

1: Ralf Dahrendorf - Wikipedia

Get this from a library! Class and class conflict in industrial society.. [Ralf Dahrendorf] -- Presents a resume of Marx's theory of class and an analysis of post-capitalist society in terms of class theory.

Rummel This much, at least, we should have learnt from Hegel and Marx: A situation characterized by the absence of manifest social conflict may contain important latent conflicts of interest; the latter may have a relatively great potential to serve as the focus of crystallization of manifest conflicts. This being the case we cannot, in sociology as in peace research, direct our attention exclusively to what "is"--we must at least be equally concerned with that which "could be. This notion is powerful in being dynamic, intuitively persuasive, and appearing to fit well with history. It is powerful in providing in one package a description, an explanation, and a prediction of contemporary problems, and a remedy. His was no equilibrium or consensus theory. The structure itself was a derivative of and ingredient in the struggle of classes. His was a conflict view of modern nineteenth century society. The key to understanding Marx is his class definition. Such ownership vests a person with the power to exclude others from the property and to use it for personal purposes. In relation to property there are three great classes of society: Class thus is determined by property, not by income or status. These are determined by distribution and consumption, which itself ultimately reflects the production and power relations of classes. The social conditions of bourgeoisie production are defined by bourgeois property. Class is therefore a theoretical and formal relationship among individuals. The force transforming latent class membership into a struggle of classes is class interest. Out of similar class situations, individuals come to act similarly. They develop a mutual dependence, a community, a shared interest interrelated with a common income of profit or of wages. From this common interest classes are formed, and for Marx, individuals form classes to the extent that their interests engage them in a struggle with the opposite class. At first, the interests associated with land ownership and rent are different from those of the bourgeoisie. But as society matures, capital i. Finally the relation of production, the natural opposition between proletariat and bourgeoisie, determines all other activities. As Marx saw the development of class conflict, the struggle between classes was initially confined to individual factories. Eventually, given the maturing of capitalism, the growing disparity between life conditions of bourgeoisie and proletariat, and the increasing homogenization within each class, individual struggles become generalized to coalitions across factories. Increasingly class conflict is manifested at the societal level. Class consciousness is increased, common interests and policies are organized, and the use of and struggle for political power occurs. Classes become political forces. The distribution of political power is determined by power over production i. Capital confers political power, which the bourgeois class uses to legitimize and protect their property and consequent social relations. Moreover, the intellectual basis of state rule, the ideas justifying the use of state power and its distribution, are those of the ruling class. The intellectual-social culture is merely a superstructure resting on the relation of production, on ownership of the means of production. Finally, the division between classes will widen and the condition of the exploited worker will deteriorate so badly that social structure collapses: With the basis of classes thus wiped away, a classless society will ensue by definition, and since political power to protect the bourgeoisie against the workers is unnecessary, political authority and the state will wither away. Classes are authority relationships based on property ownership. A class defines groupings of individuals with shared life situations, thus interests. Classes are naturally antagonistic by virtue of their interests. Imminent within modern society is the growth of two antagonistic classes and their struggle, which eventually absorbs all social relations. Political organization and Power is an instrumentality of class struggle, and reigning ideas are its reflection. Structural change is a consequence of the class struggle. However, time and history have invalidated many of his assumptions and predictions. Capitalist ownership and control of production have been separated. Joint stock companies forming most of the industrial sector are now almost wholly operated by non-capital-owning managers. Workers have not grown homogeneous but are divided and subdivided into different skill groups. Class stability has been undercut by the development of a large middle class and considerable social mobility. Rather than increasing extremes of wealth and poverty, there has been a social leveling and an increasing

emphasis on social justice. And finally, bourgeois political power has progressively weakened with growth in worker oriented legislation and of labor-oriented parties, and with a narrowing of the rights and privileges of capital ownership. Most important, the severest manifestation of conflict between workers and capitalist--the strike--has been institutionalized through collective bargaining legislation and the legalization of strikes. His emphasis on conflict, on classes, on their relations to the state, and on social change was a powerful perspective that should not be discarded. The spirit, if not the substance, of his theory is worth developing. Dahrendorf recognizes two approaches to society, which he calls the Utopian and the Rationalist. The first emphasizes equilibrium of values, consensus, and stability; the second revolves around dissension and conflict, the latter being the mover of structural change. Both are social perspectives; neither is completely false, but each views a separate face of society. Unfortunately, he feels, the consensus view has dominated contemporary sociology, especially in the United States, and he sets out to create some balance between the two views by developing and illustrating the theoretical power of a class-conflict perspective. A review of subsequent theoretical works bearing on class is followed by a sociological critique of Marx. These necessary scholarly chores completed, Dahrendorf presents his own view of class. Society grants the holders of social positions power to exercise coercive control over others. This control is a matter of authority, which Dahrendorf defines, according to Weber, as the probability that a command with specific content will be obeyed by certain people. Authority is associated with a role or position and differs from power, which Dahrendorf claims is individual. Authority is a matter of formal legitimacy backed by sanctions. It is a relation existing between people in imperatively coordinated groups, thus originating in social structure. Authority, however, is dichotomous; there is always an authoritative hierarchy on one side and those who are excluded on the other. Within any imperative group are those who are superordinate and those who are subordinate. There is an arrangement of social roles comprising expectations of domination or subjugation. Those who assume opposing roles have structurally generated contradictory interests, to preserve or to change the status quo. Incumbents of authoritative roles benefit from the status-quo, which grants them their power. Those toward whom this authoritative power is exercised, and who suffer from it, however, are naturally opposed to this state of affairs. Superordinates and subordinates thus form separate quasi-groups of shared latent interests. On the surface, members of these groups and their behavior may vary considerably, but they form a pool from which conflict groups can recruit members. With leadership, ideology, and the political freedom and social conditions of organization being present, latent interests become manifested through political organizations and conflict. How does Dahrendorf define social classes? They are latent or manifest conflict groups arising from the authority structure of imperative coordinated organizations. Class conflict then arises from and is related to this structure. The structural source of group conflict lies in authoritative domination and subjugation; the object of such conflict is the status quo; and the consequence is to change not necessarily through revolution social structure. Since authoritative roles are the differentia between classes, classes and class conflict also exist in communist or socialist societies. Classes exist insofar as there are those who dominate by virtue of legitimate positions such as the Soviet factory manager, party chief, commune head, or army general and those who are habitually in subordinate positions the citizen, worker, peasant. The Conflict Helix, which describes my view of class conflict as part of the social conflict process, reveals many similarities between the conflict helix and the dynamic perspectives of Marx and Dahrendorf. This section makes these similarities and some of the differences explicit. The conflict helix begins analytically with a conception of the social space as a field of meanings, values, norms, statuses, and class, where status has the joint meaning of formal positions as in authoritative roles and the informal statuses of wealth, power, and prestige. Marx and Dahrendorf also have beginning analytic conceptions of society. For Marx, it is people distributed on the bases of differentiated property ownership and sources of income; for Dahrendorf, it is differential power, norms, and roles. This subjective culture is purposely ignored by Dahrendorf in his desire to emphasize the conflict dynamics of society. The existence of some shared meanings and values is a prerequisite of class conflict, however, and a breakdown of crystallized meanings, values, and norms can itself generate the conditions for class conflict. A culture in which slave labor is generally believed right, proper, and sanctioned by the gods, as in classical Greece, will have little associated class conflict. For Marx,

meanings, values, and norms were themselves a product of property relations. Their closest counterpart, ideas, were a manifestation of class division. In the helix, the social space is transformed into a structure of conflict insofar as differential locations in the space define opposing attitudes. For me, an attitude is a psychological disposition to want certain goals. Attitudes form a switchboard between needs and active interests; the connections are wired through acculturation, socialization, and personal learning, and experience. It is the reflection of our culture and society, of our social space. These opposing attitudes are more than simply conflicting wishes or wants; instead we have a clash of opposing perspectives. The structure of conflict defines latent conflict groups, in the sense that people who have opposing attitudes are reservoirs for opposing interests groups. Now, I define class according to the relationship of people to authoritative hierarchies in groups. There are two classes, those with authoritative roles and those without, and these classes define opposing attitudes i. Other structures of conflict are not associated with classes, but this is the main one manifested in societal or collective conflict and political struggle. Classes are latent interest groups associated with the authoritative roles of imperatively coordinated organizations. However, Dahrendorf does not distinguish types of groups or dissociate authority and coercion, nor does he deal with the psychological implications of latent interests, feeling it sufficient to treat interests as a sociological category. With this I disagree; for an understanding of the meaning and process of conflict requires a preliminary consideration of perception, expectations, dispositions, needs, and power. To provide such a foundation was the intent of my Vol. The Dynamic Psychological Field , and my treatment of field and power in Vol.

2: Full text of "Class and class conflict in industrial society"

EMBED (for www.enganchecubano.com hosted blogs and www.enganchecubano.com item tags).

Includes bibliographical references and index. Moore The Dysfunctions of Stratification. A Critical Analysis-- Melvin M. Tumin Concluding Commentary to Part Two. Wright Mills -- Elites and Power-- A. Shils Gradational Status Groupings. Reputation, Deference, and Prestige. Featherman and Robert M. Hodge Concluding Commentary to Part Three.. Although these developments are revolutionary in their implications, until now there has been no comprehensive effort to bring together the classic articles that have defined and redefined the contours of the field. In this up-to-date anthology, the history of stratification research unfolds in systematic fashion, with the introductory articles in each section providing examples of the major research traditions in the field and the concluding essays commissioned from leading scholars providing broader programmatic statements that identify current controversies and unresolved issues. This comprehensive reader is designed as a primary text for introductory courses on social stratification and as a supplementary text for advanced courses on occupations, labor markets, or social mobility. The resulting collection of articles both celebrates the diversity of theoretical approaches and reveals the cumulative nature of ongoing research. This comprehensive reader is designed as a primary text for introductory courses on social stratification and as a supplementary text for advanced courses on social classes, occupations, labor markets, or social mobility. The following types of questions and debates are addressed in the six sections of the reader: Do the recent experiments with de-stratification in Eastern Europe and elsewhere provide new insights into the functionalist theory of inequality? Can we identify a set of organized and cohesive social classes in advanced industrial societies? Does it make sense to refer to a ruling class, a political class, or a power elite in these societies? Are the basic contours of occupational mobility the same within all advanced industrial societies? Have the new structuralists led us astray in our attempts to understand the sources and causes of occupational attainment? Are there fundamental differences across social classes in styles of life, patterns of consumption, and attitudes toward work? Are these class-specific cultures attenuating as we move into advanced industrialism? Is there an emerging underclass in America? What are the principal sources of racial, ethnic, and gender inequality? Can we identify a teleological dynamic driving the development of stratification systems? Are new forms of stratification and inequality emerging as Eastern Europe enters its postsocialist stage? The volume offers essential reading for undergraduates who need an introduction to the field, for graduate students who wish to broaden their understanding of stratification research, and for advanced scholars who seek a basic reference guide. Although most of the selections are middle-range theoretical pieces suitable for introductory courses, the anthology also includes advanced contributions on the cutting edge of research. The editor outlines a modified study plan for undergraduate students requiring a basic introduction to the field. Nielsen Book Data An anthology dealing with the history of social-stratification research in America. Core articles introduce the major research traditions in the field, and essays provide broader programmatic statements that identify current controversies and unresolved issues. Nielsen Book Data Subjects.

3: Editions of Class and Class Conflict In Industrial Society by Ralf Dahrendorf

As industrial associations stabilize, the conditions of organization gradually emerge, and both capital and labor form organizations (employers' associations, trade unions) in defense of what are now articulate manifest interests. Industrial class conflict enters a manifest phase of which strikes and lockouts are the most telling symptoms.

Bow, bow, ye lower middle classes! Bow, bow, ye tradesmen, bow, ye masses. Gilbert, Iolanthe I These are continua along which people desire to move, with consensus as to the desired end. Relative status ranks, status disequilibrium, and incongruence have consequences for conflict and social interaction among individuals, as argued in Chapter But individuals organize themselves into conflict-groups which clash and struggle in terms of their interests, and status relationships are insufficient for an understanding of this social conflict. A new category is needed, one that lies along the front between field and antfield. Wherever authoritative roles exist, they differentiate between those who command and those who obey. Moreover, in any organization 1 we can differentiate between those who participate in the hierarchy of command, regardless of their position in this hierarchy, and those who are subordinate. The president, vice-president, manager, division head, and foreman in a factory are all part of the command-hierarchy, even though those at the bottom may be acting on command from above as much as they are commanding others. It is the mass of workers, who have no command and power, and must simply obey. So far command is an empirical concept. We know from experience, from our sense for a group situation, who has authority to command and who does not. Our social antennae are always alert to this right, to the authoritative roles, in the various groups of which we are members. This sensitivity to the "head man" provides direction in our behavior as we relate ourselves to others within an organization. One of the first questions asked by new members of an organization concerns who is the leader. But as a way of understanding conflict between groups, we must move beneath empirical phenomenon to theoretical structures, such as the configuration of opposing attitudes between individuals that lie along their various sociocultural distances. At the societal level, however, we can define one particular structure that separates all individuals into one of two theoretical categories: It divides those who are part of the command-hierarchy of an organization from those who are not. It distinguishes between those who authoritatively dominate and those who submit--those who are superordinates and those who are subordinates. On the basis of our organizational memberships and roles, therefore, we can separate people into either the category of superordinate and superordinate. The significance is that this division defines a structure of conflict between two social classes. I consider a social class henceforth, simply class to be a category of individuals sharing membership in a similarly oriented conflict-group. There are only two classes and they oppose each other by virtue of an intrinsic opposition in the attitudes of their members. Classes thus define a particular structure of conflict based on the defining differentia of the two classes, which is membership in the authoritative hierarchy of an organization or subordination to it. Authoritative roles and the expectations associated with them are the basis of classes. They define the structures of conflict between clusters of individuals in social space. So far I have defined the categories of superordinate and subordinate, but have provided little basis for understanding why a structure of conflict should obtain. Consider that conflict between individuals may be latent, with no awareness of antagonistic attitudes. When interests are not yet stimulated, there is no conflict consciousness. The latency comprises dispositions for interests to oppose, the yet unrealized tendencies that lie along social differences and similarities, along social distances. Thus, conflict between worker and manager may be latent, as between buyer and seller, Catholic and Protestant, American and Arab. People may be unaware of this antagonism of interests even though they are in contact or stand in some social relation to each other. A particular important social relation has to do with the distribution of rights, privileges, and obligations, with who owns what which in essence constitutes the authority to exclude others from it , with the status quo. A status quo is the core of a structure of expectations 5 but takes on particular interest regarding classes when it is articulated through law-norms and their instrumentalities, authoritative roles. For intrinsic to the authoritative structure of an organization is the differentiation between those who have certain rewards and rights and those who do not. Executives have more rights and rewards

than secretaries, kings more than subjects, foremen more than laborers. Bringing status into the picture, incumbents of authoritative roles tend to be higher than subordinates on wealth, power, or prestige. More directly, the hierarchy of authority differentiating between those who command and only obey also usually defines the stratification of an organization. We have found in Chapter 17 that statuses are bundles of attributes that roughly delimit profiles shared by individuals at the same status level. Thus, the rich share a variety of attributes, attitudes, and values setting them off from the poor. The attitudinal difference between laborer and manager, between landowner and peasant, between totalitarian elites and subjects exemplify these differences. Those high in status tend to support the status quo, of course. Their status in part depends on this, as do their rights and rewards. And in groups high status is conjoined with authoritative roles. Thus, authoritative role incumbents will tend to support the status quo. By the same line of argument, subordinates, usually low in status, will tend to be opposed to the distribution of rewards and rights that authoritatively defines their position in the organization. Subordinates will thus tend to oppose the status quo. A class distinguishes members of the command-hierarchy from the subordinates. That is, it demarcates a cluster of similar attributes, attitudes, and values and comprises those who tend to support or oppose the group status quo. Thus it should be clear why class is dichotomous those who support versus those who oppose the status quo, defines opposing attitudes those who have versus those who want and is a structure of conflict. Classes are dispositional conflict-groups. Because classes define opposing attitudes, they tend to produce opposing conflict-parties. Thus in Western democratic societies, opposing conflict-groups tend to be recruited from workers and bosses and peasant and landowner. Thus we find the union versus management, the left versus the right, Democrats versus Republicans, Labor versus Conservatives. Classes are well springs of conflict embracing society; they are recruitment reservoirs for interest groups. To turn now to antifields, classes have so far been defined regarding organizations, which are groups having more or less diffuse authoritative hierarchies. A professional organization may have only weak, narrowly limited authoritative roles; a state may be tightly bound by a dictatorial command structure. This variation among organizations is a variation in their class demarcation. Thus, the division between field and antifield, their antagonism, their contradiction, can now be seen in terms of latent class-conflict. Field and antifields form a social front of class-conflict, the societal wide disposition for ins and outs to struggle, the general tendency for those who benefit to support a status quo and those who do not to oppose it. Thus field versus antifield is not only a philosophical idea but a sociological concept as well. The social space of individuals is thus divided and subdivided into nested, overlapping, and separate structures of conflict. We may therefore stand in different class relations to another, depending on the organization. We may be a member of a church subordinate position, a student subordinate, a treasurer of our bowling league superordinate, a member of the Sierra Club subordinate, and an Army Reserve captain superordinate. In one organization we and our friend may stand in an authoritative relationship as for example in the Reserve while in another such as the league this relationship may be reversed. Such crosscutting class memberships segment our attitudes, statuses and conflict-structures. Insofar as society is crosscut by class-segmentation, especially among the quasi-coercive and coercive organizations, then no societal conflict front will form. Our dissatisfaction with the status quo of one organization is balanced by benefits from the status quo of another. Class conflicts thus remain localized in organizations. However, there is a tendency for the same people to have authoritative roles across organizations. Often the criteria for incumbency, such as intelligence, education, charisma, and success, mean that the same individual will be part of the authoritative hierarchy of different organizations. The poor and uneducated generally are the subordinate members of organizations; those of high family, education, power, or wealth generally have authoritative roles. This is not to say that mobility does not exist, for certainly in many societies there is a circulation of elite. The point is that success breeds more success and power builds on itself. At the psychological level the cognitive incongruence associated with being a superordinate in one organization and a subordinate in another produces psychological forces towards bringing these roles into balance. In societies there is a tendency towards class-generalality. Thus, there is a tendency for the proletariat to be generally subordinate in different organizations and the capitalist superordinate; the Protestant in Northern Ireland superordinate and the Catholic subordinate; the white superordinate in the Union of South Africa and the black

subordinate; the Communist party official superordinate in China and the nonofficial subordinate. Through class-generalization a structure of class conflict for an organization is inclined to be the structure of conflict for society. This sketch is incomplete, for the necessary role of political power is. The generalization of class conflict is not only horizontal, but vertical. Class conflict over the status quo in an organization must entail conflict over the legitimacy of these authoritative roles for the larger organization as well. Since the organization with the greatest power is the state with its governmental arm, generalization of class conflict eventually extends to the political level. That is, class struggles must become political struggles. If we are talking about an industrial, secular society, class conflicts between worker and management will generalize across industries and groups and become a political class struggle. Thus the manifest confrontation in all industrial societies between anti status quo, pro-labor parties of the left, and pro status quo parties of the right. In every modern democracy conflict among different groups is expressed through political parties which basically represent a "democratic translation of the class struggle. On a world scale, the principal generalization which can be made is that parties are primarily based on either the lower classes or the middle and upper classes. Manifest class conflict is a struggle, a balancing, as to which class will control state power, as to who gets what. The outcome is a balance between classes based on their resources, the strength of their interests, and their expectations. The outcome is a distribution of rewards and rights, and a determination of state authoritative roles and the legitimacy of such roles for the whole society. From within the perspective of human societies as political societies, the composition of the body of first-class citizens cannot help but be the crucial internal political question. It is, in fact, the political basis of civil wars and revolutions. When one considers the central role of moral evaluation in social and political life, it must follow that human beings cannot be neutral about the kinds of men in their society who have genuine, public authority and about the things for which they stand Brotz, , p. How is a latent conflict structure transformed into a conflict situation and manifest conflict? Members of different classes become conscious.

4: Class and Class Conflict In Industrial Society by Ralf Dahrendorf

Excerpt from Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society Generalizing theoretical formulation and its empirical test are balanced in the present investigation.

After this, his family moved to Berlin. In 1945, during the last year of the Second World War, Ralf was arrested again for engaging in anti-Nazi activities and sent to a concentration camp in Poland. He was released in 1946. He became a doctor of philosophy and classics PhD in 1948. Interest groups, on the other hand, "have a structure, a form of organization, a program or goal, and a personnel of members. After joining, he was appointed parliamentary secretary to the foreign minister. Because he was placed third on the ladder of command in the foreign ministry, he did not enjoy the experience. In 1950, he became a Commissioner in the European Commission in Brussels. He was dedicated to the EU as a guarantor of human rights and liberty. In this series of six radio talks, entitled *The New Liberty*, he examined the definition of freedom. Between 1952 and 1954, he led the educational sub-committee of the Benson Commission. In 1955, he acquired British citizenship. Dahrendorf chose this name to honour the School in this way, and also as a sign of his liberal humour. He sat in the House of Lords as a cross-bencher. Dahrendorf insisted that even the most basic civil rights, including equality and freedom of expression, be given constitutional legitimacy. After retiring, he lived partially in Germany and partially in the United Kingdom, with one home in London and one in Bonn in south-western Germany. When asked which city he considered his home, he once said, "I am a Londoner". He married his first wife, Vera, in 1956. She was a fellow student at LSE. Together they had three daughters: Nicola, Alexandra and Daphne Dahrendorf. When he was created a peer in 1982, his wife became known as Lady Dahrendorf. Ellen Dahrendorf, who is Jewish, has served on the board of the Jewish Institute for Policy Research, been chair of the British branch of the New Israel Fund, and is a signatory of the Independent Jewish Voices declaration, which is critical of Israeli policies towards the Palestinians. Despite later revisions and affirmations of his work, today this book still remains as his first detailed and most influential account of the problem of social inequality in modern, or postcapitalist, societies. Marxism did not account for evidence of obvious social integration and cohesion. Structural functionalism, on the other hand, did not focus enough on social conflict. The wealthy "and therefore the powerful" ruled, leaving no way for the poor to gain any power or increase their position in society. Drawing on aspects of both Marxism and structural functionalists to form his own beliefs, Dahrendorf highlighted the changes that have occurred in modern society. Dahrendorf believed in two approaches to society, Utopian and Rationalist, Utopian being the balance of values and solidity and Rationalist being dissension and disagreement. While he believes that both are social perspectives, the Utopian approach is most apparent in modern-day society, leaving Dahrendorf to create a balance between the two views. He believes that the struggle for authority creates conflict. This new theory is said to have taken place in reaction to structural functionalism and in many ways represents its antithesis. The conflict theory attempts to bring together structural functionalism and Marxism. According to Dahrendorf, functionalism is beneficial while trying to understand consensus while the conflict theory is used to understand conflict and coercion. In order to understand structural functionalism, we study three bodies of work: Davis and Moore, Parsons, and Merton. This new system of capitalism, which he identifies as postcapitalism, is characterised by diverse class structure and a fluid system of power relations. Thus, it involves a much more complex system of inequality than Marx originally outlined. Conflict theorists, and therefore Dahrendorf, often took the exact opposite view of functionalists. Whereas functionalists believe that society was oscillating very slightly, if not completely static, conflict theorists said that every society at every point is subject to process of change". They believe that power is an important factor in social order. Dahrendorf believes that both conflict theory and consensus theory are necessary because they reflect the two parts of society. In developing his conflict theory, Dahrendorf recognised consensus theory was also necessary to fully reflect society. Consensus theory focuses on the value integration into society, while conflict theory focuses on conflicts of interest and the force that holds society together despite these stresses. In the past, structural functionalism was the commanding theory in sociology, until the conflict theory came along as its major challenger. However, both structural

functionalism and the conflict theory have received major criticisms. In fact, Dahrendorf asserted that there has to be consensus to have conflict, as he said that the two were prerequisites for each other. Although it initially appears to be an individual issue and psychological, Dahrendorf argues that authority is related to positions not individuals. Dahrendorf expands on this idea with the notion that roles of authority may conflict when in different positions that call for different things. Dahrendorf explains that latent interests are natural interests that arise unconsciously in conflict between superordinates and subordinates. He defines manifest interests as latent interests when they are realised. In conclusion, Dahrendorf believes that understanding authority to be the key to understanding social conflict. Dahrendorf, like Merton, looked at latent and manifest interests and further classified them as unconscious and conscious interests. He found the connection between these two concepts to be problematic for the conflict theory. The command class exercises authority, while the obey class not only has no authority, and but is also subservient to that of others. With a clear interplay between both class types class conflict theory sought to explain that interplay. The main difference between quasi groups and interest groups are that interest groups are able to organise and have a sense of "belonging" or identity. He also believed that, under ideal circumstances, conflict could be explained without reference to other variables. Marx defined class as the difference between the dominating class and those who dominate. He believed that in modern society there were three types of classes: Capitalists, workers and petite bourgeoisie. The proletariat and the bourgeoisie are the pillars in the formation of classes. Marx believed that the battle between the different classes formed the concept of class phenomenon. Marx understood that there are two classes: Every society needs both. The conflicts between them causes a destruction of the existing societal order so that it can be replaced by a new one. On the other hand, Dahrendorf believed that the formation of classes was the organization of common interests. This further means that people who are in positions of authority are supposed to control subordination, meaning that sanctions could be put into effect against people who fail to obey authority commands, resulting in fines and further punishments. Dahrendorf argues that society is composed of multiple units that are called imperatively coordinated associations. He saw social conflict as the difference between dominating and subject groups in imperatively coordinated associations. On the contrary, Dahrendorf argued that class formation was always based on authority. He defined authority as a facet of social organizations and as a common element of social structures. There is also another difference between Marx and Dahrendorf concerning the structure of societies. Dahrendorf believed that society had two aspects: He saw them all as equally the double aspects of society. On this point, Dahrendorf asserted that society could not survive without both consensus and conflict. He felt this way because without conflict, there can be no consensus, and although consensus leads to conflict, conflict also leads to consensus. Conflict theory has many of the same problems of structural functionalism. Conflict theory is also linked to structural functionalism by its ideas about systems, positions, and roles. In order to respond to the many critiques of structural functionalism, the development of an orientation known as neofunctionalism began to rise. Dahrendorf was criticized for being satisfied with having two alternative theories of order and conflict, rather than trying to find a theory that combined the two. The theory fails to address much of social life. As a consequence of the debates over identity, and inevitably in a globalising, modern, multicultural world, the issues of citizenship came into play. Specifically, the discussions analysed the ways in which citizenship contributed to the formation and construction of identities. Like Marx, Dahrendorf agreed that conflict is still a basic fact of social life. Dahrendorf believed that class conflict could have beneficial consequences for society, such as progressive change. Dahrendorf criticised and wanted to challenge the "false, utopian representation of societal harmony, stability, and consensus by the structural functionalist school. Dahrendorf points out that in postcapitalist society there are elaborate distinctions regarding income, prestige, skill level, and life chances. Grabb, "Theories of Social Inequality: Classical and Contemporary Perspectives. Stanford University Press Dahrendorf, Ralf. University of California Press: Excerpts of remarks by Ralf Dahrendorf on the governability study. New York University Press. In a letter intended to have been sent to a gentleman in Warsaw. Random House Dahrendorf, Ralf. Approaches to Social and Political Theory. Introduction by Raymond Aron , Paris: Gallimard Works available in German[edit] Gesellschaft und Freiheit:

5: Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society

Class conflict, frequently referred to as class warfare or class struggle, is the tension or antagonism which exists in society due to competing socioeconomic interests and desires between people of different classes.

While the theory itself can be set out in a highly schematic and "logical" fashion, the analysis of facts would lose much of its color and interest if forced into the strait jacket of theoretical exposition. Although I shall indicate when the following analysis of conflict in advanced industrial society is guided by the theory of social class and class conflict, I shall not attempt to rearrange facts so as to fit the order of postulates, models, and hypotheses resulting from the considerations of the last two chapters. The order of reality rather than of theory will guide our analysis in the final chapters of this study, except in this section of this chapter, which serves a special purpose in the context of the following analysis. Thus, one of the tests of the usefulness of our theory of group conflict lies in its applicability to the conditions with which Marx dealt. There is, of course, no intrinsic reason why it should be possible to deal more schematically with this historical material than with post-capitalist society. However, in the present context I propose to simplify the task of reconsidering class conflict under capitalism. I shall refrain from questioning the facts described by Marx, and, instead, concentrate on how these facts appear in the light of the theory of group conflict. This would appear to be a doubtful procedure. All too often the societies that appear in the work of sociologists are merely historical constructions borrowed from earlier works or even invented in order to provide an impressive contrast for contemporary data. For Marx, the enterprise is the nucleus of class war. In terms of our approach, the relevant feature here is that the industrial enterprise is an imperatively coordinated association. Marx, of course, emphasized the property aspect. This seems reasonable, in retrospect, since at his time it was legal possession of the means of production that provided both the foundation of capitalist power and the main issue of industrial conflict; but this is nevertheless too specific an approach to the problem. Industrial enterprise, being an imperatively coordinated association, has in it two quasi-groups which we may designate, following Marx, as those of capital or the capitalists and of wage labor or the wage laborers. Both capital and labor were united by certain latent interests which, being contradictory, placed them on the opposite sides of a conflict relation. The intensity of conflict in capitalist society was increased by the superimposition of authority and other factors of social status, especially income. Domination meant, for the capitalists, a high income, while subjection involved for labor extreme material hardship. There was a clear correlation between the distribution of authority and social stratification. Despite this initial position, large obstacles were in the way of organization for both quasi-groups in the early stages of industrialization. We find here that constellation of factors described above p. Lack of leaders and ideologies technical conditions , heterogeneous modes of recruitment to authority positions social conditions , and, in the case of labor, the absence of freedom of coalition political conditions --all these hold industrial conflict for some considerable time in a stage of latency, in which there are only occasional attempts at organization. Industrial class conflict enters a manifest phase of which strikes and lockouts are the most telling symptoms. The situation described so far is that of the sphere of industry. It is characteristic of conflict in capitalist societies, however, that not only authority and social status, but also industrial and political conflict are superimposed one on the other. Conversely, the subjected groups of industry were as such excluded from political authority. Industry is the dominating order of society; its structures of authority and patterns of conflict therefore extend to the whole society. Consequently, the quasi-groups of industry also extend to the political sphere. The industrial quasi-group of capital becomes, as bourgeoisie to use the Marxian terms once again , the dominant group of the state, whereas wage labor is, as proletariat, subjected in the political sphere as well. Since, under the particular conditions of capitalist society, conflict fronts that characterized industry and society were identical, the conflict was intensified to an extraordinary degree. In the political field, too, organization of conflict groups proved difficult in the beginning. Insofar as industrial and political quasi-groups were identical, the same factors were at work in the state that tended to prevent industrial organization. Moreover, political restrictions, such as electoral systems, made it difficult for the proletariat to form effective interest groups. Thus, class conflict was

smoldering below the surface of society for some time, until all restrictions fell and the two classes met openly in the political arena. By virtue of the superimposition of various lines of differentiation this conflict was, as we have seen, extremely intense. Its intensity was further increased by the fact that both classes were relatively closed units. Mobility within and between generations remained an exception. But in this period it was not merely the intensity of the conflict but the violence as well that was extraordinarily great. In industry and the state, there were virtually no accepted modes of conflict regulation. In the absence of a democratic process that put both parties to a conflict on an equal footing, the subjected class increasingly became a suppressed class which faced as a solid but powerless bloc the absolute rule of the incumbents of roles of domination. Because of this hardening of the class fronts, there were widespread demands for a complete and revolutionary change of existing structures. For structure changes could not slowly grow out of class conflict in this stage. Immobility and lack of regulation made the penetration of the ruling class by members of the subjected class impossible. At the same time, there were neither institutional channels nor ideological provisions for the ruling class to accept and realize any of the interests of the proletariat. Thus, it seemed justified to predict that class conflict in capitalist society tended toward both sudden and radical changes, i. Marx carried his analysis of capitalist society approximately to this point. Although he went considerably further in detail, his whole work converges on the prediction of the proletarian revolution. We have seen earlier how at this point Marx became a prisoner of preconceived philosophical and, perhaps, political convictions. Thus he did not, or would not, notice that factual developments followed the course of his predictions only up to a point. The ossification of conflict fronts and the intensification of conflict began to be checked both by the very fact of organization of interest groups on the part of the proletariat and by the structure changes to which this organization led. Within industry in particular, signs of the development of modes of regulation became apparent; trade unions managed to make some of their claims effectively heard and accepted. Marx showed himself a consistent philosopher but a poor sociologist when he tried to ridicule such "partial results" and the operation of trade unions i. His attempt to advocate, despite such tendencies, an intensification of class war, and his insistence on the revolutionary goal of the proletariat, document his prophetic and political rather than his scientific self. At this point, we have to reject not only the substance, but the very intention of his work. It should now be abundantly clear that the traditional, Marxian concept of class is but a special case of the concept advanced in the present study. For Marx, classes are conflict groups under conditions of a absence of mobility, b superimposition of authority, property, and general social status, c superimposition of industrial and political conflict, and d absence of effective conflict regulation. Thus, classes are conflict groups involved in extremely intense and violent conflicts directed toward equally extremely sudden and radical changes. This is the "traditional" or "historical" concept of class. As against this concept, we have removed all four conditions mentioned from its definition and included them as empirically variable factors in a theory of social class and class conflict. In this way, the concept itself becomes a highly formal and--in this sense--"unhistorical" category; but the theory gains in fruitfulness, range, and applicability. Thus, what has happened since Marx are in fact changes in the factors that contributed to the intensity and violence of the conflicts of his time. Patterns of conflict regulation emerged in both industry and the state. More and more, the democratic process of decision-making gave both parties a chance to realize their goals. The violence of class conflict was thereby effectively reduced. The institutionalization of social mobility made for a certain degree of openness in both classes. Absolute deprivation on the scales of social stratification gave way, for the proletariat, to relative deprivation, and later, for some, to comparative gratification. Finally, the associations of industry and the state were dissociated to some extent. All these changes served to reduce both the intensity and the violence of class conflict in post-capitalist society, and to make sudden and radical structure changes increasingly improbable. New patterns of class conflict emerge, to which we shall turn presently. It must, of course, be emphasized that, whatever concept or theory one employs, history cannot be explained solely in terms of class. The changes that separate capitalist and post-capitalist society are not wholly due to the effects of class conflict, nor have they merely been changes in the patterns of conflict. Thus, the subdivision of authority positions stimulated by an ideology of rationalization in both the enterprise and the state is an autonomous process. The decomposition of capital and labor by the separation of ownership and control, and by the emergence of new

differentiations of skill, has consequences for class conflict but is due to other factors. As a comprehensive process the development from capitalist to post-capitalist society remains outside the scope of the present analysis. But it should be clear from the preceding sketch that in principle our theory of group conflict is applicable, also, to the facts with which Marx dealt--and I hope it will be clear from the following rather more elaborate analysis in what sense it lends itself, by generalizing earlier approaches, to a coherent account of industrial and political conflict in the contemporary world. In a sense, Schelsky is undoubtedly right in calling the "often heard question. Have we still got a class society today? However, this question is naive not so much because it is too general to be answered with a plain "yes" or "no," but because it can be answered without thereby stating anything significant or exciting about post-capitalist society. Are there still classes? Or, as we can ask more precisely now: Are there still interest groups and quasi-groups in the sense of class theory? That there are interest groups in contemporary society can be affirmed immediately. It is not difficult to show that all these organizations are interest groups in the sense of our definition. Quasi-groups, on the other hand, may be assumed to exist wherever there are authority relations and imperatively coordinated associations. Is it necessary to prove that there are such associations and relations in contemporary society? The state, the industrial enterprise, the churches--to mention only a few-- are imperatively coordinated associations which exist in all modern societies and which, if our theory is right, justify the assumption that there are quasi-groups with conflicting latent interests within them. And if post-capitalist society has quasi-groups and interest groups, it has classes also. Like its precursor, advanced industrial society is a class society. Concept and theory of class are still applicable. By taking this position we differ from a number of sociologists whose work has been discussed above. But is this difference, as described so far, more than a difference of terminology? Cannot the charge be leveled against us that we presuppose the existence of classes by definition instead of demonstrating it empirically? Can we really answer the question of whether we still have a class society as easily as we did? The assertion that there still are classes because there are quasi-groups and interest groups is indeed less than a definition. It is, on the basis of class theory, a mere tautology. On the other hand, the assertion that there are still classes because there are imperatively coordinated associations is more than a definition. Although it presupposes the theoretical and perhaps definitional connection between classes and authority relations, it asserts the empirical presence of relations of authority. Social classes and class conflict are present wherever authority is distributed unequally over social positions. It may seem trivial to state that such unequal distribution exists in associations of post-capitalist society, but this assertion nevertheless establishes both the applicability of class theory and the radical difference from all attempts to describe contemporary society as classless. Nevertheless, to conclude merely that we are still living in a class society is as insufficient as it is unsatisfactory.

6: Class Conflict in Capitalist Society | Daniel Harrison and Paul Lipold - www.enganchecubano.com

Editions for Class and Class Conflict In Industrial Society: (Paperback published in), (Paperback published in),

7: SOCIAL CLASS, CONFLICT, AND DISTANCE

Class, Culture and Conflict in Barcelona This is a study of social protest and repression in one of the twent Class and Community: The Industrial Revolution in Lynn HARVARD STUDIES IN URBAN HISTORY SERIES EDITORS ++ Stephan Thernstrom Charles Tilly THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN LY.

8: Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society.

One of the most powerful sociological explanations of social conflict is that of Karl Marx, who posited a class struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie intrinsic to capitalist, industrial society.

9: Class and Class Conflict In Industrial Society by Dahrendorf, Ralf

CLASS AND CLASS CONFLICT IN INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY. pdf

Search the history of over billion web pages on the Internet.

Hazardous materials warning labels Cape May, queen of the seaside resorts Commentaries on Aristotle Verben mit prÄpositionen liste Location, location, location : Thomas Johnson and the tavern Why some Christians hesitate Chrome wont forbidden The population change in education Rand McNally San Francisco Popout Map Studies of behavioral quiescence in the nematode Caenorhabditis elegans David M. Raizen Latin II for Christian schools Time line of Cesar Chavezs life. Electronics Design with Off the Shelf Integrated Circuits The power of breath Pt. 1. General correspondence, 1945-1947 The Fox, the Rose, and the minor contributions of France Language of Amarna, language of diplomacy Abominacion Desoladora Enfentada Profecia Apocaliptica Boulding, K. E. The limits to progress in evolutionary systems. A small glimmer of light Out of my keeping, A character A Christian perspective on business John R. Sutherland The lord is my shepherd stuart townend sheet music Understanding system administration Multiple regression : concepts and calculation An Introduction to the Theory of Knowledge (Cambridge Introductions to Philosophy) Enzyme Handbook: Volume 11 Beginning and intermediate algebra 4th edition The anatomy of some scientific ideas. Dictionary of Dance The Ultimate Guide for the Choral Director (Resource) Feminine Persuasion How humans construct their environment Exam essentials ielts practice test American working class Sammy Spiders First Shavuot (Sammy Spider Set) The hearts yearning Domestic offenses : Judias Buenoano and Betty Lou Beets The Dobro Book (Dobro) The relation of municipal and international law Random Access File (Writing West)