

Title	英文抄録
Sub Title	
Author	
Publisher	慶應義塾経済学会
Publication year	1957
Jtitle	三田学会雑誌 (Keio journal of economics). Vol.50, No.12 (1957. 12) ,p.1- 4
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	
URL	<a href="https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00234610-19571201-0115">https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00234610-19571201-0115</a>

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.

## Productive Labour and Service

*by Kyuzo Asobe*

A. Smith defined the productive labour as the labour which produces the capital, or the labour which produces the surplus-value. But he further defined it as the labour which produces the commodity, or the labour which produces the material object.

K. Marx, in his "Theorien über den Mehrwert" Teil 1, reduced Smith's second definition to his first definition, and admitted it, as it were, as the elementary phase of the first definition. However, can Smith's second definition be reduced wholly to his first definition? I think not. It seems that it is possible to find Marx's original definition of the productive labour in Smith's second definition. By Marx's original definition of the productive labour I mean the labour which functions in the labour-process (Arbeitsprozess) as the necessary condition for effecting exchange of matter (Stoffwechsel) between man and Nature, the everlasting nature-imposed condition of human existence.

According to my opinion, Smith's second definition represents the original definition of the productive labour, while his first definition represents the historical-capitalistic definition of the productive labour. It should be noted here that Smith's method was not systematic in the treatment of these two definitions. Then, where must we find the unity of the two definitions?

The unity of the two definitions must be found in the fact that if the productive labour in the capitalistic sense is not productive at the same time in the original sense, then it can not form the value, and consequently the surplus-value. The service is the unproductive labour in the original sense, or the labour which does not function in the labour-process. Therefore, even if the service is subsumed to the capitalistic relations of production and lets the capitalist acquire the surplus-value (profit), it does not form the value by any means. The service-labourers are not the creator of the national income. Their incomes are only secondary and derivative. This is not modified by the fact that the greater part of the service-labourers is subsumed to the capitalistic relations.

I hope I shall be able to examine the theory of the national income being based upon the theory of the productive labour some other time.

## Social Relations in Industry

*by Yoshimatsu Aonuma*

This is an attempt to clarify the conditions of factory laborers in Japan. In this analysis, the subjective aspects of laborers are related with the objective ones. The latter concerns about individual character and family conditions. The former deals with opinion and attitude towards management, union and society. Concrete cases will be analyzed in this paper. The most important materials are composed of two factories, one is located in Tokyo, other in local city.

We insist on using the typological method instead of quantitative approach. By this method, we can grasp several types in the exaggerated manner. It is a problem to be solved in the future, to what extent we can generalize the phenomena derived from these cases.

## Die historische Bedeutung des deutschen Bauernkrieges (Nr. 3)

*von Makoto Terao*

Die Hauptursachen des Widerstandes der deutschen Bauern gegen ihre Herren sind die folgenden zwei Punkte.

1. Die herrschaftlichen Dorfordnungen, die in 15. und 16. Jahrhunderte stark eingeführt war und an die Stelle der von den Bauern gefundenen althergebrachten Rechte und Freiheiten neu eingeführte herrschaftliche Verordnungen setzen. Vor allem klagten die Bauern über die Beeinträchtigung der Allmendnutzungen, (Wälder, Weiden und Wasser), die Behinderung der Jagd und Fischerei, die willkürliche Ausdehnung des Mühlenbannes u.s.w., und die Beschränkung des freien Marktverkehrs, durch die Zwing- und Bannrechte. Sie beschwerten

auch über die Beeinträchtigung der bäuerlichen Gerichtsbarkeit und der dorflichen Selbstverwaltung.

2. Die vielfältigen bäuerlichen Abgaben und Leistungen an ihre Herren. Die wichtigste Abgabe ist der Zins, meist in Form einer Getreideabgabe. Auf Leibeigenschaftsverhältnisse deuten Leibzins, Hühnerabgaben und besonders Besthaupt, das im Spätmittelalter allen Bauern aufgelegt war. Nicht nur klagten die Bauern über diese Abgaben und verlangten sie die ganze Abschaffung des Leibeigenschaftsverhältnisses, sondern sie beschwerten über Zehnten, Besitzwechselabgabe, Frondiensten, Gerichtsbußen und Strafgeldern. Dem Landesstaat klagten sie über die neuen Steuern und Zölle, vor allem über die indirekte Steuer des Ungeldes auf die Lebensmittel.

Der deutschen Bauern berief sich auf das alte Rechte und Herkommen durch diese zwei Hauptbeschwerden. Die Kämpfe um das alte Rechte waren fast stets spontan losbrechende Massenbewegungen. Ihre Träger waren die Gesamtgemeinde in Dörfern. Trotzdem läßt sich der Bauernkrieg nicht allein aus der Forderung nach dem alten Rechte erklären. Schon 1502 die Speyerer Bauern beriefen sich neben dem alten Rechte auf das Göttliche Recht Der Bauer, der sich auf das Göttliche Recht berief, nicht allein eine verletzte Rechtsordnungen wiederherstellen, sondern dacht er an einen neuen demokratischen Gesellschaft. An diese Kampf um das göttliche Recht teilnahm nur ein kleiner radikalierter Teil der Bauernschaft mit Plebejer, wenig Bürger und Adel.

## Trade Unions in the Economic System

### —The Structure of the Negotiated-Price Market—

*by Yohko Sano*

The writer's main interest is to examine the rôle of trade unions in the modern economy. This study will lead to the writer's ultimate object together with the former studies. Here, to make clear the function of trade unions in markets, the structure of a market is analysed by means of the degree of "organizing".

First it is attempted to distinguish the "negotiated-price" market from the "quoted-price" market as J. T. Dunlop did about the labor

market, and to extend the definition of the negotiated-price market to the product market. Then characterization of the market by (1) rigidity of prices and (2) fixity of current routes is tried. These are, in a sense, the features of centralization, or of the so-called monopoly. From the view point of market mechanism the negotiated-price market to which the quoted-price market tends to develop, is not a phase of imperfect competition including some monopoly, but the one of perfect competition. A case study of coal industry explains a character of the product and labor market.

1. In the product market of coal industry where negotiation is usually employed to reach the prices agreeable both to buyers and sellers, they aim at rigidity of sale prices, and their sales networks are almost fixed. (The enterprises of coal consisting of large and small scale ones are commonly called "Ohte-suji" and produce about seventy percent of all coal output.) A regularity is found among the eighteen enterprises: a tendency to equality of average cost which is adjusted by calory and freight. It is already recognized that the law of equality of prices operates in this negotiated-price market, so that it results in equality of the difference of price and cost among those enterprises. In spite of the existence of the features of centralization mentioned above, this shows the same result of perfect competition. That is a state of equilibrium in the present economy.

2. In the labor market related to coal industry where the function of collective bargaining works fully, the rigidity of wages and the stability of employment are generally observed. There are two unions called "Tan-Ro" and "Zen-Ro", and the former is said to be more strongly organized than the latter. Productivity which is here considered to have some connection with wages, is significantly correlated to wages of the members of Tan-Ro who won the equal level of wages four years before, but who only succeeded in negotiating wages to be added in each case of agreement since then. On the other hand wages of the members of Zen-Ro are in general lower than those of Tan-Ro, and have no correlation to productivity concerned. From this, trade unions play the rôle of something like a hook between productivity and wages, that is, trade unions' activities bring markets more perfect. Organizing of markets means the efficiency and smoothness of the market function.