

Title	英文抄録
Sub Title	
Author	
Publisher	慶應義塾経済学会
Publication year	1961
Jtitle	三田学会雑誌 (Keio journal of economics). Vol.54, No.7 (1961. 7) ,p.1- 3
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00234610-19610701-0096

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.

Über die sogenannte historische regelmäßige oder gar notwendige Verbindung von Benefizium und Vasallität

von *Hisashi Uono*

Wenn wissenschaftlich wir zwischen *precaria* und *beneficia* in der fränkischen Zeit unterscheiden wollen, müssen wir an die These von A. Dopsch erinnern.

Nun starten wir von Theorie über Prekarien, Benefizium und Vasallität, dann wollen wir die Urkunden über sie behandeln.

Schließlich in den Urkunden, haben wir die vasallitischen militärischen Lehen und die bäuerlichen Lehen, welche nebeneinander gehen oder von diese zu jene übergehen.

Doch in vasallitischen Lehen, es liegt die persönlichen Herrschaften über die materiellen Herrschaften.

Some Problems on the Study of History of German Working Class Movement

A Critique on Walter Bartel; Die Linken in der
deutschen Sozialdemokratie im Kampf gegen
Militarismus und Krieg, 1958

by *Kanae Iida*

It is often said the history of German working class movement is distinguished as having the most dramatic, unfortunate and tragic vicissitude. And even now, the German is divided into two constitutionally different countries, the German Federal Republic and the German Democratic Republic. So we are worth while to not that the study of history of working class movement is in full flourish in both countries and their viewpoints are quite different. In the former, an approach to the conditions of the working classes is dominant, on the contrary, in the latter, the trend of ideological and theoretical study is determinative.

In this essay the writer is going to criticize the formalism and dogmatism apparent in the work of Prof. Walter Bartel, the most well-known historian of the German Democratic Republic. His intention is to clarify purposes of the study on the history of the working class, through criticizing the method of Prof. Bartel's „Geschichtsschreibung“

Prof. Bartel's work consists of following chapters.

Chapter I. The Origins of the First World War, 1914-1918 (Zur Genesis des Weltkrieges, 1914-1918)

Chapter II. The War was made unavoidable. (Der Krieg wird unvermeidlich macht)

Chapter III. 4. August and the social democratic party. (Der 4. August und die Sozialdemokratie)

Chapter IV. The German Left form their independent group (Die deutschen Linken formieren sich zur selbständigen Gruppe)

Chapter V. From Agitation to Action (Von der Agitation zur Aktion)

Chapter VI. The main enemy is in the land (Der Hauptfeind steht im eigenen Land)

Chapter VII. The socialchauvinistic policy deforms the action of the masses. (Die sozialchauvinistische Politik lähmt die Aktionskraft der Massen)

Chapter VIII. The Influence of the Russian Revolution (Die Wirkungen der russische Revolution)

Chapter IX. The National Strike—a national behaviour (Der Januarstreik—eine nationale Tat.)

Anhang.

Chapter X. Spartakusgroup is ready to the revolution (Die Spartakusgruppe bereitet die Revolution vor)

In this book Prof. Bartel defines the positions of K. Kautsky and Bebel as “the Central Sect”—opportunist group and designate the group of Rosa Ruxenburg and Karl Liebknecht “the Left Wing” or the revolutionary group. But he fails to mention the relation between the leaders and “the rank and file”. The development of the German Socialdemocratic Party from 1890, the year of repeal of the Laws of suppressions of the socialdemocratic movement, has brought reformist group represented by Eduard Bernstein.

The advent of imperialism and the danger of the war made this split in socialist movement more severe and as the result, the right

wing, left wing and central group were struggling to grasp the hegemony of the labour movement. The emergence of split and opposition among the leaders of S. P. D. were no more than the reflection of the various influence of the trade union movement (freie Gewerkschaften, Hirschdunkerische Gewerkschaften und Katholische Gewerkschaften u. s. w.).

The leaders of the Central Sect, K. Kautsky and Bebel had been supported by the great masses of trade-unionists. Their contribution to the labour movement and their brilliant activities for the emancipation of the working people and the repeal of laws against social-democracy infatuated the working people and their old careers as the veterans and the prominent leaders of S. P. D. imbibed in the mind of the masses with the unshakable and enthusiastic belief.

The outbreak of the world war following the collapse of the Second International was the defeat of the pacifist groups of S. P. D. Above all, Kautsky and Bebel were changing their standpoint as the orthodoxical marxists before the war and forming "the Central Sect". However, it was true that they were strongly supported by the trade-unionists and their leaders, especially of "freie Gewerkschaften".

Prof. Bartel has no intention to mention and crystallize the relation between the leaders and the rank and file. His defect is in the fact that he could not appreciate the rôle of "the Central Sect" which played the dominant influence among the masses, only to reproach their behaviour as opportunist. Most important is "why the Central Sect got the majority?".