

Contradictions in Explanations of Socio - Economic Modernization of Production.

Allan J. Sutherland.

Abstract

This paper examines the unproductive responses to problems encountered by theories of modernization by focusing on two sets of theories of socio - economic modernization. It does this by focusing on the problems posed for theories of socio - economic modernization by the persistence of small scale production, specifically on the response of converting models originally constructed to explain a critical phase in the emergence of modern societies, into traditional, moribund models. An alternative explanation is sketched, requiring theories of modernization with greater explanatory power.

Keywords: Modernization, Transitional models, Traditional models, Simple Commodity Production, Household Production.

概 要

近代化理論が直面する問題への非生産的な対応に関して考察し、なかでも二種類の社会経済近代化理論を集中的に取り上げる。具体的には、小規模生産が依然存在し続ける状態の説明にあたって社会経済近代化理論が抱える問題にしばり、とくに、近代社会の出現における重要な段階を説明するために本来は構築されたモデルを、伝統的かつ静的なモデルに転用するような対応の問題点を詳説する。そこで、新たな説明を提案・概説し、近代化理論により大きな説明力を求めるものである。

キーワード：近代化、移行期モデル、伝統型モデル、単純商品生産、家内生産

Introduction.

This paper will focus on socio - economic modernization, detailing how responses to phenomena recalcitrant for theories (phenomena which contradict the explanations and predictions of preferred theories), embrace contradiction, are unproductive, and do not attempt to resolve contradiction and expand explanatory capacities. For sake of simplification, theories of modernization will be divided into two sets, and briefly detailed, and then the strategies of theorists confronted with the persistence of small scale production will be examined. This will show that when faced with phenomena which contradicts their preferred theo-

ries, rather than reformulate the theories they adapt a model which was originally formulated to explain dynamic changes to account for what they conceive of as prematurely halted, or stuck social transition in the social organization of production. It will be shown that doing this has a highly negative impact on the original theories that they are struggling to protect by this strategy, leading to a division between pure, uncluttered theory and practical, cluttered social and historical phenomena. The elevation of theory to a status of purity, is to divorce it from the reality that it was created to assist both our understanding of, and effectiveness in, its improvement, and consequently elevates theory to a position of explanatory failure

and practical uselessness. There is a need to creatively address existing theories and radically solve their contradictions and problems, providing enhanced explanatory capabilities. The paper will then, based on evidence obtained in research of the Scottish Fisheries,¹ an explanation of small scale production that is technologically and economically dynamic is presented, which calls for theorists to devise new theories which eradicate the inconsistencies of the old ones and explain actual processes of modernization and contemporary life.

I. Theories of Industrial or Capitalist Society.

Modernization, modernity, and modernism are concepts applied to numerous social processes and phenomena that occurred over an expansive period of time; the terms are used to explain the processes leading to specific organizations of socio-economic activity, of social structures, national and other cultures, to science, social theory, philosophy, as well as to the various arts, e.g., music, painting, literature, architecture, etc. The sheer expansiveness of the social phenomena to which the concepts apply make the task of creating a cohesive, all-embracing explanation a Herculean task. Nonetheless, the transformations that have occurred in the various arenas of human activity demand serious scholarly attention in order to clarify understanding of their emergence, nature and possible future consequences. There is no lack of scholarly activity addressing these issues, in fact the social science pursuit of their study is a contemporaneous creation, and a number of theories proposed. However, it is essential to stress that true understanding will only result from a willingness to confront explanatory problems and to reformulate our explanatory undertakings, if we are to overcome explanatory failures with theories that expand explanatory successes. All too often this is not the case, and existing theories are treated as though they were correct and the recalcitrant activities as incorrigible. Alternately, the postmodern trend now is to ascribe the inconsis-

tencies and inadequacies of the theories to the societies, practices and actors themselves and describe these as contradictory. In both instances there is a refusal to address directly and deal with inconsistencies and contradictions in explanatory undertakings.

Essentially, there are two approaches available for analyzing the social organization of production; theories of industrial society or theories of capitalist society. Both emerged during a period of major social transformation, for which they strove to give account, offering developmental theories; theories predictive of future, and explanatory of past, developments and processes. These were not divergent concerns; predictions of the future were to be confirmatory of explanations proposed for past processes. The lack of success that these have had with their explanations and predictions has spawned claims that their explanatory project is not just mistaken, but utterly impossible, due to the impossibility of the scientific undertaking and/or dramatic changes in the contemporary social world.¹¹

To explain social change, both predicted that an initial predominance of numerous, small diversified producers would be supplanted by that of a few large scale, hierarchical, centrally organized and controlled producers as modernization. However, there is a paradox in confronting the problem of small scale production¹¹; while there has often been considerable progressive and successive development in social conditions and capacities this development has not been as predicted by these two sets of theories, neither in terms of causes or of outcomes. The social organization of the Scottish Fisheries present an obvious and serious, not unique, anomaly for these sociological theories of modernization, to which the theoretical responses was to redesign a dynamic transitional model of production, drawn from these theoretical sets, converting it into a traditional, moribund one. Regardless of whether, in so doing, the attempt

was to explain it as an unstable, temporary or a more permanent anomaly there was an acute paradox; the models employed for this purpose were the very ones offered to explain the progressive development of the modern social order. This was so whether the modern social order was identified as industrial or capitalist society.

The first set of theories are apparent in the work of Comte, Durkheim, Weber, Parsons, Galbraith, Bell, Kerr, et. al., etc., and the second in the work of the Marxist tradition, e.g., Marx, Lenin, Mandel, Baran and Sweezy, Poulantzas, Wright, etc. While there are dissimilarities within and between both sets of theorists concerning conceptions of the nature and causes of modern society and its development, they all share similarities in their representation of some of its central processes. Both see the progress and concentration of production as inevitable. Both see this process as mediated by the producer units being located in a market economy, wherein competition brings the concentration of production in very large units which derive their efficiency and strength from their size. Their size allows them to develop their organization and provides them with resources to do so with stamina. Both share some common ground in their portrayal of modern society as a distinct construct of social relationships, some of which are extrapolated here to construct a typification of specific features of industrial/capitalist society common to both:

1. Feudal social relationships and regulations of trade are supplanted by forces leading to modern industrial society, where the market becomes the medium of communication and decision-making for the provision and distribution of goods and services.
2. Capital becomes the private property of individuals, consequently, labour gains what Marx termed, with biting irony, a double edged freedom; freedom from possession of their means of production and freedom to sell their labour power on the market.
3. Physical and temporal separation of the household from the place of production.
4. A social division of labour dispersing tasks amongst organizations providing specialist goods and services, requiring a unitary exchange medium to equalize values; i.e., money.
5. An internal division of labour within the production organization, e.g., the company.
6. An entrepreneur; either an individual or a company enacting the entrepreneurial function of initiating and enacting changes in production methods, goods, etc.

These can be considered to be the main, or natural, elements distinguishing modern industrial/capitalist society from all previous types of society that are common to both theoretical traditions. The differences in the theories become apparent when their proposed causes of social development are examined. Theories of industrial society see the development in the division of labour and technology and the rationalization of production the main dynamics of change within a competitive market. Theories of capitalist society emphasize class conflict spurred by the structural tendencies within a competitive market as the main dynamic of change.

II. Theories of Industrial Society.

Theories of industrial society tend to shadow a theoretical strategy akin to that of Adam Smith to explain the emergence and growth of industrial society as factory production based on private ownership of capital, and, similarly, to conceive the production practice preceding and leading to modern, industrial society as a smaller scale version of what succeeds it. The difference being in the unity of capital and labour in production which was described as occurring in or around the household: Household production is the kernel that evolved into industrial society and provided the key to the development of industrial society of which it

was prototypical.^{iv} However, these theories of progressive, improving evolution of societies faced two severe problems: (a) providing an account for the inspiration of that change; and (b) to cohesively incorporate the change within an overall explanatory framework which was, essentially, a self-contained equilibrium one.^v

Curiously, when this theoretical perspective is examined closely it becomes apparent that, when confronted with counter-evidence, the fundamental transitional model is transformed into a traditional model in effort to account for the absence of transition. The work of Smelser and Parsons (1956) makes explicit the core of this theoretical approach. Succinctly, their argument was that the market facilitated development in technology and the division of labour that required large scale production for its existence and practice. The household was inadequate to the task of introducing this progressive development of production and was superseded by superior, internally differentiated, production units. Where the household was not so superseded it became an example of traditional production.

It may appear strange to suggest that Parsons and Smelser utilize a transitional model as a traditional model to explain away the anomalies to their prognosis of social development. After all, they employed a functional analysis of society and they, in line with the general strictures against the synchronics inherent to that model, were constantly criticized as being unable to explain the processes of social change. While, both of these criticisms are common currency in the critical literature, it is certainly the case that Smelser and Parsons were concerned to explain social change and development. Their awareness of the problems they encounter in explaining change is obvious from their proper wish to extend the notion of the resources brought to production for commerce beyond those normally considered economic resources in economic theory. It is also apparent in

their stress that society never reaches an equilibrium state in all of the functional requirements for a society to reproduce itself. However, given this, as of economic theory, we are led to ask; why develop an equilibrium model of perfection to explain a society in disequilibrium undergoing imperfect development?

To explain social change Parsons and Smelser attempted to devise a theory applicable to all forms of society; to identify features common to every society in any time period or geographical location. To this end they focused on the supposed functional requirements of any society to reproduce. Thus, every society, every social development, came to be characterized and measured in terms of the functional features found at the preceding phase. Surprisingly, given the need to distinguish societies to detail their development, it was in terms of continuous features of societies that this development was being assessed^{vi}.

The household provided the starting point for their analysis of the development of social life and social structure that led to modern industrial society. The household was identified by them as the unit which fulfilled the functional requirements of society in a single, complete social whole. Within the household, they contended, all four functional imperatives that all societies must fulfil to survive and reproduce themselves could be observed combined and fulfilled; goal fulfilment, adaptation, integration and pattern maintenance. However, this reassuring picture of the functional integration of society being met within a single, homely, unit had its limitations which were upset by forces external to the household. Responses to these forces they, first, identified as differentiation of the performance of, functional, tasks to the separate individuals who composed the household; a specialization that enhanced the efficiency of their performance and production of both socially integrated individuals and of their commodities. As societies developed these functions, initially united within the same people and in the same place, were

further distributed amongst social entities in distinct geographical locations. Thus, for example, the factory became the separate location of production, of the adaptation function, while the household became that of socialization and tension management, of the pattern maintenance function. The function of integration was that of the entrepreneur who brought together new combinations in order to answer dissatisfactions in goal fulfilment. As such a responsive and not an initiating function is ascribed to the entrepreneur. The household presented the unity of a mini industrial society out of which that modern society was argued to have emerged.

Smelser and Parson tried to model society as moving towards a never reached equilibrium of functionally differentiated and integrated units. This integration was effected via the market. They were aware that the separation of functions was never complete, nor the full functioning of any one function compatible with the functioning of any other, which generated enormous contradictory tensions in their theoretical framework, because it was precisely these functions which defined the separate units in society. After all, these separate entities were formed to meet the requirements of their functional specialism; this was the *raison d'être* for their existence, and the functions were required to be met to ensure a stable social system. In Smelser's and Parsons' terms the functions defined the collectivities and the sub-sub-systems of the sub-systems of a society. The differentiations of the functions initially unified in the household lost degrees of their distinctiveness of location and identity. It was precisely in the location of such integration that the explanation of the stubborn persistence of the household in its original functionally integrated form tends to be located.

The above model, with a number of refinements, was what was developed by the subsequent theorists of industrial society. Their analysis con-

tended that progress entailed development in the division of labour and technology and that there was a concurrent homogenization of production procedures and practices both within and amongst any discrete units of production, due to competition. These changes required expansion in the size of the company, to enable investment in larger, more expensive and developed means of production and to provide economies of scale. The scale and the complexity of firm's operations, they further argued, required, and led to the development of, a complex internal command structure: It required a complex bureaucratic structure of personal and regulations to command and ensure co-ordination and homogenization of the production procedures and practices in the firm around the most developed and efficient ones. The separation of the ownership from the control functions appeared in the emergence of professional managerial groups and large scale finance companies. However, there was a central paradox; the efficiency generating progress was seen to contain serious inefficiencies by theorists of industrial society. While the prognoses of the theories were seen to be compromised in a number of ways by subsequent analysts operating some of the inefficiencies can be briefly and usefully listed for the purpose of the subsequent analyses as follows:

1. Enhanced efficiency in commodity production was argued to require separation from the household. Thus, work was ascribed a unique identity and value, measured in monetary return, for which, as means to an end, it became a cost, creating an incentive to lessen the cost and increase the reward; thus creating inherent inefficiency.^{vii}
2. Modernization incurred additional costs; of supervision in some proportionate order with the growth in the size and complexity of organizations and the separation of ownership from control. As well as performing co-ordinating tasks supervisors were also thought necessary to maintain employee effort and work quality.

3. Modernization was argued to repeatedly overturn the values that located people socially, leading to anomie and inefficiency at the individual and institutional levels.
4. Modern rationalization was described, in practice, as entrapping producers, bringing a reduced range of experiences and of opportunities to exercise choice; this increased monotony and powerlessness, affecting motivation, satisfaction, and commitment.
5. Bureaucracy, basic to the modernization process, was empirically found also to bring inflexibility and inefficiency (c.f., Blau 1963, Gouldner 1954, Merton 1953).
6. While early theorists of routinization and bureaucratization thought their application universal, not all subsequent research found them to conform with their theoretical explication. Not all situations and production processes were seen amenable to routinization and/or bureaucratization, argued to less, not more, efficiency^{viii}

These were some of the main inefficiencies that were seen as caused by the progressive development of the production process. These were also often proposed to explain why this development in the production process was at times found to be stalled in its practical application. These inefficiencies were proposed to explain why, in large production organizations, the predicted developments were not carried out to their fullest. The contradictions of the theoretical prognoses found in practice were proposed to explain the absence of the prognoses in practice.

III. Theories of Capitalist Society.

Theories of capitalist society, derived from the work of Marx, provide the alternative approach to modernization of the social organization of production; these also strive to explain social change and undergo shifts in analytical emphasis in efforts to accommodate and account for recalcitrant

developments. These theories predicted constant restructuring of the labour process and the concentration of production in more centralized, larger units accompanied by ever sharper polarization in ownership, incomes, experiences, and heightened inter-class conflict.

In Marxist theory modernization as capitalism, was understood to have emerged from, by a complete transformation of, feudalism society resulting from class conflict and development in the forces of production which could not be accommodated by the tradition based social relations within which it occurred^x. From its inception capitalism was seen as necessarily progressive, progressing from small to increasingly large scale concentrated production forms; that simple co-operation emergence from craft, Simple Commodity, Production and progressed through manufacture, and machinofacture, onto large scale capitalist production. The essential characteristics of simple commodity production are; (a) labour owns its own capital, (b) production is centred on the household, (c) production is for exchange on the market, and (d) there is no application of wage labour. Driving this process were class conflict and the necessity for each producer to achieve socially necessary labour time in their activities. With this modernization society progressed but became increasingly polarized between the owners of capital and dispossessed labour. Marx argued that theoretical and historical development were not discordant; they were presented as one and the same process.^x From the initial stage each stage provided the necessary and sufficient conditions for the subsequent one and once the initial stage was achieved every stage until the ultimate was entailed otherwise the model floundered with the contradiction of contingency.^{xi} Curiously, the full realization of capitalism was the full realization of contradiction and each moment of development incurred production inefficiencies.^{xii}

Initially, the capitalist merely combined work-

ers and deployed them using the previous techniques of simple commodity production, achieving only the formal, not the real, subsumption of labour. The act of bringing together decreased production costs and increased output and the size of the producer unit. It also sharpened producer competition by reducing the socially necessary labour time and generated increasing class conflict between the owners of capital and the dispossessed workers. The number of producers simultaneously decreased with each new refinement as those not adopting the new methods were competitively overwhelmed. By and large these were, in the Marxist model, the basic and common features of each improvement in the production process and of the emergence of each succeeding stage of capitalism. Progress along these stages was detailed as the necessary expansion of production and innovation in technology so that labour was exclusively directed towards valorizing for capital. Each stage was marred, though, by deterioration in the conditions and experience of labour and increased class conflict.

Labour's characteristic, as the sole source of value, was conceived of as a recalcitrant and potential production force, not as a determined quantity as machinery was considered to be, imposed the move from formal to real subsumption through class conflict and competition. This move is detailed as having the following features and consequences:

1. The complete separation of conception from the worker's execution of their tasks with conception becoming the sole prerogative of the owners and managers of capital.
2. The general task of labour is fractured into smaller and smaller units requiring less skilled and trained labour; labour is made simple and homogeneous.
3. The increasing mechanization of the means of production.
4. The cost of labour power is reduced and materi-

alizes in lower real wages and destitution for the worker.

5. The porosity of the labourer's working day is eradicated; there are no times when their activity is not directed towards valorization.

These outcomes were seen as impacting on those carrying out the labour process in such a way as to effect both their experiences and consciousness; it affected their commitment and motivation to work in the capitalist form of employment. The eschatological outcome was from deteriorating working and living conditions to ever increasing class conflict and consciousness and on to socialist transformation and human completeness. Comparative and contrasting sets of experiences were offered by this thesis throughout the stages of development. Its immediate impact was to increase class conflict in the form of collective and individual resistance. Collective, in the formation of trade unions and the pursuit of strikes, sit-ins, work-to-rules, etc. Individual in the form of absenteeism, tardiness, sabotage, outsmarting tactics, etc. Both the cause and effect of capitalist dynamism were, in this theory, the inefficiency of the system and the inefficiency of engendered conflict. The striving to reduce the potential for conflict and increase the efficacy of labour simultaneously was seen to increase and decrease the conflict. Nevertheless, in the model the increase necessarily exceeded the decrease which left open the possibility that other social organizations could be more efficient due to their being less wasteful of the human energies expended in the process of conflict and lost through the diminution of the experience and, thereby, of the commitment and motivation to work.^{xiii} Insofar as the developments foreseen by Marxist theorists have been realized and they are found to deleteriously affect the experience and evaluation of work then it should be expected that where there were all round better alternatives experienced these will be preferred and sought.

The renewed interest in the labour process sparked by Braverman's book, which was an attempt to prove Marx's prognoses regarding the deskilling and Proletarianization of labour, led, in fact to the opposite, to an awareness of the work's severe limitations. Braverman's critics tended to focus on what he pointed out himself; that his analysis did not consider the worker's responses to capitalist changes in the labour process. With this the concern moved to the historical reality of the process to reveal that the achievements were far from perfect due to workers resistance to the changes; to class conflict. Stark noted the importance of conflict in his reading of Montgomery's analysis of craftsmen:

"In contrast to Braverman, who locates the craftsmen's autonomy in their technical skills, Montgomery argues that 'a simple technological explanation will not suffice. Technical knowledge acquired on the job was embedded in a mutualistic ethical code also acquired on the job, and together these attributes provided workers with considerable autonomy at their work and powers of resistance to the wishes of their employers.'" (1980 p. 322)

And Price noted contentedly:

"...we are, therefore, faced with the irony that the 'failure' of the 'political' struggle to displace the 'wages' struggle lies within the incompleteness of domination itself." (1983, P. 62)

In other words, the class struggle against the real subsumption of labour negates the class struggle.

Within the Marxist model, in a similar location to the Household Production model in the theories of industrial society, is the model of Simple or Petty Commodity Production. Simple Commodity Production was identified in the model as a transitional model which would necessarily transform into full scale capitalism. A curiosity emerges when small scale production is encountered. At that point theorists within the Marxist stream turn

to this transitional model to provide an explanation for small scale production. In doing this they convert a transitional model into a traditional model sticking development.

IV. Resolving Small Scale Production into Traditional Production.

Both theoretical approaches to modern society experienced considerable difficulty when confronted with the persistence of small scale production, like in the Scottish Fisheries, and both developed similar, converging, strategies to resolve their difficulties. These explanatory strategies bring no solution, instead they reconstruct small scale production as traditional production, which is impeded, stuck development. Small scale production is reconstructed as stuck development because it contradicts the explanations and expectations of these theoretical perspectives. Also, as the models applied to small scale production were initially constructed to explain social change, within the theoretical frameworks they become inherently contradictory. Deprived of the theoretical dynamism that supposedly gave them the power to drive modernization onwards, they call into question these very same theories of modernization.

In an effort to protect the master theories, and provide seeming explanation, the recalcitrant practices are spoken of as unstable (ever able to come unstuck and reassume their birth-given dynamism), incurring a need to emaciate their teleological power. This is achieved by dividing theory from reality, from social practices; whereby theories and models are ascribed pure theoretical, at best heuristic, status, and their subjects, e.g., the practices of small scale production, are given impure historical or contingent status. The recalcitrant practices were thus thought of as, on the whole, neutralized for theory, because actual phenomena cannot be expected to fully accord with the theoretical categories formulated to explain them. While theories and practices may to some degree

differ, when they diverge such that the practices seriously undermine the explanations, then elevated status of theories becomes a status of explanatory failure. Indeed, the analysts pursuing these tactics to protect theories from embarrassing facts, can be perceptive of aspects of the practices being studied, particularly of where these contradict the theories' prognoses, however, they are hampered by their reluctance to formulate new explanatory theories and categories so as to enhance the explanatory capacities of both. Instead, they propose the contradiction of the theory as the explanation. Recognition of contradiction of the expectations of theories, does not equate provide an explanation. By considering these models the attempt will be made to develop a model for the Scottish Fisheries which explains their organization as progressively developmental, not as retarded development.^{xi}

For mainstream theorists the context within which household production occurred was that of developing industrial society. Household production was seen as dependent upon the context of its location. Sometimes this location was the interstice between co-existing forms of society and production. This interstitial location was variously described as between industrial and agricultural societies, commercial and non-commercial economies, modern and traditional, peasant, societies. In each case the former was considered to be the dominant and determining form and Household production was resolved into a stalled stage in the development to the former from the latter. However, there was a tendency in this theorizing to idealize the former; the former were spoken of as though they had been realized in practice as they had been described in mainstream developmental theory. The debates that arise when either these categories or aspects of them are addressed directly makes it patently obvious that they are far from being only minimally problematic for the theories. Nevertheless, for mainstream writers the interesting aspects of House-

hold production derived from its dual character as being distinct from and formally subordinated to processes in a wider context.

For Marxists, the context within which Simple Commodity Production occurred was as a dynamic part of emerging modern, capitalist society. However, when found in capitalist societies, Marxist theorists also it as a dependent model, which was sometimes expressed as it being determined a form, not a mode, of production.^{xv} However, this conception leads to a tendency to idealize the very problematic category of capitalism itself; when analyzing simple commodity production capitalism comes to be conceived as developing normally according to the expectation of the theoretical model. This is patently not the case as the debates on the persistence of small scale production in a number of areas, on class polarization and transformation, the labour process, etc. attest. Further, the market model, while seemingly affording some explanatory purchase on reality, is seriously flawed and the model of capitalism is inaccurate for the present context within which Simple Commodity Production is supposed to be located.^{xvi} Nevertheless, for Marxist writers the interesting aspects of Simple Commodity Production when applied after the emergence of later stages of modern development derived from its dual character as being distinct from and formally subordinated to processes in a wider context.

For mainstream and Marxist writers: 1. Household and Simple Commodity Production are agreed to be distinct in the unity in ownership between the direct producer and the means of production. 2. Both mainstream and Marxist writers then describe them as subordinated to processes of a wider context; this location of the production process was within the market economy where the producers have to purchase their inputs and realize their reproduction by means of selling their products. It was the dynamic of competition within market relations which was proposed as necessi-

tating a process of restructuring within either Household or Simple Commodity Production relations. This was a process of capital accumulation and concentration which would give rise to its ultimate evolution into the modern form. The attempted reconciliation of this expectation and the apparent stability of the former fall roughly into seven strategies. While these strategies were not always singly pursued by theorists, often found in some combination, it is analytically valuable to distinguish and treat them separately:

1. An Apparent Anomaly.

The contention here was that transformation of production processes, of either Household or Simple Commodity Producers was effected. That either the rationalization of production or the real subsumption of labour was occurring within either the Household or Simple Commodity Production forms. That this was carried out by large scale capitalist companies providing innovative technologies that determine the nature of production. The market location of the producers enforced the widespread adoption of these innovative technologies. The cost and design of which was argued to ensure that small scale, apparently non-capitalist, producers were actually controlled and exploited by large scale, monopoly capital at least as much as they would be had their means of production been owned by this capital and they been in its employ. Also the cost of the technology made it necessary for the producers to take on loans to buy it. Both the cost and the interest charges effected the transfer of surpluses to large capital. Furthermore, the competitive producers faced monopsonistic buyers for their produce and received lower prices for their produce than they would have otherwise. (c.f., Clements 1983c, Goodman and Redclift 1986, 1987) This thesis will be hotly disputed as contrary to the reported perceptions and preferences of the fishers and of the features reported as central to the second two theses. Forby that there are three principle flaws in this sort of proposition:

Firstly, it is difficult to see what is distinctive between the purchase and deployment of technology by large capital and that by Household/Simple Commodity Producers; neither design the technology and both are impelled to deploy it by the same processes of competition according to the theoretical explanations being deployed. Even if the former were to design it the distinction remains tendentious given the locational context of the forms of production and it is precisely this that is stressed by the theorists; i.e., the thesis confuses the company with labour.

Secondly, the thesis fails to take account of the theoretical need for either centralized bureaucratic and rationalized processes or for capital to own the means of production and subsume labour directly under its control. Another way of expressing this is that they fail to take into account the distinction, Marx noted, between the division of labour in production and the division of labour in society:

"Division of labour within the workshop implies the undisputed authority of the capitalist over men, who are merely the members of a total mechanism which belongs to him. The division of labour within society brings into contact independent producers of commodities, who acknowledge no authority other than competition..."

(Marx 1976 pp. 476 - 7)

This confusion appears in the following on Canadian fishers:

"Penetration of SCP by capitalist relations can be understood as a process of Proletarianization... it will be argued that capitalism does not necessarily fully proletarian labour, which instead maintains certain characteristics of so called independent commodity production."

(Clements 1983c p. 255)

These characteristics are the ownership of the means of production which, Clements argues, is a sham, a formal possession without the control -

that accompanies such ownership. With this the division of labour within society becomes the division of labour within production and the need for concentration, and for progress within the capitalist mode of production is negated.

Thirdly, theory requires more than the absence of a necessity to provide an adequate explanation of social processes which run counter to processes entailed by the theory, particularly when the entailment derives from reasons greater than the immediate consequences of the processes themselves. These reasons derived also from the greater resources that ownership of capital was argue to afford, especially when it came to points where it was necessary to be able to match or, more hopefully, outlive, overwhelm and supplant the competition. The absence of necessity, the ability to achieve the same ends by other means, may provide the necessary conditions for an adequate explanation but they do not provide the sufficient conditions for one.

2. The Skill Requirements of the Production

Process.

This was advanced, in some way, by Lofgren (1972) Sinclair, (1984) Thompson et al., (1983) and Wadel, (1972), and is quite informative as it focuses on the specifics of the production activity as central to the explanation of the social organization being analyzed. However, it cannot save the developmental theses of either the two approaches outlined.

This strategy focused on the skills of labour and argued that in particular activities, like fishing, there were peculiarities in the production process which impeded rationalization or deskilling and concentration of the production process. In fishing these peculiarities were said to be the volatile reproduction and mobility patterns of the fish, limited knowledge of these patterns, fish species cohabit in heterogeneous mixes, impeding rationalization of harvesting labour and also of catches to

fit market conditions. Consequently, exploration to find new areas of good quality fish was necessary and, it was argued, the more risk taking, adventurous fishers could reap superior catches taking their incomes to multiples of the fleet average. This impeded rationalization of labour and species harvesting was said to obstruct vertical integration of the harvesting and processing sectors. Furthermore, the intricacies of the seabed and the hazardous nature of the sea and the weather demanded very skilful sailing. These intractable features imposed dependence on the skill and volition of the skipper and crew, thwarted imposition of a highly centralized, hierarchical, and rationalized structure of harvesting, thereby of the concentration of the ownership of vessels.

This is an astute thesis of the nature of fishery activities however, it cannot save the developmental theses of the two approaches outlined above. Before considering this basic problem there is the specific problem that it cannot account for the spectacular emergence of the shore owned company boats of the trawler fleets in Britain because it posits an awareness of the impracticality of large scale organization by investors. Also, limitation of the ability to rationalize and command processes has not been seen as a reason preventing either the imposition of company structure or the separation of capital from labour in the past; it has been posited as subordinate to and accommodated by these overarching processes. Thus bringing together labour enabled the division of labour and rationalization of production within theories of industrial society and the transformation of the forces of production and the real subsumption of labour in Marxist theory. Any limitation, then, has been seen as reason for transformation of these processes.

For this thesis, describing specific features of the social praxis of the fisheries, to be informative, and for the nature of the development within the fisheries to be taken account of, the develop-

mental theories themselves need to be reformulated. Had the fisheries been a single exception, perhaps their exceptionalism could be accepted as minor. That there are many such exceptions, similar and related, exhausts the feasibility of exceptionalism. Indeed, the specific argument of exceptionalism here bears astounding resemblance to Gouldner's explanation for the differential application of bureaucratic practices within a gypsum plant and the more general critiques of the unintended consequences of the bureaucratic personality or of the anomic individual. It also bears striking resemblance to attempted explanations for the restricted real subsumption of labour in general capitalism and of sectarian, economic, consciousness which inhibited the formation of full class consciousness. Both have some foundation in the intractable nature of labour process which inhibits capitalist development and engenders a fractured, divided and distinctly unpolarized working class. The factors identified in this strategy are central to the explanation of the Scottish Fisheries, however for them to be taken account of requires reformulation of the developmental theories.

3. Flexibly Responsive Labour.

The third strategy to reconcile small scale production practices with the general theories is also informative but, nevertheless, is incapable of protecting those theories. Friedmann (1978a, 1978b, 1980, 1986a, 1986b, 1986c) developed quite a sophisticated version of this thesis in analyzing American wheat farmers where she attempted to merge the Household and Simple Commodity Production models to resolve the problems in both. Friedmann's thesis is of interest here because of her discussion of flexibility in the application of labour. Interest in her work also comes from her examining issues of both Household and Simple Commodity Production models, and from the strong influence she had on later theorists within these approaches. Ultimately, because she is unwilling to rethink the theoretical framework, her

explanations are visited by the problems inherent to both industrial and capitalist theories of modernization.

For Friedmann the unity between capital and labour, a critical factor in the Simple Commodity Production model, was guaranteed by the location and demographic reproduction of the household. The household's demographically determined labour supply was, she wrote, self-sufficient and flexible, regarding the occasion, intensity and duration of their work time. Being so flexible they matched optimally the fluctuating labour requirements of farming. This was further facilitated, she argued, because their technology also helped couple the family farm to the demographics of the household with only minor, seasonal need for recourse to supplementary wage labour.^{xvii} She argued that as this seasonal hired labour was provided by the sons of other Simple Commodity Production Households, organizations they would inherit or own in the future, they were not, in the Marxist sense, dispossessed labourers and were, therefore, not exploited. She argued that this absence of exploited labour obviated Simple Commodity Production Households of the need to realize profit, accumulate and expand, and dissolved the models' inherent teleology. Doing this she was locating the requisites for accumulation firmly within the **internal** capital and labour relations and not in the **external** market mediated relationships. For mainstream writers, from which she draws her household features, it was precisely these **internal structures** and **external relations** which they advanced to explain further evolution in the production organization, through refinement in the division of labour and/or the differentiation of functional requisites within the household. Her account here partly agrees with Marx's one of the capitalist dynamic deriving from class relations, however, it ignores another aspect of these class relations; the need for all structures to operate at socially necessary labour time and to accumulate to maintain their efficiency; class rela-

tions within the market imposed this need in Marx's theory, and for very good reason; to address problems with the labour theory of value and to explain how factory capitalism overtook Simple Commodity Production. Rather, than solving the theoretical problems presented by small scale production by attempting to merge two opposing perspectives, she solves none of the problems of either and successfully imports the problems of both.

Even were Friedmann's theoretical strategy of demonstrating that labour requirements were almost completely supplied for from within, and supplementary was indeed provided by future owners of, Simple Commodity Production Households themselves, this does not address the question of profit, which is an accrued surplus over production costs. For both mainstream and Marxist writers problem of explaining profit remains, so far, unresolved^{xviii}; Friedmann adopts the Marxist attempt to conceptualize and explain profit as a product of labour exploitation, whereby profit does not exist where labour and capital are united. However, this contradicts her definition and location of Simple Commodity Production Household firmly within the capitalist mode of production wherein the driving force is competition and profit is a surplus after the production cycle is complete. Also, the subdivision of profit into rent, interest payments, insurance, etc., means that it is mostly a necessity for small scale producers. When a surplus arises at the end of a production cycle, or a series of cycles the producers face the issue of what to do with that 'profit' confronts these producers, providing the opportunity to further improve their capacities as producers. Market competition, a guarantor of expanded reproduction within the capitalist mode for both sets of theorist, was central to her discriminating the Simple Commodity Production Household model; with these difficulties from the meaning and source of profit, her definition and separation of mode from form evaporates in confusion. These difficulties are most acute where there is,

constant technological improvements and increased production by these so-called Simple Commodity Producer Households. If there is no imperative for expanded reproduction, the occurrence of change, especially cumulative change, within those to whom the model is applied presents an embarrassment. Attempting to solve this problem usually leads to factors outside the model, which cannot themselves be imperative, otherwise they contradict the prohibitive within Friedmann's definition.

Regardless, it was both her concern with flexible labour and acceptance of supplementary wage labour that made her reformulation of the transitional models so attractive for other theorists, and contributed it being applied to small scale production in fishing (Deas 1981, 1982, Sinclair 1984). However, because it was apparent that few fishing boats could operate effectively with the labour from only a single household, this led to further modification of Friedmann's coupling of simple commodity production and the household to enable it to contain a number of households. However, it was exactly this area of non-exploited labour that Friedmann later identified subsequently criticized as the most problematic aspect of her initial model. She then argued that combining household and production was actually a contradictory form of patriarchal exploitation of the docile domestic labour of women!^{xix} Thus, the distinction between inside and outside of Simple Commodity Household Production is eroded in another sense; both have patriarchal bosses promoting patriarchal exploitation. Simple Commodity Household Production here only differs in its scale, not in its form, and has the same contradictions of class and patriarchy that characterize social theory generally. These theorists would have been better to ignore the issue of extended kin relations within which they could locate the flexible labour of fishers, and attempting further extension of a model which is inherently flawed. Thus, the unproductive cycle of striving to

modify and synthesize compromised models and theoretical undertakings is only prolonged by Friedmann's attempt synthesize the Household and Simple Commodity production models, to which she has now added the additional problem of gender relations.

4. Cultural Values.

A fourth strategy, of both mainstream and Marxist theorists, to explain the persistence of small scale production in the face of contrary theoretical expectations deploys cultural values. The crucial problem here is that the cultural values add a supplementary explanatory layer onto the theories to account for explanatory and predictive failings; even where these failings are fundamental and potentially murderous for the theories, the purposed of the supplements is to save and protect the theory, not to develop and advance the theory or understandings. When cultural values are given this task, then they can do so only to the degree that they are meaningless for the theories that they are being called upon to protect. Were they not meaningless, they would have a place within the theories, and could not afford any protection. Both sets of theories argue that cultural values are not meaningless and contingent, but are integral with processes of modernism. Indeed, modernization is cited as directly challenging and overwhelming traditional cultural values, because of the superiority and compatibility of these values for social practices which are modernized. When cultural values are deployed to protect theories of modernization of production processes from instances that contradict their explanations and predictions, it is, therefore, surprising, if understandable, that these supplementary cultural values are drawn from traditional understandings, and are said to operate counter to propositions of efficiency; the problems this presents for both mainstream and Marxist theoreticians becomes painfully obvious.

Smith's (1985) work contains the main difficul-

ties in using this strategy to modify and deploy transitional models to explain phenomena in modern society. Smith looks to traditional community norms, of mutual help and obligation to explain the survival of Simple Commodity Production. He equivocates between suggesting whether the form will continue to exist or disappear, seeing a threat to its continuance coming from both within and without the producers; the original progressive dynamic is here feeble instability. The productivity differentials which he finds amongst different producers were factors which in the classic Marxist model facilitated development into large scale capitalism. However, while he finds that these differentials allow some to commute their community obligations into money exchanges, he argues these only attenuate, not eradicate, the community values stressing mutual help and obligations amongst producers. Insofar as these values and obligations are subject of commutation they have a market value, which is less than the value of the time spent on the duties that they replace, otherwise they offer little assistance. The commutation made possible by the capitalist market context, which is necessary for the existence of Simple Commodity Production, makes the community values and obligations irrational obstacles to development and with this they can not contribute to a stable core nor explain its continuance. Indeed, Smith's understanding of this is why he notes the model unstable, if not contradictory, because commutable cultural values become monetary values and can provide no additional explanatory factors for modern small scale production.

Thus, adding dislocated and, in that sense, irrational, cultural values neither explains the social practices nor protects either set of theoretical approaches. The addition of such cultural values is *ad hoc* addition aimed at forestalling productive replacement of flawed perspectives. If cultural values are important and contributes to the structure and practice of socio-economic activity, then these values need to be integral with theory, and

not patched on *ad hoc*.^{xx}

5. State Intervention.

The fifth strategy seeking to use the Household or Simple Commodity Production models to provide an explanation for the persistence of small scale production evoked state intervention. (Friedmann 1978b, 1980, Sinclair 1984, 1985, 1986a, 1986b) Peter Sinclair pursued this strategy in analyzing Canadian fishers and sought to use a model that allowed the state considerable independence from civil society. Doing this, he emphasized factors such as transfer payments, i.e., investment grants, unemployment payments, etc., and state licensing and regulating of fishing. However, he was ambivalent as to the value of the strategy to explain differential advantages to inhibit the social development of modernist industrial or capitalist society. His ambivalence concerning the causal efficacy of the state was expressed as a warning against having an over-deterministic model^{xxi} of the state and in his ambivalent prognoses regarding the long-term prospects for the small scale fishers. Unfortunately, the state cannot account for the lack of theoretically expected development in the fisheries in a way that protects either the mainstream of Marxist theories.

First, the state can only account for this lack of fit compatibly with the theoretical perspectives insofar as, a) developments forecast by the theoretical perspectives are generally occurring in civil society, and, b) it is possible to clearly define and differentiate the state from civil society. Inability to do either results in the failure of the strategy. Success with both, brings the problem then, specifically, explaining why states should sustain a theoretically inefficient production organization when very good reasons exist for it not to do so. Indeed, stress needs to be placed on the specific form, usually the action ascribed to state intervention is general, and does not attempt to discriminate recipients by their mode of operation. In farming, where this explanation is most common, large

commercial farmers receive greater state financing than small, independent farmers. With attempts to resolve the problem of small scale production by introducing state intervention, there is the implicit assumption that these prerequisites, a) and b) were either met or unproblematic. However, neither is actually met.

The general explanations and prognoses of both theoretical perspectives when dealing with modernization and its consequences, e.g., with the concentration and rationalization of production, role or functional differentiation, stratification, explaining social consciousness in terms of social location, of social action within social structure, are currently fraught with contradictions. Recent formulations of state theory have been undertaken due to such explanatory and predictive shortcomings. The twists and turns taken by theorist, Marxist and mainstream, in respect of the state are quite characteristic of the failure to address the fundamental problems with their explanatory undertakings. Initially, the state was conceived of as the creation of civil society, however the explanatory failures with civil society and the state led to attempts give the state some independence from civil society (relative autonomy), which it then acts upon to counter the developments predicted by the theory used which would otherwise occur. The state then become an effective cause, not an effect, of civil society,^{xxii} to solves explanatory problems. However, as soon as substantial independence is ascribed the state, and explanatory undertakings pursued, inevitably this leads back to the theoretically differentiated civil society to provide causal factors to deal with explanatory problems with the state. This is particularly apparent in the discussion concerning the partner dichotomy to the state civil society distinction, power and legitimacy.^{xxiii}

Sinclair, to attempt to account for small scale production in the Canadian fisheries, chose a theoretical approach which conceived the state as con-

siderably independent of civil society. However, that the state has, so far, proved unsuccessful at accounting for general explanatory failure means that it cannot be deployed to account for a specific explanatory failure without directing theoretical attention to providing an account of the state. The state then becomes part of the problem of explaining persistent, inefficient production practices. Were the strategy proven to be correct, small scale production would be demonstrated inefficient, otherwise the state would be an unnecessary factor in the equation. The strategy of using the state to account for the theoretical failings is a circular one which leads back to the need for a thorough explanation of the issues in hand; the state is then a part of the problem rather than its resolution, and the saviour of either of the theoretical approaches to modernism..

6. Occupational Pluralism, Cross - subsidy.

The sixth attempt proposes that the producers are engaged in other activities which subsidize the one being analyzed as small scale production. This can take the form of either occupational pluralism or of subsistence production. Within the models this is sometimes posited as an overlap between modes of production and the small scale producers are argued to be interstitial forms of production existing in spaces between modes of production. For both household and simple commodity theorists this is argued to allow unequal exchange between the producers being analyzed and those they sell, supply, their product to, usually large companies. The companies buy at a price lower than that the reproduction price would be, were the producers to specialize on this product alone allowing a transfer to domineering companies.(C. Smith, 1984) The prime explanatory problem here is that too much is being asked of too little; where production leads to a deficit, it remains necessary to show why the subsidizing activity is not the one specialized in, as there are obviously greater returns to input there than from the activity being subsidized otherwise subsidy

would not be possible. Also, why has the subsidizing activity not been reorganized along the lines of the models that are held to be more efficient in the theories advancing the cross - subsidy argument? Furthermore, the benefits theoretically considered as flowing from specialization and reorganization are lost to those who are supposedly, exploited, multi - producers. The more general problem is that both sets of theoretical approaches explain the move from small scale, through Simple Commodity or Household Production as entailed by movements of efficiency, in order to gain the benefits of the divisions of labour, rationalization and greater control over the production process, etc. In short, this strategy is also a circular theoretical strategy which returns the theorist to the point of departure, the need to address the fundamental theoretical failures in the explanations of modernization, rather than attempting particular solutions to general problems.

7. Structural Impediments.

The seventh argues that production is heterogeneous and that some areas of production are less tractable than others to capitalist reorganization and development along classic lines. (Mann and Dickinson 1978) The contrast posed is a polar one between tractable and intractable production processes; the tractable become fully developed whereas the intractable do not transcend Household or Simple Commodity Production. The contrast, however, cannot be sustained as starkly as this since the basis for intractability forgets the existence of the market which founds the need for imposing homogeneity, socially necessary labour time, on production processes. The contrast cannot be sustained either as it is not possible to show the achievement of full development tractable production (e.g., see Hirschhorn 1984, Sabel and Zeitlan 1985, Duche and Savey 1987.).

The intractable argument was developed in food production, in particular, where it was argued that food production was less tractable, and in some

cases, so far, fully intractable to full-scale modern rationalist or capitalist reorganization. The varied penetration by capital reflects, it is argued, the difference between the production time and the labour time necessary to produce the commodity and realize value in exchange. The thesis rests on the argument that capital extracts value only from the labour time required to produce a commodity. If natural processes such as plant growth cycles or wine maturing, extend the production time beyond the labour time entailed then the ability of the capitalist to realize surplus value will be restricted and consequently reduced. This is so because it lengthens the time period between capital being expended in the production process and the actual sale of the commodity on the market when it realizes its value. Principally, the presumption that the shorter the production cycle the greater the realization of value and, thereby, of surplus value founders on the inability to explain and ascribe profit and its related categories such as rent and interest repayments, as discussed above. If these different incomes were not being equalized between areas of production then the market model that is advanced as differentiating Household and Simple Commodity Production from, and integrating it with, its context collapses. If the different incomes are being equalized then the inequalities in the realization of profit in these distinct areas of production collapses, and there are not structural impediments.

Another equally serious difficulty with this strategy is that it cannot explain why some areas of production that were replaced with full scale production reverted to small scale production. This was the case with fishing and wheat farming. To some degree, this then becomes part of a more serious explanatory problem; the division of structure and action, which is only feasible where both move in separate ways, yet each is meant to be the product and producer of the other^{xiv}.

V. Explaining Small Scale Production.

The true solution to explaining small scale production lies not in the contradictions of the theories of industrial and capitalist society, nor in the strategies devised to explain that production within these theories and which rely on such contradictions. The solution to the problem of the small scale social lies in the organization themselves, and a willingness to accept the implications of that production organization for social theory such that leads to the progressive reformulation of theory. Taking the harvesting sector of the Scottish Fisheries as example, the explanation of the predominance of small scale production there lies in the distinctiveness of the activity and experiences of fishing, especially as the social organization affects these, and contrasts positively with alternative organization of productive activity.

The social organization of the Scottish Fishery is flexible, responsive and dynamic because of the near unity between capital and labour and the share system of income distribution as they contrast with other organizations and systems. Fishing is an activity practised in the open, changing and sometimes dangerous sea, and the varying intensity of demands when working aboard a fishing boat composes an inconstant undertaking. Because of this the fishers need to be able to rely on one another fulfilling the responsibilities of their post through self-motivation and the fullest possible exercise of their abilities. Fishing, as an occupation, offers fishers a bundle of features, some of which are common to most occupations and some are unique to fishing. These fishers' orientation to fishing is a multifaceted one whereby they seek and consider that fishing affords them more of the features sought of a work situation than any other open to them (c.f., Sutherland 1993). The fishers' orientation and comparative assessments of fishing gave them good reason to work to sustain, not to restructure, the social organization of fishing. The outcome of the vane at

tempt to restructure fishing along centralized 'capitalistic' or 'rationalized' forms and the fishers' perceptions and understandings dissuades both them and others linked with fishing, who would normally be considered sources of reorganization, by either vertical or horizontal concentration, from doing so (Sutherland, 1996). Studies of the shore company owned trawl fleet found them to be more marked by conflictual relationships amongst the crew and between them and the fleet owners. Comparative studies of fishers on shore company owned and organized fishing fleets found their fishers to be comparatively less satisfied than those working on fisher owned boats (Sutherland 1993).

A crew who can be independent, adventurous, self-motivated, co-ordinated and flexibly responsive in temporally and physically applying themselves to fishing are better placed to seek out, follow and catch an unbounded and rapidly moving prey which are found in inconstant species mixes in the expansive and dangerous environment of the sea than those who cannot be so. The nearer unity between capital and labour, the more informal and open command structure, the more equitable method of income distribution among all crew positions, and the occupational identity of share fisher elicits this from fishers better than a more centralized and rationalized ownership structure. Furthermore, they elicit this while making fishing a comparatively more comprehensively endowed and interesting occupation. Fishers working to the share system of distributing the income^{xxv} from a trip, determined by the quantity and quality of the fish caught and processed, equally amongst the crew and the owners, with the owners also working as fishers on the boat, could identify some equity between the shared risks taken and the returns received. Thus, while fishers working on a shore company owned vessel who are paid a wage face the same technical demands of fishing they would be less free to strike out on their own and fish adventurously to their own initiative.

Fundamentally, centralized, shore company ownership of capital assets, fishing boats, is concerned with the regulation and reutilization of practices, and are is not about giving over such control to others, allowing them to roam freely and take risks in search of any species of fish. Furthermore, while fishers working for shore company owned vessels, and paid a wage, face the same technical demands of fishing they are less willing to fish a temporally flexible pattern, demanding rationalized and routines system fitting their payments, and incurred more conflictual relationships with skippers and boat owners^{xxvi}. The social organization of the Scottish Fisheries where the boats are owned, usually in share, and controlled by the fishers and the income from each trip is distributed by the share system, makes it easier for the fishers, as a crew, to fish independently and adventurously. It makes it easier for them, as a crew, to take measured risks fishing new and tricky grounds and/or in tricky weather conditions, gaining some important differential advantage.

A fishing vessel is a socially located enterprise whose strength of organization partly derives from the social network of organizations within which it is integrated and the social development of scientific knowledge which enhance capacities, efficiently and safely. While the appearance of a fishing boat is of a lone vessel at sea and fishers can perceive themselves as highly individualistic, they are, in fact, socially located and their social organization partly dependent on extensive social networks, e.g., their linkages with shore organizations such as fish sales agencies, banks, etc. Part is in the social development of knowledge, of fish stocks, of their reproduction and migratory patterns, fishing and navigational technologies^{xxvii}, and of the means to ensure an efficient, safe and balanced harvesting of species. The solution to the problem of the social organization predominant in the Scottish Fisheries lies also in the quality of the social relations within which its em-

bedded. The fishers sell their fish in the local market by auction where there is a minimum intervention price, set by the EEC and administered by the fish producer organization that they are members of. The fish are sold through fish selling agents who take a commission for this and other services that they provide. Other fishers and a fisher's relatives and friends sometimes take minority shares in their boat, lend money to them to become established as share owning fishers and/or recommend them to others for this purpose. They also do this to assist them improve their craft. The fish selling agents also lend fishers money to assist them buy or improve their boats, as do local banks. In addition to these, some fuel suppliers, local business consortiums, etc., are occasionally willing to finance new or successful fishers to buy or improve their vessels. None have shown any interest in establishing a large fishing fleet under their ownership and control, preferring, instead, to restrict their activities to those of their primary purpose and concern of fish selling, servicing and provisioning the fishing boats, etc. In this they have a similar views of the nature and practical requirements of fishing and of the fishers' orientations to fishing, intransigent independence and assessments of what makes a good fisher. Their own limited capacities to exercise informed control over the operations of the boats at sea without impairing these boats' effectiveness confirms this as does the failure of the earlier attempt to restructure the social organization of the fisheries. Thus, organizations and people closely associated with fishing face obstacles to, and have similar reasons not to attempt to centralize ownership and control of a fleet of fishing boats. At this point it must be stressed that the above is not compatible with either of the two theoretical traditions, as they explain socio-economic modernization, as outlined at the beginning; consequently the implications of the above conclusions and proposed account, which is partial as described here, needs to be utilized to formulate more cohesive, less contradictory ex-

planations. Nor, does it sit comfortably with postmodern social science, which now prefers to posit alienated individuals growing increasing isolated and independent for their social context.

Conclusion

Modernization, modernity, and modernism are concepts applied to numerous social processes and phenomena that occurred over an expansive period of time; the terms are used to explain the processes leading to specific organizations of socio-economic activity, of social structures, national and other cultures, to science, social theory, philosophy, as well as to the various arts, e.g., music, painting, literature, architecture, etc. The sheer expansiveness of the social phenomena to which the concepts apply make the task of creating a cohesive, all-embracing explanation a Herculean task.

This paper focused on socio-economic modernization and detailed how responses to social practices recalcitrant for social theory (social practices which contradict the explanations and predictions of preferred theories), embraced contradiction and proved to be unproductive, rather than attempt to resolve contradiction and expand explanatory capacities. For simplification, theories of socio-economic modernization were divided into two sets, and briefly detailed, and then the strategies of theorists confronted with the persistence of small scale production were examined and roundly criticized. This revealed that when faced with phenomena which contradicted their preferred theories, rather than reformulate these theories they simply attempted to adapt a model originally formulated to explain processes of dynamic change to account for what they conceived of as impeded, or stuck social transition in the social organization of production. It was shown that their doing this had a wholly negative impact on the original theory that they were meekly struggling to protect by this strategy, and that this lead -

to an unhealthy divide between pure theory and practical social and historical phenomena. This elevation of theory to a status of purity, was shown to divorce it from the messy reality that it was created to assist our understanding of, and effectively elevated it to a position of explanatory failure and practical superfluity. Instead, it was argued here that there is an urgent need for social theorists to creatively address existing theories and radically deal with their contradictions and problems in ways that solves these providing theories with enhanced explanatory capabilities. Based on evidence obtained from research of the Scottish Fisheries, an explanation of small scale production that is technologically and economically dynamic was presented which, being incompatible with existing approaches, necessitates theorists to devise new theories which eradicate the inconsistencies of the old ones to explain process of modernization.

Footnotes

¹ A subsequent paper will extend this critique and explanation to the performance of small scale record (CD) companies in the contemporary jazz music business.

¹¹ This has spawned a plethora of postmodern writings which ascribe the inconsistencies and inadequacies of these and their own theories to the societies, practices and actors themselves, which they describe these as contradictory; e.g., disorganised capitalism (Lash and Urry 1987); schizophrenic society (Deleuze and Guattari 1977); there is no coherent explanation because there is no coherent social world, only local and contradictory social phenomena (Lyotard 1987); there is no society nor are there individuals Baudrillard (1983); descriptions of post-industrial society (Bell 1973); post-Fordist society (Elam 1990); and such like. What characterises many of them is a lack standard, scientific or other, by which their undertakings can be described as a success or not; we are left wondering that the more contradictory and inconsistent their propositions come, the more successful they would consider their endeavours to be: "...if we do our work well, 'reality' will appear more and more un-

stable, complex and disorderly than it does now." (Flax, 1986, cited in Holmwood 1996, p. 107.

¹¹¹ Examples of some of the types of small scale reduction, other than the specific research strategy examined here, see Curran and Burrow (1986) for an overview, or Duche and Savey 1987, who argue that rather than declining in number and importance small and medium firms are increasing, Scott and Christopherson (1987) who discuss this in relation to high-technology industries, or Sabel and Zeitlin (1989), for a more historical discussion, for example.

¹¹ Paradoxically, the resistance to change of the household came to provide the explanation of some types of small scale production, for these theories.

¹ Frequently efficiency, or improved efficiency is presented as an imperative for change, Smith, Durkheim and Weber, for example, present enhanced efficiency as explanatory category for change, but where the problems arise is a) in locating the wellspring of this river ceaseless of change, b) sustaining its expansive flow within the banks of the explanatory categories of the requirements of (stable) social systems, and c) were a and b to prove possible, the problem remains of accommodating these within these essentially equilibrium models.

¹ This perspective of continuous societies, contributes to the introduction of a tragic element into their view of human action and freedom. As societies develop along continuous features the refinement of these features leads to the containment of human action and the negation of freedom.

¹¹¹ See Clegg (1979) for a classic discussion of the need for an institutional framework to ease the operation of industrial relations and overcome the inefficiencies spawned by their absence.

¹¹¹¹ Alvin Gouldner has written two very perceptive reports (1954, 1955) on the application of bureaucratic procedures, based on his study in a gypsum processing plant and mine in the US.

¹² The actual historical picture is more cloudy than the model presented by Marx and subsequent Marxists, of course, c.f., Brenner 1977, for example.

² Marx presents his theoretical model immediately following trenchant criticism of classical political economy's contention that the factors of production exchange

at equivalent values. Here the historical analysis applies this critique in the form of criticism of Smith's theory of primitive accumulation. Insofar as the mainstream theorists have an understanding of the need for capital accumulation, it is Smith's theory of primitive accumulation which, either explicitly or implicitly, provides the starter motor.

²¹ The model floundered because the successive stages did not unfold as dutifully as predicted; this led to the injection of contingency, whereby a preceding stage was demoted to the status of a necessary, perhaps, but not by itself a sufficient, stage, for the emergence of the predicted succeeding stage for its emergence. The model floundered on the contradictions of each stage preventing the development of the subsequent stage because its inefficiency was surpassed by another, more efficient, model which did not have these inefficiencies. Finally, the model floundered on contingency which meant that stages could be by-passed.

²¹¹ In functionalist terms, the realisation of each functionally necessary stage incurred dysfunction and the realisation of the ultimate functional social equilibrium was the realisation of complete and perfect dysfunction.

²¹¹¹ This contradiction contributed to ambivalence in Marxism respecting the meaningfulness of reform; whether reform equalled the gradual achievement of socialism or incorporation. With Simple Commodity Production; was it a disguised form of, or a haven from, capitalism and the capitalist labour process? This, and its obstinate persistence, were at the core of attempts to formulate Simple Commodity Production models that were neither functionalist nor teleological.

²¹² The history of the Scottish, indeed the British, Fisheries may be considered to provide a classic example of this developmental path with the emergence of shore company owned trawler fleets. Here was an example of separation of ownership from producers and there was considerable conflict between the owners and their employees. However, the development in the means of production, as the history also shows, was incredibly stilted and it is difficult to consider the conflict as anything more than trade union conflict, not as class conflict.

²² The concept of mode of production was reserved to describe the totality of social-economic society, e.g., the

Asiatic or capitalist modes of production.

²²¹ Both aspects, for both perspectives, are expressed in: "In simple commodity production, ownership and labour are combined in the household, and production takes place under conditions of competition." (Friedmann 1978 p. 71. Emphasis added.)

²²¹¹ Ideally, the minor and subsidiary status of this labour needs, where used, to be demonstrated through a precise account of its deployment and detailed figures concerning its cost, if not its output worth.

The attractiveness of this thesis of labour flexibility when trying to explain the fisheries is obvious from the above description of the fitful nature of the labour requirements there. However, this flexibility needs to be socially located and cannot, for the fisheries, be so located within such household dynamics

It has also been said of the fisheries in Scotland that the demise of the company fleets related to the size of the boats, of the technology, that they used which were too large to operate effectively in the inshore waters. There are two problems with this argument. One, as noted in the history, the companies had along forewarning of impending changes in territorial right with the express purpose of excluding them; within the entrepreneurial capitalism of economic and Marxist theory it was incumbent upon them to modify their technology. Secondly, the argument converts a class model into a technologically determinist model; there is no reason why large boats cannot be deployed in inshore waters as the recent appearance of viable 120 foot plus boats attests and there is no reason why the technology of small boats cannot be deployed as part of a large company fishing fleet within the terms of the theory; the criteria is competitiveness.

²²¹¹¹ Of course, it is assumed, as in classical political economy, that profit is the surplus of income over cost, and is a return to the entrepreneur for their work, investment, and risk taking. However, matters are not so straightforward; the return for the entrepreneur's work in economic terms is a return to labour or wages, the return to investment, in similar terms, is interest, and the question of risk becomes insurance costs, because risk is calculable. The economist Knight, 1921, attempted to solve this problem by introducing the distinction of risk

and uncertainty, the first determined situations where the economic agent had calculable probabilities, the latter where there were no calculations possible; however this plays havoc with the market model which relies on perfect competition, thus perfect knowledge, for it to operate; if this market cannot be assumed, then classical and neo-classical economics cannot be sustained. See Obrinsky, 1983, for more detailed discussion of profit, and the difficulties it poses for contemporary economic theory.

^{xix} Friedmann stated in her article:

"Family enterprises are not relics but, for better or worse, are part of the present and near future of advanced capitalism. As enterprises they can be understood as simple commodity production. However, simple commodity production does not include families or households in its concept: it is simply the unity of property and labour within the context of generalised circulation of commodities. Indeed... it is difficult to analyse family and simple commodity production in conjunction with one another because generalised commodity circulation individualises human beings. It shapes most people as bearers of labour power, that is, as competitive participants in labour markets. It shapes others as property owners. Therefore the unity of property and labour within capitalism refers logically to individuals. Yet, very often... this unity coincides with labour and family inheritance... We have tacitly accepted the explicit claims by anthropologists such as Sahlins and Meillassoux, echoing the popular view, that despite the implied autocracy of the head, households are characterised by the virtues of pooling, sharing and generosity. Feminist analysis of the household as the site of domination and subordination contradicts this ideology and suggests the importance of connecting family/household relations with commodity relations, whether these be wages or sales of the domestic product. For commodity producing households, which are based on family ties but not always identical with them, analysis of this kind will dissolve the dichotomy between inside and outside... showing the reciprocal effects of value relations and the age/gender division of labour." (1986a, p. 47)

^{xx} The issues of cultural values is, of course, a critical

one for social theory. In economics the assumption is of *homo economicus*, of omniscient and parsimonious rational man who makes economic choices to optimise the return for cost. Thus, there is no place for cultural values, which become residual categories, and packed into the concept of taste, which is called upon in *ad hoc* manner to account for theoretically unaccounted for phenomena, not a rare occurrence. The residual categories were packed up, and given to sociologists and psychologists to explain, which eradicates their residual nature. In sense the appeal to external cultural values is an appeal to residual categories, and should be out of bounds for any rational science.

^{xxi} In truth, an over-deterministic model is in reality an under-deterministic model. It is said to be over-deterministic because it ascribes features and events which do not occur in reality, which means that it is under-deterministic because it does not determine, explain the social practices it is supposed to determine and explain.

^{xxii} See Skocpol at al's article in Held et al., 1983.

^{xxiii} See the discussion in Skocpol 1979, Poulantzas 1978, Offe 1973, Habermas 1975, Giddens 1984, Holmwood and Stewart 1991) in respect of this tension and conclusion of a lack of distinctiveness between the categories.

^{xxiv} For detailed discussion of the structure agency problem, see Holmwood and Stewart, 1991

^{xxv} The share payment system was method of equal distribution of income among owners and crews. The total income for the trip, minus operating costs (for fuel, ice, landing fees, etc,) was first divided 50% for the owners and 50% for the crew. Ownership was most often either by a single crew member, usually the captain or a number of people, usually all crew member. Where there was more than one owner, the owner share was distributed in direct proportion to ownership, usually calculated in 16ths. The crew share was distributed equally; each member of a crew of 7 would receive 1/7th of the crews' proportion, regardless of their status on the boat; the skipper receives exactly the same amount of the crew's share as did the a common deckhand.

^{xxvi} See Tunstall, 1962 for a harrowing account of this in the UK company trawling fleets.

^{xxvii} These navigational technologies, also include use

of the sophisticated satellite navigation systems, which the fishers themselves could not set in place or support, but the availability of such affordable equipment is highly useful to them.

Bibliography.

- Aglietta, Michael. *Capitalist Regulation: The US Experience*. Verso, London; 1979.
- Amin, Ash. *Post-Fordism: A Reader*, Blackwell, Oxford; 1994.
- Aron, Raymond. *Main Currents in Sociological Thought*. V.1 Penguin, Harmondsworth; 1968.
- Aron, Raymond. *Main Currents in Sociological Thought*. V.2 Penguin, Harmondsworth; 1970.
- Ayata, Sencer. *Economic Growth and Petty Commodity Production in Turkey*. *Social Analysis*; 1986; 20; 79-92.
- Baran, Paul A. & Sweezy, Paul. *Monopoly Capitalism*. Penguin, Harmondsworth; 1968.
- Baudrillard, J. *In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities Or, The End of the Social and Other Essays*. Semiotext(e), New York; 1983.
- Bell, Daniel. *The Coming of the Post-Industrial Society*. Basic Books, New York; 1973.
- Bell, Daniel. *The Information Society, the Social Framework of the Information Society*; in, Forrester, (ed.); 1980.
- Bernstein, Henry. *Capitalism and Petty Commodity Production*; in *Social Analysis*; 1986; 20; 11-28.
- Blau, Peter M. *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago; 1963.
- Block, Fred. & Hirschhorn, Larry. *New Productive Forces and the Contradiction of Contemporary Capitalism*; in *Theory and Society*; 1979; 7; 3; 363-395.
- Brass, Tom. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship: Un-free Relations and the Production of Commodities*; in *Social Analysis*; 1986; 20; 56-67.
- Braverman, Harry. *Labour and Monopoly Capital*. Monthly Review Press, New York; 1974.
- Brenner, Robert. *The Origin of Capitalist Development; A Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism*; in *New Left Review*; 1977;104; 2-92.
- Buttel, Frederick. & Newby, Howard.(eds.) *The Rural Sociology of Advanced Societies: Critical Perspectives*. Allan Held Osmun & Co. Montclair New Jersey; 1980.
- Buttel, Frederick. *The Political Economy of Agriculture in Advanced Societies: Theory and Method*; in McNall,ed.1982; 27-53.
- Clarke, Tom. & Clements, Laurie.(eds.) *Trade Unions Under Capitalism*. Harvester Press Sussex; 1978.
- Clegg, Hugh Armstrong. *The Changing System of Industrial Relations in Great Britain*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford; 1979.
- Clements, Wallace. *Class, Power and Property; Essays on Canadian Society*. Methuen, Toronto; 1983a.
- Clements, Wallace. *Property and Proletarianization: Transformation of Simple Commodity Producers*; in *Canadian Farming and Fishing*. 1983c; Clements 1983a; 225-243.
- Cook, Scott. *Value Price and Simple Commodity Producers: Zapotec Stoneworkers*. *Journal of Peasant Studies*; 1976; 3; 4; 395-425.
- Cressey, Peter. & McInnes, John. *Voting for Ford: Industrial Democracy and the Control of Labour*. *Capital and Class*; 1980; pp.5-33.
- Curran, James. & Burrow, Roger. *The Sociology of Petit Capitalism: A Trend Report*. *Sociology*; 1986; 20; 2; 256-279.
- Deas, Barrie. *Relations of Production and Exchange in the Fishing and Fish Processing Industries in North East Scotland*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Robert Gordon Institute of Technology, Aberdeen; 1981.
- Deas, Barrie. *Relations of Production in the Scottish Fishing Industry*. *International Journal of Sociology*. 1981a; 59-71.
- Deleuze, Giles, and Guattari, Felix. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Penguin Press, Harmondsworth; 1977.
- Dubin, Robert. *Industrial Workers Worlds; A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers*; 1956; Rose, (ed.) 1962.
- Duche, Genevieve. & Savey, Suzane. *The Rising Importance of Small and Medium-Sized Firms: Towards a New Industrial System*; in Hamilton (ed.); 1987; 1-12.
- Elam, Mark, *Puzzling Out the Post-Fordist Debate: Technology, Markets, and Institutions*; 1990; Amin, 1994; 43-70.
- Evans, Peter. et al. *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; 1985.

- Fincham, Robin. "From 'Post-Industrialism' to 'Information Society'": A Comment on Lyon; in *Sociology*; 1987; 21; 3; 463-466.
- Forester, Tom. *The Micro-Electronics Revolution*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford; 1980
- Friedmann, Harriet. *Simple Commodity Production and Wage Labour in the American Plains*; in *Journal of Peasant Studies*; 1978a; 6; 1; 71-10.
- Friedmann, Harriet. *World Market, State and Family Farm: Social Bases of Household Production in the Era of Wage Labour*. *Comparative Studies*; in *Society, and History*; 1978b; 20; 545-586.
- Friedmann, Harriet. *Household Production and the National Economy: Concepts for the Analysis of Agrarian Formations*; in *Journal of Peasant Studies*; 1980; 7; 2; 158-184.
- Friedmann, Harriet. *Patriarchal Commodity Production*; in *Social Analysis*; 1986a; 20; 47-55,
- Friedmann, Harriet. *Patriarchy and Property: A Reply to Goodwin and Redclift*; in *Sociologia Ruralis*; 1986b; XXVI; 2 pp.186-193.
- Friedmann, Harriet. *Family Enterprises in Agriculture; Structural Limits and Political Possibilities*. 1986c; in Cox et al; 1986; 41-60.
- Galbraith, John Kenneth. *The New Industrial State*. Hamish Hamilton London, 1978.
- Giddens, Anthony. & Held, David. *Classes, Power and Conflict: Classical and Contemporary Debates*. Macmillan, London, 1982.
- Giddens, Anthony. & MacKenzie, Gavin.(eds.) *Social Class and The Division of Labour*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1982.
- Giddens, Anthony. *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*. Macmillan, London, 1984.
- Goodman, David. & Redclift, Michael. *Capitalism, Petty Commodity Production and the Farm Enterprise*; in *Sociologia Ruralis*; 1985; XXV; 3/4; 231-244.
- Goodman, David. & Redclift, Michael. *Capitalism, Petty Commodity Production and the Farm Enterprise*. 1986; in Cox et al. (eds.); 1986; 20-33,
- Gouldner, Alvin W, *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*. The Free Press of Glencoe, New York;1954.
- Gouldner, Alvin W, *Wildcat Strike*. The Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1955.
- Granovetter, Mark. *Economic Action: The Problem of Embeddedness*; in *American Journal of Sociology*; 1985; 91; 3; 481-510.
- Habermas, Jurgen. *Legitimation Crisis*. Beacon Press, Boston. 1975.
- Hamilton, Iain F.E.(ed.) *Industrial Change in Advanced Economies*. Croom Helm, London; 1987.
- Held, David. *States and Society*. Martin Robertson, Oxford; 1983
- Hirschhorn, Larry. *Beyond Mechanization: Work and Technology in a Post-Industrial Age*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts; 1984.
- Holmwood, John. *Founding Sociology? Talcott Parsons and the Idea of General Theory*, Longman, London; 1996.
- Holmwood, John. & Stewart, Alexander. *The Role of Contradictions in Modern Theories of Social Stratification*; in *Sociology*; 1983; 17; 2 ; 234-254.
- Holmwood, John. & Stewart, Alexander. *Beyond Agency: The Structure-Action Problem and its Solution*. Paper presented at the Theoretical Sociology Working Group of the International Sociological Association, XI-Ind World Congress, Madrid; July; 1990.
- Kerr, Clark, Dunlop, John T. & Harbison, Frederick H. *The Logic of Industrialisation*; in Kerr; et. al. 1960, *Industrialism and Industrial Man: The Problems of Labour and Management and Economic Growth*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA,; 1960.
- Knight, Francis, *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit*; 1921
- Lash, Scott. & Urry, John. *The End of Organized Capitalism*. Polity Press, Cambridge; 1987.
- Lenin, V. *What is to Be Done*; in Clarke and Clements (eds.); 1978.
- Linberger, L. et al.(eds.) *Stress and Contradiction in Modern Capitalism*. Lexington Books, Lexington, MA; 1975.
- Linder, Marc & Houghton. *Self-Employment and the Petty Bourgeoisie: Comment on Steimetz and Wright*; in. *American Journal of Sociology*; 1991; 96; 3; 727-735.
- Lofgren, O. *Resource Management and Family Firms*. *Swedish West Coast Fishermen*; 1972; in Andersen and Wadel (eds.); 1972; 82-102.
- Lyon, David. *From 'Post-Industrialism' to 'Information Society'; A New Social Transformation*; in So-

- ciology; 1986; 20; 4; 577 - 588.
- Lyon, David. Information Technology and Information Society: A Response to Fincham; in *Sociology*; 1987; 21; 4; 467 - 468,
- Lyotard, F. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* Manchester, Manchester University Press, Manchester; 1984.
- MacNall, Scott. Current Perspectives; in *Social Theory*. V.3 JAI, Greenwich; 1982.
- Mann, Susan A. and Dickinson, James M. Obstacles to the Development of Capitalist Agriculture; in *Journal of Peasant Studies*; 1978; 5; 4; 466 - 481,
- Mandel, Ernest. *Late Capitalism*. Verso, London; 1978.
- Marx, K. *Capital* V.1. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth; 1976.
- Merton, Robert K. Bureaucratic Structure and Personality. 1952; Merton et al.(eds.) 1952; 361 - 371,
- Merton, Robert K. Reader in Bureaucracy. Free Press of Glencoe, New York; 1952. Newby, Howard. & Buttel. Frederick H. Toward a Critical Rural Sociology. 1980; in Buttel & Newby (eds) 1980 ; 1 - 28.
- Obrinsky, Mark. Profit Theory in Capitalism. Martin Robertson, Oxford; 1983.
- Offe, Claus. The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation. 1973; Lindberger et al.(eds.) 1973.
- Parsons, Talcott. & Shills, Edward A.(eds.) Toward a General Theory of Action. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1951; (Edition; seventh printing of 1971.).
- Parsons, Talcott. & Smelser, Neil J. *Economy and Society: A Study in Integration of Economic and Social Theory*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London; 1956.
- Piore, Michael J. & Sabel, Charles H. *The Second Industrial Divide: Possibilities for Prosperity*. New York, Basic Books; 1984.
- Poster, Mark. Foucault, Marxism and History: Mode of Production Versus Mode of Information. Polity Press, Cambridge; 1984.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. *State, Power, Socialism*. Verso, London; 1978.
- Price, Richard. The Labour Process and Labour History; in *Social History*, Vol.8; 1 ; 57 - 75, 1983.
- Roberts, B. Finnegan. D. & Gallie, D.(eds.) *New Approaches to Economic Life*. Manchester University Press, Manchester; 1985.
- Rocher, Guy. *Talcott Parsons and American Sociology*. Nelson, London; 1974.
- Rose, Arnold M. (ed.) *Human Behaviour and Social Processes; An Interactionist Approach*. Routledge & Kegan Paul. London; 1962.
- Russel, Susan D. & Poopetch, Maritsa. Petty Commodity Production Relations in the Inner Gulf of Thailand; in *Human Organization*, 1990; 49; 2; 174 - 187.
- Sabel, Charles. & Zeitlin, Jonathan. *Historical Alternatives to Mass Production: Politics, Markets and Technology in Nineteenth-Century Industrialization*. Past and Present; 1985; 108; 133 - 176.
- Sabel, Charles. Flexible Specialisation an the Re-emergence of Regional Economies. 1989: Amin; 1994; 101 - 156.
- Scase, Richard. *The Petty Bourgeoisie and Modern Capitalism: A Consideration of Recent Theories*. 1982; Giddens and McKenzie,(eds.) 1982; 148 - 161,
- Schumpeter, Joseph A. *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Interest and the Business Cycle*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts; 1951.
- Scott, A. & Christopherson, S. High Technology Industry and Regional Development: A Theoretical Critique and Reconstruction, *International Social Science Review*; 1987; 1; 12; 215 - 231.
- Scott, Alison MacEwan. Introduction: Why Rethink Petty Commodity Production?; in *Social Analysis*; 20; 3 - 10; 1986.
- Scott, Alison MacEwan. Towards a Rethink of Petty Commodity Production; in *Social Analysis*; 1986; 20; 93 - 105,
- Selden, Arthur.(ed.) *The Prime Mover of Progress: The Entrepreneur in Capitalism and Socialism*. Papers on the Role of the Entrepreneur. The Institute of Economic Affairs, London; 1980.
- Sinclair, Peter R. Fishermen of Northwest Newfoundland: Domestic Commodity Production in Advanced Capitalism. *Journal of Canadian Studies*. 1984; 19; 1; 34 - 47.
- Sinclair, Peter R. The State Goes Fishing: The Emergence of Public Ownership in the Newfoundland Fishing

- Industry. Dep. of Sociology Memorial University of Newfoundland ISER, Research and Policy Papers, No.1; 1985a.
- Sinclair, Peter R. Off Course: Navigating Troubled Waters in the Newfoundland Context; in Newfoundland Studies, 1985b; 1; 1; 99-114.
- Sinclair, Peter R. From Trappers to Draggers. Social and Economic Institute Studies; 31 ISER, Memorial University of Newfoundland St. Johns Newfoundland; 1985c. Sinclair, Peter R. The Survival of Small Capital: State policy and the Dragger Fleet in North-West Newfoundland; in Marine Policy; 1986a; 111-118;
- Sinclair, Peter R. Coping with Scarcity: A Critical Analysis of Fisheries Management in the North Atlantic. Paper presented to the Conference on Social Research and Public Policy Formation in the Fisheries, Tromsø, Norway 16-20 June 1986b. Skocpol, Theda. States and Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France Russia and China. Cambridge University Press Cambridge; 1979.
- Smelser, Neil J. Social Change in the Industrial Revolution: an Application of Theory to the Lancashire Cotton Industry 1770-1840. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London; 1959.
- Smith, Adam. An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations (First pub. 1789 as the fifth edition.) First Modern Library Edition Random House, New York; 1937.
- Smith, Carol A. Does a Commodity Economy Enrich the few while Ruining the Masses? Differentiation Among Petty Commodity Producers in Guatemala; in Journal of Peasant Studies; 1984a; 11; 3; 60-95.
- Smith, Carol A. Forms of Production in Practice: Fresh Approaches to Simple Commodity Production; in Journal of Peasant Studies; 1984b; 11; 4; 201-222.
- Smith, Carol A. Reconstructing the Elements of Petty Commodity Production; in Social Analysis; 1986; 20; 29-46.
- Smith, Gavin. Reflections on the Social Relations of Simple Commodity Production; in Journal of Peasant Studies; 1985; 13; 3; 99-109.
- Stark, David. Class Struggle and the Transformation of the Labour Process: A Relational Approach; 1980; in Giddens and Held (eds.); 1982; 310-329.
- Sutherland, Allan J. The Social Organization of the Scottish Fisheries. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh; 1993.
- Sutherland, Allan J. Is the History of Scottish Fishing Peculiar? ; in Area Studies Tsukuba; 1996; 14; 61-85.
- Thompson, Paul. Wailey, Tony. & Lummis, Trevor. Living the Fishing. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London; 1983.
- Tunstall, Jeremy. The Fishermen: The Sociology of an Extreme Occupation. McGibbon and Kee, London; 1962.
- Touraine, Alain. The Post-Industrial Society. Random House, New York; 1971.
- Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Trans. Talcott Parsons. George Allen and Unwin Ltd. London; 1930.
- Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization Trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. The Free Press of Glencoe. New York; 1964.
- Wilson, Fiona. Urban Craftsmen and Their Struggle Against Capitalism: A Case Study from Peru; in Social Analysis; 1986; 20; 69-78,.
- Wright, Erik Olin. Classes. Verso, London; 1985.