International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 9 Issue 04, April 2019,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Sociological Perspectives on Industrialization

Dr Alka, Assistant Professor
Department of sociology
Government PG College, Champawat

Abstract

The Great Exhibition, aptly named the Crystal Palace, was inaugurated by Queen Victoria in May 1851. The palace was constructed entirely of prefabricated iron and glass. Displayed during the event were the many accomplishments and industrial might of the United Kingdom. Half of the world's iron, coal, and cotton was being produced by Britain back then. More than 80% of the population was involved in occupations other than agriculture by the late 19th century, and 75% of that population resided in rapidly expanding urban centers. By 1900, the United States of America, Germany, and many more had joined the ranks of the world's most powerful industrial nations. You probably have a general notion of what industrialization entails, the material might ofindustrialized nations, and the fact that we all want to be just like them. Because industrialization touched every facet of society and the economy, questions about its beginnings, its pace, and its effects will never go away. Although the impetus for change originated earlier, industrialization took off in the latter part of the 18th century. It was gradual and uneven at initially, but by the time Victoria ascended to the throne in 1837, it had changed very few lives and very few institutions. We will try to comprehend industrialization and the societal changes that followed in this section. Our first stop will be at the English Industrial Revolution, the birthplace of modern industry. After this, we will look at how this massive shift in technology and manufacturing has altered society. We will also look at this process through the lenses of other academics who have studied it. Afterward, we will examine the implications of industrialization for society at large and how it impacts India specifically. However, let's examine the phrase and understand the defining characteristics of industrialization first.

Keywords:*Industrialization,Factories,Communications,Capitalism,Post-independent India*

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 8 Issue 12, December 2018,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Introduction

The term "industrialization" describes the gradual evolution of manufacturing techniques. Additionally, this fundamental economic process is now the driving force behind revolutionary shifts in society and politics. Technology innovations, especially in metallurgy and large-scale energy generation, have driven these societal and economic shifts. Whether philosophical shifts result from industrialization or vice versa is debatable, but industrialization is certainly associated with new ways of thinking about and approaching the natural world. We must look at industrial production fundamentals to know why a technological shift may cause such massive social shifts. The three main characteristics of industrialization are:

Factories: The enormous factory, housing thousands of people under one roof and putting them to work on equipment powered by steam, gas, or electricity, is a defining feature of industrial society. A technical division of labour is one of the new forms of division of labour introduced by industrial firms. Investments in machinery and equipment amounting to large quantities of money are necessary for large-scale manufacturing output. Entrepreneurs who can get the money needed and are willing to take the risk of running the business effectively are what this requires. Another consequence is that workers are no longer considered proprietors of their tools. He or she is no longer considered an owner of the means of production but rather a wage labourer. The use of mass manufacturing processes often results in the decentralization of labor into 148 distinct but related tasks. A big and impersonal market must be the focus of bureaucratically structured production in large-scale industries. This starts the societal process of commercialization and monetization. But impersonal market factors, such shifting consumer preferences and demand swings, have a major impact on manufacturing.

Urbanization: The transformation of production methods brought about far-reaching social changes. As previously stated, the structure of production and labour relations shifted from family- or guild-owned small crafts to factories controlled by the entrepreneurial class. Centers of production emerged, separate from those based on traditional agriculture, wherever factories were established during the early days of industrialization in response to the high need for labor. Many cities expanded due to the massive influx of people who moved there. Produce output increased dramatically in the 18th and 19th centuries due to agricultural advancements such crop rotation, selective breeding of animals, and new

technologies, particularly in England. A higher agricultural surplus was a result of this, which allowed for the maintenance of urban populations. Urabanization is a hallmark of industrialised nations; in general, the concentration of a population in cities is inversely proportional to a country's level of industrialization.

Historical Background of Industrialization Process

The use of power-driven equipment in production ushered in the Industrial Revolution. It started long ago and is still going strong in certain parts of the world today. England saw the most rapid industrialization in the eighteenth century, while the movement was widespread across western Europe. Several reasons emerged at the same time, giving England a leg up. The fuel and raw materials that England needed could be obtained in enormous quantities from its overseas colonies. The coal and iron mines had no shortage of workers. Tobacco and tea merchants had the capital to fund scientific and technological advancements, sping up the already-in-progress scientific revolutions. New Approaches to Farming: Innovative developments in agricultural technology were also happening in England between 1760 and 1830. We already established that crop rotation was in place to prevent the land from falling over in between plantings. Enclosed compact farming replaced the open field method. The horse hoe and seed drill were both invented by Jetro Tull, while Bakewell first did stock breeding. Bakewell showed breeding for food quality. Careful stock management, meticulous genealogy records, inbreeding, and animal selection were all aspects of Bakewell's animal husbandry. He had particular success with sheep, and his inbreeding approach was well-established by the end of the century.

Advances in Transportation:

A watershed moment in industrialization came in 1773 with the invention of the steam engine by James Watt. The invention of electricity and the railroads were two more advancements and discoveries that accelerated industrialization. The whole nation of England was wired with electricity by 1936. The widespread availability of electricity in the 1930s was a major contributor to Russia's burgeoning industrial sector. The railroads were another characteristic of the growing industrial nations of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, the widespread success of steam locomotion in Britain prompted the construction of railroads throughout Europe, with several European nations relying on British money, tools, and expertise. The British export of railroads became commonplace. France started its railroad system after 1842, a joint venture between the

government and private sector. The government supplied the roadbed, which then leased it to a private business that supplied the equipment. Railroads connected long-distance settlements in the US, Canada, and Russia. Although Germany did not have any huge empty expanses, the railroads did play a role in bringing the country closer together economically and politically. The internal combustion engine, which powered automobiles, utterly altered the way people lived in the middle of the twentieth century. The American people embraced automobiles with open arms. The expansion of the automotive industry changed the face of road construction, gave rise to new service vocations, and opened up vast investment opportunities. This was the case in the United States and western Europe after WWII. Commercial flying started during the First World War. Due to the country's strategic location and the treaty's prohibition on military aircraft, private airlines flourished in Germany. By 1929, commercial flights were departing from major European cities and landing at every major location on the planet. Plus, the day when aircraft carried more people than railroads as a commercial mode of transportation was coming soon.

Communications:

Transmitting a human voice over a telephone line was a game-changer in 1876. Even though the telephone did not achieve widespread popularity for several decades. Towards the century's close, the wireless telegraph became an indispensable tool for mariners. The United States made much more money out of radio than Europe did when it first came out in 1920. Not only did European broadcasting networks not air commercial ads, they were also run or tightly regulated by the state. After it was found that the important expense in sending mail was handling and not the distance delivered, the penny post was instituted on all letters in Britain in 1840. A half-ounce or lighter letter might be sent for one English pence (two cents). To ease the transfer of mail between nations, the Universal Postal Union was formed in 1875. 150 Faster business transactions became possible in 1871 when telegraph wires were extended from London to Australia, allowing instantaneous transmission of messages worldwide. As new forms of transportation and communication accelerated the velocity of life, the globe continued to shrink tremendously.

Changing Social Patterns:

Voice over IP (VoIP) technology completely changed how people communicated in 1876. Even if the telephone didn't gain widespread use for another few decades. The wireless telegraph was a common maritime safety equipment by the century's conclusion. The

commercial exploitation of radio in the United States was much more extensive than in Europe, even though it did not arrive until 1920. Commercial advertising was not allowed on European broadcasting networks since they were either owned or strictly regulated by the state. The discovery that handling, and not the distance delivered, was the important expense in delivering messages led to the introduction of the penny post on all letters in Britain in 1840. For one English penny, you may send any letter that weighed half an ounce or less (two cents). To improve mail delivery from one country to another, the Universal Postal Union was formed in 1875. 150 When telegraph lines were extended from London to Australia in 1871, business transactions could be expedited since messages could be flashed halfway over the world in minutes. As more efficient modes of transportation and communication proliferated, the globe shrank alarmingly.

Social Thinkers on Industrial Society

Changes brought forth by industrialization and the personalities that made up these new societies captivated many social theorists in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Tonnies' "Gemeinschaft" and "Gesellschaft," Durkheim's "organic solidarity" and "mechanical solidarity," Maine's "status" and "contract," and Spencer's "militant" and "industrial society" are just a few examples of how early sociologist consistently compared and contrasted pre- and industrial societies. On the other hand, there is Marx's more complex method of classifying civilizations according to their mode of production, which encompasses phases like "primitive communism," "ancient," "feudal," and [capitalist]. Because they attempted to depict the unavoidable course of history, these theories and typologies were often evolutionary in nature. They compared industrial civilizations to non-industrial or pre-industrial ones and sought to identify the underlying organizing principles of the former. According to St. Simone and the subsequent Comte, industrial civilization was to be contrasted with military society. The former was structured on systematically producing products, whereas the latter revolved around looting, waste, and show. There were four aspects to an industrial society that St. Simone saw: a) production, b) ways of order certainty and accuracy, c) organisation by "New Men" engineers, industrialists, and planners, and d) knowledge as its foundation. Instead of the face-to-face connections seen in smaller communities, Tonnies saw the impersonal relationships based on contracts that defined contemporary industrial society. Similarly, Durkheim examines the foundational principles of the division of labor as well as the mechanical and organic

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 8 Issue 12, December 2018,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

solidarity that hold together different organizations. Karl Marx, Émile Durkheim, and Karl Weber are the most influential theorists when it comes to analyzing industrial civilizations; therefore, let's take a close look at their works.

Karl Marx (1818-1883)

Complex and wide-ranging, Marx's theory seeks to reassemble the political economy of human history while simultaneously addressing the pressing issues of his day. According to his research, the current industrial production system is based on capitalism. 152 The predicament of the working class piqued Marx's attention, which he furthers with his historical materialism theory, which he received from Friedrich Engels. In Marx's view, the transformation of labour into a commodity is the defining feature of capitalism as opposed to the earlier feudal system of production. The time came when peasants could no longer own the land or equipment they needed to produce, thus they had no choice but to sell their labor-power for a price. When workers agree to take money in exchange for their output over a certain time period, they are selling their labor-power (in other words, they are not selling the product of their labor, but their capacity to work). They are able to live off the money they get by selling their work force. To survive, "proletarians" must sell their work power. A "capitalist" or "bourgeois" is someone who purchases the power of labour, who typically does own the land and the means of production. Capitalists profit on the disparity between the demand for their manufactured goods and the supply of labour. Marx noted that the input unit costs are always less than the output unit prices in every industry that has been successful. Marx referred to this disparity as "excess value" and said that it originated from surplus labour. Capital, according to Marx, comes from the surplus value that workers had their labour taken.

Workers in an industrial capitalist economy lead dehumanised lives, but Marx did not see this as inevitable. He and Engels presented a revolutionary alternative; in the Communist Manifesto, they laid forth not just a criticism of the current state of affairs but also a plan for political action (1848). In Marx's view, downtrodden workers would eventually band together to topple the capitalists. Plus, the capitalists would lose control of the means of production and be deposed in a revolutionary coup d'état if class animosity continued to rise. Among modern intellectuals, Marx ranks high in both influence and inspiration. In a rethought version, communist nations like Soviet Russia tried to implement his vision of a peaceful world. These economies' downfalls have only served to inflame Marxist

sentiment. That the rising class tensions he foresaw never materialised in the West in the wake of industrialization is something his detractors have been pointing out for some time. There was still a widening economic gap between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, but industrialization brought about a new middle class that wasn't interested in violent revolution and a welfare state that kept the working class from becoming too radical. This was true in countries like the US and UK. Although Marxism gained traction in the industrialised world due to the Great Depression's economic destruction, its popularity waned as a result of subsequent government protections and economic recovery. Even though Marx has been the target of criticism in academic circles, his core ideas have served as the basis for many different types of social movements. Not to mention the influence of his ideas on capitalism and industrialization. Max Weber, who recognised the rationalisation principles that shape the contemporary industrial world, deserves our attention today.

Max Weber (1863-1920)

Weber sought to analyse capitalism in an effort to complement Marx's primarily economic viewpoint, say many experts. "He believed that a particular Christian ethic had not been given the scrutiny it deserved, so he assigned himself the unique duty of examining its economic importance," Zeitlin says. Though he sometimes mentions causal influence and correlation, he makes it plain that he is intentionally focusing on "just one side of the causal chain," which is the effect of religious beliefs on economic behaviour. More specifically, he hoped to add to our understanding of how "ideas become powerful forces in history" by evaluating the Protestant ethic's impact on the contemporary economic system.

According to Weber, rationalisation is the one and only characteristic that characterises all contemporary institutions. Value orientation, which stems from traditions in fields like politics and economics, differs from this logical, legally oriented value that acts as a foundation. The term "rationalisation" describes how more and more social interactions and behaviours are driven by calculations and efficiency rather than by sentiments rooted in tradition, custom, or emotion. The rationalisation of governmental and bureaucratic processes, the growth of contemporary scientific knowledge, and the development of cutting-edge technological capabilities are all seen as hallmarks of this era of modernization. Western nations' capitalist growth was spurred, according to Weber, by this

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 8 Issue 12, December 2018,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

logical value in protestant ethic. In Protest Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, he develops this idea further.

Thus, Weber concludes that the absence of a rational morality in Eastern religions like Confucianism and Hinduism prevented the growth of capitalism in those regions. In his analysis of Hinduism in India, he draws attention to the religion's teachings about reincarnation and the mundane world's inherent impermanence. He also finds that the religion's endorsement of the traditional caste system hindered economic progress, or, put another way, that the "spirit" of the caste system worked against the indigenous growth of capitalism. He goes on to say that most people's beliefs centred around mystical or otherworldly experiences, that intellectuals were generally not very political, and that there was a clear divide in society between the educated, who looked up to prophets and wise men for guidance, and the uneducated masses, who were too busy with their daily routines and believed in magic. Concerning India, Weber's argument was the subject of several discussions. To test if the Marwaris' and Jains' work ethic and austerity fit with Weber's argument, several researchers dug deeper into his theory in an Indian setting. Others, such as historian Irfan Habib, contended that the British utterly wrecked India's thriving textile sector and ruined the country's chances of capitalist growth. In what follows, we'll talk about certain parts of India's industrialization. Now is a good time to mention that many social scientists, when they imagine industrialised civilizations, relate to Weber's concepts of rationalisation and disenchantment. But first, we need review Durkheim's writings and his theories on industrial society. Like Weber, Durckhiem was preoccupied with assessing the changes brought about by industrialization; they were both living at the same time.

Emile Durkheim (1858-1917)

The effects of industrialization and modernization on society were Durkheim's principal research interests. They start to industrialise as workers start to specialise more and more. As a consequence of industrialization, a new kind of solidarity has emerged, which Durkheim refers to as organic solidarity. Modern, industrial cultures have a very stratified division of work. People nowadays do different things, have different interests, and may not even agree on important life issues. This, however, does not lead to the collapse or disintegration of a civilization, as Durkheim swiftly notes. Solidarity develops organically. People are like an animal's organs in that they serve a certain purpose while also depending on the health and productivity of others to do so. When one organ stops working, the others

follow suit. If one component of a civilization fails, the whole will collapse. The origin of organic soldarity, according to Durkheim, is this dependence on one another for social (and even bodily) existence. In his seminal 1893 essay, The Division of Labor in Community, Durkheim delves deeply into the concept of social solidarity, or the connection between all members of a society. He began by elaborating on the cohesiveness of pre-industrial communities. As he put it, "mechanical solidarity" happened when everyone in a community did the same things or very similar things. If a single member of society were to die without being replaced, the society as a whole would remain unchanged as all the other members continued to function in the same way.

From what you've studied about Durkheim thus far, you must already know that he believed that all civilizations need harmony to operate properly. Eventually, Durkheim argues, modern civilization "will be firmly in balance" if it is structured around the industrial revolution (quoted in Zeitlin, 2000:238) Division of labour has beneficial outcomes, such as "it leads to exchange of services, reciprocity of duties, interdependence etc.," which will bring about this equilibrium. Organic solidarity, in his view, results from contracts and other kinds of formal legal agreements that regulate these transactions. It is because this division of labour temporarily took a pathological shape, according to Durkheim, that it is an abnormal situation and failed to promote solidarity. Marx stresses the divisive character of contemporary industrial society, a place where men are estranged from themselves and from each other; a state in which dominance, exploitation, and conflict were commonplace and inevitable under the current "relations of production" system. In contrast, Durkheim argues that the only way division of labour may lead to bad outcomes is in its pathological form. This disease is known by Durkheim as anomie. According to Durkheim, anomie occurs when there is a lack of clarity, confusion, or social and/or moral standards. The absence of socially recognised boundaries, or norms, according to Durkheim, is what ultimately leads to antisocial conduct. Durkheim argues that industrialization in particular has the tendency to loosen constraints on human desires. Modern industrial cultures divide individuals and decrease social relationships due to increasing complexity and the division of work, in contrast to old societies that effectively taught people to regulate their wants and ambitions, mostly via religion.

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 8 Issue 12, December 2018,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Industrilisation In India

As is well known, the word "industrialization" is used to describe the incorporation of machines into manufacturing processes. Most people also think that the Industrial Revolution in England sped up industrialization worldwide. Given the apparent causal relationship between technological advancements and industrialization, one could reasonably wonder if indigenous industrialization was taking place in India at the same time, and if so, how much of an impact colonisation had on either the expansion of new industries or the decline of older ones. Not only did colonialism have an impact on industrial policy in post-independence India, but so did the prevailing paradigms of development rhetoric and the politics of the time. Before we look at industrialization in post-independence India, let's explore the colonial period.

European colonisation of India and the rise of industry The colonial state is often brought up in discussions on industrialization in India. Apologists for the British Empire sometimes point to the investments the empire made in infrastructure and other areas as evidence that the empire ushered in a new period of industrialization in India, which is a widely held belief. The opposite side of the argument is that indigenous economies suffered greatly as a consequence of colonisation, which eliminated whatever advantage they may have had in the textile business. The nationalists of the period, who sought more indigenous participation in government, were strong advocates of this line of thinking. Two books that became staples of nationalist history were Drain of Wealth by Dadabhai Naoroji and Economic History of India by R.C. Dutt. Indians were forced to leave the handloom sector and work in agriculture, according to the nationalists, because of the low-priced mill fabric produced by the British. Contrary to popular belief, India was not a developing nation prior to the British conquest. Marx and others shared this attitude, but he did highlight colonialism's exploitative aspects. Historians like Irfan Habib argued that the economy in the East was everything but stagnant, refuting the idea of economic decline. Aside from their naval deficiency, the Indian civilization of the 17th century was on par with the Europeans in the skills of manufacturing, agriculture, and culture, according to Hamza Alvi, who cites historical sources. There is evidence of a significant level of urbanisation in mediaeval Indian civilization, which contradicts the notion of that time period as a rural backwater. During the second part of the 16th century, Habib mentions "multitudes of craftsmen, peons and servants found in the towns... in 120 large cities and 3200

townships." 'Agra and Fatehpur Sikri, which are twin cities, were each believed to be bigger than London,' he continues. At one point, Delhi was believed to have as many inhabitants as Paris, the largest metropolis in Europe.

Capitalism, according to Hanza Alvi and other dependency theorists (for a detailed discussion, see unit 9 of the sociology of development course), was an early phenomenon that spread across the world via trade and the extraction of resources from colonies that supported capital accumulation in cities like the British Empire. That is to say, mills and industries in Manchester and elsewhere in England relied on cony resources for fuel. Greed and looting quickly overtook what had begun as unfair commerce. After taking control of India, the British began collecting taxes, duties, and income to bolster their own economy. They also imposed a hefty tariff on Indian textiles. Britain no longer had to pay for India's textile exports in bullion and precious stones; this was after the East India Company found a substantial local source of funding in the shape of land income. It was able to purchase Indian textiles with the riches it harvested from the Indian people. Massive sums of land income were now flowing into the Company and its workers' pockets, which they used to purchase textiles for export. Unrequited exports from India to Britain were now going to be flowing in one direction alone. Indian nationalists were supposed to refer to it as the "Economic Drain" that was happening in India. ”

There was a dearth of financial investment in India during the early days of colonisation. Nevertheless, infrastructure like as railroads, telegraphs, post, etc., were established to facilitate commerce with England. The subsequent 157 investments were from English businesses and capitalists seeking access to inexpensive labour and raw materials. The support of the Empire was also beneficial to them. Due to British policies that did not encourage Indians and their reluctance to go into unfamiliar sectors, very few Indian entrepreneurs ventured into manufacturing. On the other hand, the Parsis and the Marwaris were among the many commercial groups that originally worked as intermediaries and collaborators with the British, such as those who dabbled in industry establishment. The Marwaris of Calcutta transitioned from a trading family to a thriving jute industry. A small number of Marwari families underwent a slow but steady transition from "traders to manufacturers." The following steps may be used to define this pattern: A number of Marwari merchants joined official jute-trade organisations, and (B) their influence in the

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 8 Issue 12, December 2018,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

raw jute and jute-manufactured jute trade grew over time. Finally, some Marwaris got into the jute industry in the early 1920s by establishing their own jute mills. Others became brokers for British managing agency businesses or became board members after purchasing shares. While the Birlas began operating their first jut emill in 1919, the Goenka and Bangur did not begin operations till after WWII (Oonk, 2004:4) The Parsis, in contrast to the Marwaris, encountered less resistance from the British. They felt sorry for the British since they were their accomplices. During the Mutiny of 1857, they were loyal to the British and provided financial support for British military equipment; they also helped fund the defence of the Bombay fort. Finally, thirdly, some Parsees in West India quickly saw the value of learning English, assimilating British culture, and strengthening ties to the British in order to better their economic and social standing. It was in Bombay that the Parsis helped establish India's cotton textile industry. From 1854 to 1863, nine out of 10 mills in Bombay were owned by Parsis. The Petit family's two mills were a part of this. "Parsis owned between 41% and 30% of the city's mills between 1878 and 1915." Outside of these groups, Ahmedabad bankers began establishing mills independently of the British. Following these early ventures, several trade families began to put money into manufacturing. The government began implementing discriminatory regulations against them as a result of this threat to the monopoly of British capitalists. The British capitalist benefited from policies that favoured tariffs, taxes, and transportation. The marketing of commodities was also marked by intense rivalry. A federation of Indian chambers of commerce and industry was formed by the Indian business community (FICCI).

Industrilisation in Post-independent India

The economic trajectory of India was heavily influenced by its colonial history, particularly during the tenure of Jawaharlal Nehru, the country's new prime minister. There was no longer any doubt about the connection between colonialism and underdevelopment. Because of this, Indian officials are hesitant to support free trade on a global scale. Following the lead of Fabian socialism and the Soviet Union, Nehru opted to implement a socialist economic model. The Indian government prompted and oversaw much of the country's early economic activities after independence. The mixed-economy policy proposed by Harold Laski was one that Nehru wished to implement. Public services and large-scale enterprises were under the state's authority. Nehru drew on development language and models that were prominent at the time to chart a route for economic policy

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 8 Issue 12, December 2018,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

after independence. In his heart, he thought that India, like Russia, must to invest in its capital-intensive heavy 158 industries. The building of dams and the establishment of heavy industries characterised the early stage of economic growth. The alternatives available to him were much more restricted than they are now, and he mostly followed the consensus among academic economists in India at the time. The gross domestic product (GDP) growth rate of India remained slightly more than 4% during Nehru's tenure as prime minister. The amount of growth that might have been achieved with other economic strategies is difficult to determine with certainty: During the Nehru years, command economies in communist China and the Soviet Union expanded at a somewhat higher rate than India. This was particularly true in the decade after World War II, when Western Europe was mostly capitalist. Most of the newly independent countries that followed WWII (excluding oil-producing nations) progressed slightly more slowly, including the fiercely capitalist USA. Among the primary powers that helped India build its heavy industrial, engineering, and technological skills independently during Nehru's term was the Soviet Union. As a result of this political reality and Nehru's fondness for state-led growth, doubts over the authenticity of India's non-aligned foreign policy perspectives arose. Even if many of Nehru's goals were not achieved under the Nehruvian model, many of India's economists, especially those who lived during Nehru's time, still think central planning was the best policy for India at the time.

Gandhi and Nehru on Industrilisation

Various viewpoints, works, and disputes surround the topic of development. Most development theories are either industry-oriented or top-down, and both of these approaches have their detractors and proponents. Now that more people are aware of how the overexploitation of Earth's resources and the negative impacts of heavy industries are causing environmental degradation, critics have been quite critical of consumerist-oriented growth policies. When it comes to development, many have held Gandhi's ideas in high esteem. The time has come to examine it from both perspectives. Swdeshi and Khadi: The lasting impact of Gandhi Much of the debate concerning India's economic future after its independence has, as we said before, been influenced by and reliant on concepts related to colonialism. The rural Indian population, in Gandhi's perspective, held the secret to India's progress. His distrust of the central authority led him to envision a future for India that includes a system of village republics. He was adamantly against industrialization, which

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 8 Issue 12, December 2018,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

he saw as dooming traditional handicrafts, artisans, and the businesses that relied on them. He was a firm believer in the value of swadeshi, or independence. Because of this, our Indian community had to depend on the hard work and resourcefulness of our fellow residents for our survival. He believed that khadi, a cloth made by hand, encapsulated the spirit of swdeshi. According to Gandhi, large production is unnecessary when dealing with individual needs. Many fundamental need may be met by individual and community-level production of items. He reasoned that if village industry could be established, rural unemployment might be reduced. The genuine measure of development, in his view, is not the cheapness of mass-produced items, but rather the well-being of the poor and the prosperity of rural areas. Tools such as the spinning wheel stood for human autonomy, productive labour, and fundamental living circumstances even more than a handloom. He cautioned against the present preoccupation on material achievement. If this was really a positive development for mankind, he wondered. He believed that material prosperity did not always signify progress in moral and spiritual aspects. He cautioned against going for wealth like the West. Those who are looking for alternatives to the present paradigms in development, which are top-down approaches that don't meet people's real needs, are finding a resonance with Gandhi's ideas. From this vantage point, Gandhi's idea of village-level decentralisation is quite appealing.

Conclusions

Throughout the whole of this lesson, we have made an effort to grasp the idea of industrialization by seeking to identify the many features that are associated with it. The Industrial Revolution in England, which definitely hastened the process of industrialization across Europe and beyond, has been shown to be the beginning of the industrialization process. Production processes and social structures have been profoundly transformed as a result of industrialization, and several scholars have tried to make sense of these transformations in order to better understand them. Some of the most notable sociologists have written on the impact of these cultural changes, and it is possible that we will continue to see the effects of these developments. The industrialised nations served as a model for the third world countries, who were left behind, to follow in order to enhance their own level of life and catch up to the rest of the world. India, much like a great number of other nations, adopted Western models of economic development. The consequences of modernity on Indian society, which also included the effects of industry and

westernisation, have been the subject of a great deal of writing. During the whole of this course, we have made an attempt to address some of these issues about modernization in a variety of different courses. You have been given an effort to be provided with the perspectives of Gandhi and Nehru, two of the most prominent personalities in the history of industrialization. The purpose of this last section was to make an effort to illustrate that, as a society, we are becoming more and more dependent on the processes that are associated with information technology, which goes beyond the boundaries of traditional industrialism.

References

1. Handler Jr., Alfred D. (1993). The Visible Hand: The Management Revolution In American Business. Belknap Press Of Harvard University Press. ISBN 978-0674940529.
2. Hewitt, T., Johnson, H. And Wield, D. (Eds) (1992) Industrialisation And Development, Oxford University Press: Oxford.
3. Hobsbawm, Eric (1962): The Age Of Revolution. Abacus.
4. Kemp, Tom (1993) Historical Patterns Of Industrialisation, Longman: London. ISBN 0-582-09547-6
5. Kiely, R (1998) Industrialisation And Development: A Comparative Analysis, UCL Press:London.
6. Landes, David. S. (1969). The Unbound Prometheus: Technological Change And Industrial Development In Western Europe From 1750 To The Present. Cambridge, New York: Press Syndicate Of The University Of Cambridge. ISBN 0-521-09418-6.
7. Pomeranz, Ken (2001)The Great Divergence: China, Europe And The Making Of The Modern World Economy (Princeton Economic History Of The Western World) By (Princeton University Press; New Ed Edition, 2001)
8. Tilly, Richard H.: Industrialization As An Historical Process, European History Online, Main: Institute Of European History, 2010, Retrieved: 29 February 2011.