

Title	英文抄録
Sub Title	
Author	
Publisher	慶應義塾経済学会
Publication year	1958
Jtitle	三田学会雑誌 (Keio journal of economics). Vol.51, No.11 (1958. 11) ,p.1- 3
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00234610-19581101-0085

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.

The Mechanism of Administration and Human Relations

by Yoshimatsu Aonuma

Management, separated from the worker, consists of administrator and supervisor. The administrator, by planning and organizing the work, retains his initiative in management. The supervisor is passive agent in management, who only acts according to the frame of reference set up by the administrator. The division of management into such two agents is the pattern of management, of which we can find many current examples. We can characterize this type of organization structure by calling it centralization.

In contrast to this, in the organization structure characterized by decentralization, a simple supervisor, an passive agent without any initiative, has no room for his existence. Every stratum of management is qualified to be called administrator. This type of decentralization may be the ideal way for management, but we can hardly find any example of it in the contemporary big business.

The theme of this article is to discuss human problems, developed under each of those two organization structures, centralization and decentralization, in relation with administrative mechanism.

From the view of human relations, the decentralization is more desirable. Further more, the formation of the whole from many autonomous units seems to coincide with the democratic concept well. However, the following must be considered. In modern society, the fusion of management and the worker is rather difficult. Self control that leads to the decentralization, runs counter to the trend of the division into planning and doing.

The Outset of the Theory of Legal Minimum Wage in the History of Political Economy

by Toshio Kurokawa

The minimum of wages was discussed early in the history of Political

cal Economy, while a legal minimum wage was not taken as a subject untill John Stuart Mill appeared.

Both Adam Smith and David Ricardo treated of legal interference with wage contract; Smith said that the legal interference was just and equitable when it was in favour of the workmen, but that it was sometimes otherwise when in favour of the masters, while Ricardo claimed that wages should never be controlled by the interference of the legislature and should be left to the fair and free competition of the market. And he took objection to the Allowance System in the Poor Law on the ground of a legal interference with wage contract, following in the track of Malthus.

This Allowance System received a severe check from the new Poor Law of 1834, and though Mill said that it did not interfere with freedom of contract, he also made an argument against it, which relied for its validity on the Malthusian law of population and the Wages-Fund doctrine. Moreover, he dealt with a legal minimum wage which had been devised since the repeal of that Allowance System, and said, "Since the rate of wages which results from competition distributes the whole existing wages-fund among the whole labouring population, if law or opinion succeeds in fixing wages above this rate, some labourers are kept out of employment."

Mill, however, required a forced increase of wages-fund and legal measures for repression of population as two necessary conditions to support a legal minimum wage. But when he required such conditions, as a matter of fact, he disapproved of a legal minimum wage. It was the exponents of the Social Power theory who approved of it.

Vaine pâture

by Kunihiko Watanabe

« Par vaine pâture », Marc Bloch entend, « la pâture sur les jachères (terres provisoirement "vaines" ou "vides"), par opposition à celle qui s'exerce sur les espaces étrangers au sol arable »*. Mais faut-il comprendre par là que chaque exploitant, à son gré, peut réserver son bien à ses bêtes? La vaine pâture, tout au contraire, est essentiellement

chose collective. Ce « socialisme », ou plutôt cette mentalité communautaire, était chose traditionnelle dans l'ancienne France rurale. Dans la mesure où les temps modernes, le XVIII^e siècle en particulier, s'attaquèrent à cette institution, ils firent œuvre de révolution.

La vaine pâture constituait, en France, une pratique ancienne et de caractère nettement obligatoire. Dans le Midi, la doctrine juridique, pénétrée de romanisme, avait beau affecter d'en tenir l'origine pour purement conventionnelle. Dans le Nord, frappant en champs ouverts et allongés, c'est la terre arable, au contraire, qui, par excellence, était soumise à cette contrainte. En pays d'enclos, le champ ne connaît point la vaine pâture. La jachère, ici, sert à la nourriture des animaux de l'exploitant.

* Annales d'histoire économique et sociale, 1936, p. 401.