes of the nation in order to encourage greater effort and to discourage conflict and confusion.

But this consensus of goal does not viti Marx's assertion that the working class is increasingly alienated from his society. The very fact of being forced into a factory situation where one is required to do one form of labor only, where he has no control over his work or his product, and where the impersonal forces of market prices and capital flow dictate his life rhythm is a degradation to the worker. He can not escape from it. To exist he has to obey. His work is not voluntary, but forced. Physically he is exhausted and mentally he becomes cynical and negative. The worker is alienated from himself, from his job, his factory and society. Such as description of the worker's condition and mentality comes much closer of a dev-
elopeing nation than anything the "Karr, C. et. al.," postulate. Workers in Korean factory would, I think, instinctively grasp Marx's words. Even Pearlman's rather sophisticated term, "consciousness of scarcity" would not be difficult for a factory worker of a developing nation to understand. Such concepts overlap into the worker's day to day experience. A Korean worker in a steel mill is quite aware that he has no control over his own life. He takes orders from bosses who drive around in big cars. He exhausts his youth and his entire life in a dirty, hot, dangerous factory. Fatigue is his constant companion. His grievances go unheeded and his opinion is ignored. And he knows well that the profits he creates goes into the pockets of company owners and politicians. In Marxist terms he is alienated and knows it. In Pearlman's world he has very limited opportunity and he is conscious of it.

The authors of "Industrialism and Industrial Man" avoid the issue of worker alienation. Having come to the less than startling conclusion that innovation is initiated by some elite and not by workers, they are willing to relegate workers and their organizations to role of a dummy variable. They exist and do have some effect on the system but by and large that influence is negligible or at least able to be manipulated by the other factors in the formula. Marx, however, is more astute. He understood the workers powerlessness and also their potential for revolt. The thesis of the "Kerr, C. et. al.," depends upon the state being able to perpetuate the worker's weakness through use of social welfare and political force. The Marxian thesis predicts an explosion. In many, if not most of the lesser developed nations, it is yet too early to say which of the will be the prophet. The anger and alienation of workers has not erupted into organized revolution, and days of communism may be over, but the fact that remains is that intelligent, angry workers do man their nations means of production. Their power is said to be potential rather than actual, but since both they and the employer and the
government are quite conscious of this potential, it can not be dismissed as unimportant or though it did not exist. Political concern with workers and unions comes as much from fear of their power as it does from socialistic or humanitarian ideologies. Employers' constant appeal to government to control unions witness to their acceptance of labor strength. And the fact that unions not only persist, but achieve some wage gains and improvements in working conditions despite the combined opposition of government, company and foreign business evidences a power that is far from negligible. Walter Galenson says that one of the crucial tests of statesmanship in less developed nations is whether a balance between the demands of the economic planners and the demands of the industrial workers can be made or not. (9) Union power can not be ignored even by the planners who are the elite among the elite.

There is one other dimension of the labor movement that the two theories of Marx and Kerr, C. et. al., bring to mind. Marx saw that the capitalistic states would oppress the peoples of other nations just as they were doing the working class in their own countries. This too would have as its consequence national revolutions and the eventual ousting of the exploiters.

Kerr, C. et. al., do not go directly into the question of the internationalization of capital, nor the internationalization of exploitation, but there are rather safe deductions that can be made from their main thesis. The entire globe will eventually enjoy one from of socioeconomic structure, or at least a reasonable approximation there of, and this universal structure will resemble what they characterize as a society under a middle class elite. Their assertion of universal consequence is somewhat modified in the "Postscript to Industrialism and Industrial Man" published in the International Labor Review, June, 1971, but still remains basically as originally stated. As in-

Industrialization proceeds professionals take over its administration, and its organization is transformed into something like Galbreath's "technostructure." There is no reason for us to believe that the nations which first develop into this technostructure will restrict their operations or organizations to their mother lands. Indeed international investments, governmental foreign aid and international corporations make it clear that the middle class of United States have got the jump on the other nations in this grand evolutionary process of Kerr's, and are very much like Marx predicted they would, with some modifications for their sophisticated salesmanship. Add to this the fact that technology and the technostructure expand at rates favourable to the present middle class nations and unfavourable to the dynastic or nationalistic nations and we can fairly predict increased tensions and conflict between the middle class, technological states and the non-middle class, unable-to-catch-up poor nations. This becomes a modern version of Marx's old theme.

As technology and the means of production and markets become international, so also, if we are to follow the model of "Kerr, C. et. al.," and the theory of John R. Commons, should the activity of labour unions and the structures of industrial relations. Levine observes that according to "Kerr, C. et. al.," thesis, as industrialization proceeds the web of rules tend to become internationalized and from "resources" for commonality from nation to nation. This too we can see occurring. But unfortunately the unions of the so-called developed nations have lost sight of their origins and enter into the international scene as firm allies of the governments and companies of their home nations. They add, as it were, to the

dominance of the middle class technocracy, and the commonality of rules that do come to exist become an extra burden for the workers of the poor nations. The AFL-CIO becomes a wing of the AID. ICFTU contents itself with innocuous middle class education programs. U.S. unions demand tariffs to protect their jobs against the laborers of Korea who make one tenth of what they do. Windmuller lists eight nations that are competing in an effort to export the model of their industrial relations system.

The exportation of an industrial relations system, or of its major components, contributes to the achievement of national foreign policy goals in the same way as the transplantation of a model social, political or economic system. Labor has been institutionalized into the system of the middle class states. The elites governing the poor nations are hoping to have as much success with their own laboring classes, and so welcome the assistance of so-called international labor organizations.

Viewed from the detached, analytical posture which middle-class scholars can afford, it would seem that “Kerr, C. et. al.,” have given us a blueprint for increasing industrialization with the hope that some day all peoples of the world will participate in the fruits thereof. But viewed from the position of the poor nation, their thesis poses an increasing threat of socio-economic and political domination. The success of the middle-class elite and its technology may well be producing the international conditions under which man’s next struggle for justices and self control will erupt.