

Title	英文抄録
Sub Title	
Author	
Publisher	慶應義塾経済学会
Publication year	1956
Jtitle	三田学会雑誌 (Keio journal of economics). Vol.49, No.9 (1956. 9) ,p.1- 4
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00234610-19560901-0076

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

Historical Development of Industrial Relations and Their Specific Character in Japan

by Keizo Fujibayashi

It is a matter of common knowledge that Industrial Relations change as history develops. In Japan, however, this fact has often been overlooked by managers and workers, by government and even by students in the field concerned. It seems that such attitude has brought about a lot of glaring mistakes both in theory and practice. Our urgent need is, therefore, to recognize a somewhat deterministic tendency in Industrial Relations along with the development of Capitalistic Production, to specify to which stage of the development do belong our Industrial Relations, to forecast what change would our Relations undergo, and finally to examine whether the expected pattern of change would coincide with the deterministic tendency of the historical development.

According to the present writer's view, Industrial Relations in western countries started from those rude relations in the period of the Industrial Revolution, passed through the patriarchal relations at one stage, developed into the various forms of co-operative relations around the latter half of the 19th Century, and finally established Industrial Democracy during and after the World War I. After the second World War this Industrial Democracy has further been strengthened in certain countries. While it seems that Industrial Relations in our country still remain in the intermediate stage of moving from the patriarchal relations to the co-operative ones. This fact makes the present situation of our Relations particularly singular and complicated, letting several features manifest at the same time.

The main purpose of the present paper is thus to consider as concretely as possible how to solve the problems we must confront when we try to proceed from this situation.

On the Historical Character of Economic Theory

by Shigeo Tomita

On view of highly abstract, mathematical and mechanical approach of the recent modern economics, the paper tries to probe into the historical character that the economic theory itself has, is able to have and ought to have, in order to form or find out an economic theory with real validity as well as logical consistency. Modern economics, at least a part of it, is, the writer thinks, such a theory as M. Weber's "ideal type"; it does not mean the description of actual phenomena, but it means the tool contrived from a certain viewpoint, to understand and explain them. We shall be able to consider the historical character of such a theory from the following viewpoints: (A) from the subjective point of the student who establishes a theory, and (B) from the objective point as regards its contents with a subdivision:—(1) whether and how the theory corresponds to the actual, historical sequences, and (2) whether it can deal with the actual, historical and qualitative changes or developments. Now the writer thinks, from the points of (A) and (1) in (B), the theory as a tool-box can logically claim to have the historical character, in spite of the danger of it being non-historical approach, but from the point of (2) in (B), it cannot deal with any actual and qualitative change.

How should we proceed to evaluate the mentioned character of the theory? There will be discussed on the following issues: (1) in analysing the actual sequences by the theory, it is questionable whether it can explain the heterogeneous actuality and the transitive processes from one state to another, and (2) this line of thought combines with the "technological policy" and if this accompanies with the indifference to the value-judgement, it will result in the "policy without conviction".

The Theory of American Labor Union

—On Commons' Theory—

by Hisashi Kawada

The pure and simple unionism of the United States has long been

provocative among labor students in Japan. It will be safely said that the subject will renew their attention under the situation created by the over all policy change towards peaceful coexistence. The writer wishes in this article to review the still influential Commons' theory as a part of his research on major theories of American labor unionism which is very clearly presented in the text of testimony by Gompers and Strasser.

According to Commons, American labor movement has arisen from peculiar American conditions, and by understanding these conditions, one will be able to distinguish the movement from those of the other countries. After many years well organized investigation of American industrial society, he seemed to come to the conclusion that the best fitted labor unionism in America was the type of American Federation of Labor holding the pragmatic philosophy based on immediate necessities, which is the combination of "solidarisme" in France and "labourism" in England. To assume such a conclusion, Commons presented various historical factors: free land, suffrage and government function, extension of market, immigrants, business cycle.

The studies on the field during forty years after his well known book *The History of Labour in the United States*, revealed many shortcomings of Commons' inference. The writer followed on these findings and tried to evaluate under new light. The outstanding contradiction in Commons' theory must be found in between two factors; i. e. the over-estimation of the free land retarding effect on the one side and encouraging effect of market extension on the other. From this he, regardless of valuable extensive collection of data—*committed to judge* the formative period of the labor union much later than it actually took place. It could be understood that this contradiction was derived by his deep affection for the rise of consolidated labor movement of his own ideal type—the American Federation of Labor. The writer assumes that the reason for the development of the American unionism on the direction what Commons have supported, is not found in the validity of his analysis, but rather on the condition under which the unionism was forced towards that direction by overwhelming predominant social forces in the United States.

L. Stein—His Idea of State and Public Finance

by Michiyoshi Oshima

L. Stein was known as one of the three masters in science of public finance in Germany. He studied not only public finance but also other various branches of social science.

In his early days he devoted himself to the study of the theory of social movement. In his social theory, standing on Hegel's philosophy, he mentioned his view of contradictions and conflicts between social classes. And the basis of all his thinkings was his idealistic view of state of which he owed much to Hegel. If we compare Stein with K. Marx and F. Lassalle who were his contemporaries and learned much from Hegel and showed deep concern with social problems, we can find the most interesting relationship among them. For example, Stein was in common with Lassalle and was against Marx as for the view of revolution and state.

Since about 1860, he had been interested in the study of administration and public finance more than sociology. And the social problems that he had had concern with, began to be taken up by A. Wagner in a different way (the state-socialism or the social tax-policy). But Stein was critical to Wagner. He said that the social tax-policy should not prevent capital formation.

His theory of public finance which was the background of his criticism to Wagner, involved such elements; he maintained the theory of the organic circulation and the reproductivity of economic life of state and the taxation of annual net products. But his conceptions of capital and net product were confused and essentially different from the theory of English classic school. Therefore, we can say that his theory was to justify "the expensive government" in the society in which capitalistic production was rapidly developing. So he could not understand the necessity of social tax-policy as Wagner was holding.

We can see another difference between these two, both of whom are called the fathers of the modern theory of public finance. Wagner could understand the social problems at the step of monopolistic capitalism in Germany, but Stein could not do that, being restricted by his idealistic view of state.