


UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

THE INSTITUTE OF NATIONAL PLANNING



Memo. No. 409

Structural Problems of Industry.

by

Dr. M. Engert

14 March 1964.

I N D E X

1. The basic elements of industrial structure
2. Concepts and symbols used
3. Some minimal relationships among investment, intermediate and consumer goods' production
4. Growth and structural changes
 - 4.1 The increase of the net product and its structural implications
 - 4.2 Rate of growth
 - 4.21 Survey of the existing relationships
 - 4.22 First estimates of the rates of growth
 - 4.23 Calculation of the investment requirements
5. Final remarks.

I N T R O D U C T I O N

This Memo. discusses, in a general way, some aspects of the structure of industry. It is essential in development planning to pay special attention to this issue in order to be able to solve the problem of balanced growth. The latter, however, implies differentiated rates of growth, for the various sectors both of the national economy and the industry. They are determined, finally by a specific relationship amongst the various physical and value elements of production. Though planning usually is to get a maximum net product (national income) , this can be obtained provided the existing relationship between the gross and net product in each sector had been appropriately treated by the planners. The gross concept of production, therefore, is the one by means of which the structural and growth problems of industry can be understood and solved.

The reader is kindly requested to study also the Memo. No. 384 ("The Role of Industry in Economic Development") to which the present note is a suplement .

Structural Problems of Industry.

In development planning we are confronted with the problem of calculating rates of growth and to decide upon them. Rates of growth, however, are closely linked to structural shifts. Sometimes, the given structure (of industrial output) predetermines to a large extent the rates of growth of the various elements (branches) of industry.

The present note intends to give a first introduction into some basic ideas on structural problems of industry.

1. The basic elements of industrial structure.

According to their respective economic function both commodities and the branches producing them can be divided into three main categories:

- (1) investment goods
- (2) intermediate goods
- (3) consumer goods

The first two are commonly called producer goods.

Amongst these three categories exist or should exist certain relationships which it is our intension to discuss, briefly. The relationships we have in mind are determined by, at least, two factors:

- (i) the technological (technical) factor (the production of a certain volume of goods requires a definite input of investment and intermediate goods according to the average technico-economic level of production);
- (ii) the national factor (any national economy should have-within the ranges of the technological factor - a set of adequately balanced industrial branches which could enable it, potentially, to produce any element of a highly-productive modern industry).

If we discuss the relationships amongst the three categories with due regards of the mentioned two factors we shall arrive at a model which serves as a guideline for making a plan in the field of production. This is not the plan itself because the number of branches (3) is too small. It offers, however, many important informations about the trends and the relative magnitudes of the inter-related structural elements concerned.

2. Concepts and symbols used.

(a) For our study it is important to cover total relationships among the three categories, i.e. total inputs and outputs. Consequently, the concept of gross production (P) is necessary. Gross production of investments goods will be indicated by P_1 ; that of intermediate goods by P_2 and that of consumer goods by P_3 .

(b) Each gross production indicator (P, P_1, P_2, P_3) will be divided into its main value elements, namely:

investment goods consumed = inv.

intermediate goods consumed = int.

net product = n

This classification has its counterparts in accounting :

inv. = depreciation

int. = cost of raw materials and semi-fabricated goods

n = wages, profits etc.

(c) Accordingly, total (gross) production in industry has to be written in this form:

$$P_1 = \text{inv.}_1 + \text{int.}_1 + n_1$$

$$P_2 = \text{inv.}_2 + \text{int.}_2 + n_2$$

$$P_3 = \text{inv.}_3 + \text{int.}_3 + n_3$$

$$P = \text{inv.} + \text{int.} + n$$

(3)

3. Some minimal relationships among investment, intermediate and consumer goods production.

Actually planning of production means to fix-inter alia-the various volumes of products and how these have to be distributed. In other words: how much to produce of the various categories of goods and which branch should exchange which volumes with the other branches. For easiness of discussion we assume, first, that no foreign trade takes place and, secondly that all the net product (=national income) is consumed. Production is going on in every cycle on the same scale.

(a) In this case the gross production of the investment goods branch has to be so high as to compensate all the productively consumed investment goods in all three branches; it must equal depreciation.

$$(i) P_1 = \text{inv.}_1 + \text{inv.}_2 + \text{inv.}_3$$

Total intermediate goods production has to compensate all productively consumed raw materials etc. in all branches, too.

$$(ii) P_2 = \text{int.}_1 + \text{int.}_2 + \text{int.}_3$$

finally, total consumer goods output has to amount to the net product of the whole industry.

$$(iii) P_3 = n_1 + n_2 + n_3.$$

(b) So far, production is in line with total productive consumption of investment and intermediate goods. The next problem; however, is to distribute production. This leads us to the relationships of exchange of goods. Apparently, each branch can use one part of its production for compensation of the productive consumption of the respective value element in its own production. The investment goods branch has a demand for compensating its depreciation. As it is the sole producer

of investment goods it can take an adequate part of its production for that purpose. No exchange among the three branches takes place. This is an intra-branch exchange. Consequently, a share of P_1 which is equal to the volume of $inv._1$ remains within this branch.

Furthermore, the intermediate goods branch takes a share of P_2 to compensate its consumption of raw materials etc. This share is equal to $int._2$. Again, we have only intra-branch exchange.

The third branch uses part of P_3 to cover consumption of its net product. This part equals n_3 .

Below are that parts of industrial production which are subject only to intra-branch exchange (in circles).

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= \textcircled{inv._1} + int._1 + n_1 \\ P_2 &= inv._2 + \textcircled{int._2} + n_2 \\ P_3 &= inv._3 + int._3 + \textcircled{n_3} \end{aligned}$$

(c) The other parts of production are to be channelled through the inter-branch exchange. First, the investment goods branch needs intermediate goods equal to $int._1$ for compensation. In exchange for that it has to give part of its investment goods production to the intermediate goods branch. The latter, secondly, requires new investment goods for compensation of its depreciation; this requirement is equal to $inv._2$. Consequently, $int._1$ will be exchanged against $inv._2$. If the assumption that production should continue on the same scale be met each branch needs actually the same amount of intermediate and investment goods that it had at the beginning of the previous production cycle. This is why $int._1$ must be equal to $inv._2$.

(5)

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= \text{inv.}_1 + \text{int.}_1 + n_1 \\ P_2 &= \text{inv.}_2 + \text{int.}_2 + n_2 \end{aligned}$$

Thirdly, the last branch has to get investment goods for compensation of inv._3 . These can be obtained only from P_1 . In the investment goods branch, however, only one part of gross production has been left, namely equal to n_1 . Now, inv._3 will be exchanged against n_1 . Accordingly, part of consumer goods production (equal to int._3) will be exchanged against n_2 .

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= \text{inv.}_1 + \text{int.}_1 + n_1 \\ P_2 &= \text{inv.}_2 + \text{int.}_2 + n_2 \\ P_3 &= \text{inv.}_3 + \text{int.}_3 + n_3 \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have arrived at the basic relationships (proportions) amongst the three branches (investment goods, intermediate goods and consumer goods) that must be met if production is resumed on the same scale (with no foreign trade):

$$\text{(iv) } \text{int.}_1 = \text{inv.}_2$$

$$\text{(v) } \text{inv.}_3 = n_1$$

$$\text{(vi) } \text{int.}_3 = n_2$$

(v) and (vi) can be combined:

$$\text{(vii) } (\text{inv.} + \text{int.})_3 = n_1 + n_2$$

(d) When using figures instead of symbols we happen to face a new technico-economic problem: Is there a definite relationship amongst the mentioned three value elements in each branch? The normal trend is in favour of the share of inv. and int. in gross output. This is the inevitable outcome of technological progress. Moreover, the investment and

intermediate goods industries are usually better equipped than the others. In both sectors, therefore, the percentage of the net product is lower than in the various consumer goods industries. This has to be considered when transforming our simple model in a figurative one.

Accordingly, we assume the following relationships amongst the value elements in each branch:

	inv.	+	int.	+	n
P_1	10%		50%		40%
P_2	10%		40%		50%
P_3	5%		35%		60%

These assumptions are fairly realistic. Furthermore, we assume that the respective shares of P_1 , and P_2 and P_3 in total industrial output (P) are:

$$P_1 = 10 \text{ units}, P_2 = 50 \text{ units}$$

$$\text{and } P_3 = 74 \text{ units; total} = 134 \text{ units.}$$

Then we have:

	inv.	+	int.	+	n
P_1	10 = 1	+	5	+	4
P_2	50 = 5	+	20	+	25
P_3	74 = 4	+	25	+	45
	134 = 10	+	50	+	74

The before mentioned proportions are now

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i) } P_1 &= \text{inv.}_1 + \text{inv.}_2 + \text{inv.}_3 \\ 10 &= 1 + 5 + 4 \\ \text{(ii) } P_2 &= \text{int.}_1 + \text{int.}_2 + \text{int.}_3 \\ 50 &= 5 + 20 + 25 \end{aligned}$$

$$(iii) \quad P_3 = n_1 + n_2 + n_3$$

$$74 = 4 + 25 + 45$$

$$(iv) \quad int._1 = inv._2$$

$$5 = 5$$

$$(v) \quad inv._3 = n_1$$

$$4 = 4$$

$$(vi) \quad int._3 = n_2$$

$$25 = 25$$

$$(vii) \quad (inv. + int.)_3 = n_1 + n_2$$

$$29 = 29$$

These figures show that - within the limits of our assumptions- production by quantities and by its structural elements as well is equal to the specific requirements of each sector. Total investments amount to the real depreciation and total required investment goods are exactly produced by the respective branch (P_1). Accordingly, total requirements for compensation of productively consumed intermediate goods can be fully met by the gross output of the respective branch (P_2). Finally, total surplus of all branched (net product or national income) can be really consumed because gross output of the consumer goods amounts to that excess.

(e) In fact, the model given does not occur in practice as such. Any growth, i.e. production at a larger scale than in the previous production cycle, however, can take place only if all physical conditions for producing the previous volume of output are given resp. reproduced. Growth thus implies by definition the proportions which we have discussed.

4. Growth and Structural Changes.

Growth depends upon an economic surplus. The latter, however, must be produced in a specific form, so that it can actually be invested. It is, therefore, a surplus of investment and intermediate goods which we are in need of in order to achieve growth because consumer goods cannot be invested. The basic condition for growth must be given now in that way:

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &> \text{inv.}_3 && \text{and} \\ n_2 &> \text{int.}_3 && \text{or} \\ n_1 + n_2 &> (\text{inv.} + \text{int.})_3 \\ n_1 + n_2 &\geq 29 \end{aligned}$$

This means to increase the share of investment and intermediate goods in total net product (or national income). Apparently, we cannot manage this by a modified distribution of the national income. It is the structure of production of income which has to be accordingly changed. Consequently, not any increase in national income is a wise target for development planning but rather an increase predominantly in the form of investment and intermediate goods.

Development planning usually starts with setting a desired increase of national income (net product). The higher it is all the more we can invest provided the increase is mainly in investible goods. Let us assume now that consumption will be on the same level (in absolute terms) as against the previous period and that the desired increase in net product be 6 (six) units. Consequently, total increase is in both investment and intermediate goods ($n_1 + n_2$) only. Apparently, the total increase income is 8,1%. If we follow the general idea of this discussion, i.e. not to forget about the physical structure of the national income we have, first, to decide upon, though tentatively, the physical structure of the increase in net product. In our case the increase in $n_1=1$ and in $n_2 = 5$.

The following example is based on the same assumptions we have made earlier. But another will be added, namely, no technical progress takes place. The relative share of inv. and int. in gross production is still unchanged. This assumption is practically correct in short run; in long-term planning, however, it is basically wrong.

What the following discussion has to show are the main economic problems and technico-economic implications of the physical and value structure of production which planners face when starting their activities from the end, i.e. from an ex ante target of growth of national income. Our specific example has to tell us whether or not under the present conditions of production (volume, structure) the planned increase of national income is really feasible and within which limits we have to make our calculations for preparation of the plan.

4.1. The increase of the net product and its structural implications.

(a) According to the set target

$$n_1 = 4 + 1 \text{ and}$$

$$n_2 = 25 + 4.$$

n_1 is equal to 40% of total output of investment goods; $n_2 = 50\%$ of total output of intermediate goods (cf. p. 6.).

The existing value composition of output requires, therefore, the following output magnitudes if the preliminary target be reached:

	inv. +	int.	+	n
P_1 12,5	= 1,25 +	6,25	+	(4+1)
P_2 60	= 6 +	24	+	(25+5)
P_3 74	= 4 +	25	+	45
<hr/>				
P 146,5	= 11,25 +	55,25	+	80

(b) We have now to check the proportions:

$$(i) P_1 > inv._1 + inv._2 + inv._3$$

$$12,5 > 1,25 + 6 + 4$$

$$(ii) P_2 > int._1 + int._2 + int._3$$

$$60 > 6,25 + 24 + 25$$

$$(iii) P_3 < n_1 + n_2 + n_3$$

$$74 < (4+1) + (25+5) + 45$$

or

$$(i) 12,5 > 11,25 \quad \text{excess} = 1,25 \text{ inv.}$$

$$(ii) 60 > 55,25 \quad \text{excess} = 4,75 \text{ int.}$$

$$(iii) 74 < 80 \quad \text{deficit} = 6 \text{ c.g.}$$

$$(iv) int._1 > inv._2$$

$$6,25 > 6 \quad \text{deficit} = 0,25 \text{ int.}$$

$$(v) inv._3 < n_1$$

$$4 < (4+1) \quad \text{excess} = 1 \text{ inv.}$$

$$(vi) int._3 < n_2$$

$$25 < (25+5) \quad \text{excess} = 5 \text{ int.}$$

The last two proportions have to be dropped from our check because they had been assumed. But we can answer the question concretely whether this target given in the form of the latter two proportions can be reached.

The result tells us that the basic proportion of growth, namely $(n_1 + n_2) > (inv. + int.)_3$ can be met by a surplus of 6 units of investment and intermediate goods as a whole. This so because gross production of both investment and intermediate goods definitely is 6 units ahead (1,25 inv. + 4,75 int.). However, the share of either kind of output within this

surplus does not correspond to the target (cf. (i) and (ii)). The reason for this is that the respective requirements of the investment and intermediate goods branches are not equal to each other. For producing a total net product of 5 the investment goods branch needs 6,25 intermediate goods. The other branch, however, has to spend only 6 units of investment goods for producing a net product amounting to 30. As $int._1$ (6,25) have to be exchanged against $inv._2$ (6) it is obvious that the 6,25 of intermediate goods (which have to be given to the investment goods branch) can be taken from $inv._2$ (6) and from the surplus or net product (0,25). Consequently, the total excess in intermediate goods totals 4,75 (or 29,75 if we take the net product). The real excess of investment goods, however, is not 1 but 1,25 (or 5,25 net product).

The tentative target has to be abandoned since the actual structure of production predetermines an increase in n_1 and n_2 which is largely different from it, although total increase of the net product corresponds to the target. The practical solution of the problem will be either to set another target or to resort to foreign trade with the view to abolish the discrepancies between the value and physical structure of gross industrial production in the investment and intermediate goods branches. If we make up our minds to set the actual results as the final target, this would imply a redistribution of 0,25 n_2 in favour of the investment goods branch (in financial terms: redistribution of part of profits of the intermediate goods branch). Apparently, this can be managed only by a centralized planning system which has a direct command of most resources in the national economy.