

Title	英文抄録
Sub Title	
Author	
Publisher	慶應義塾経済学会
Publication year	1965
Jtitle	三田学会雑誌 (Keio journal of economics). Vol.58, No.7 (1965. 7) ,p.1- 2
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	
URL	<a href="https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00234610-19650701-0092">https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00234610-19650701-0092</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.

## Analysis of the Reproduction Structure of Japanese Capitalism

—An Approach from "Inter-industrial Table of 1960"—

by *Kiyoko Imura*  
*Isamu Kitahara*

In the previous study, (Mita Gakkai Zasshi, Volume 57, No. 12) important implication of the analysis of reproduction structure and its method were made clear. Also we have studied the usefulness of Inter-industry table and its limitation. In the first chapter, we have analysed the position of various production sector in reproduction structure and what sorts of functions they perform from many angles.

The first part of the present study corresponds to the fifth section of this first chapter. In the fifth section, we have tried to analyse the question of on what sort of final demand the various production sectors depend ultimately, by calculating "Ultimate market composition of various production sectors." It is one of the approach to the problem taken up in chapter 1.

The problem to be analysed in chapter 2 is to study the various analysis made in chapter 1 inclusively and to group various production sectors according to their functions in reproduction structure. The process of grouping had to be limited substantially from the statistical condition of "Inter-industrial table" so we decided to group them as follows for the time being.

- (1) Sector producing consumption means.
- (2) Sector producing raw materials and subsidiary articles for consumption means.
- (3) 1. Sector producing labor means.  
2. Sector producing durable equipments (fixed capital) in various service sectors.
- (4) Sector producing raw materials and subsidiary article for durable equipment in various service sectors and sectors producing labor means.  
Additional;
- (5) Sector producing circulating materials in various service sectors.
- (6) Sector producing raw materials and subsidiary articles for circulating materials in various service sectors.

(7) Sector producing munitions and its related sectors.

In the present study we illustrated the method of grouping according to the above classification and actually distinguished (1) sector producing consumption means. The problem of grouping (2) and others will be taken up in the forth coming study. (expected to be published in Mita Gakkai Zasshi volume 58, number 9.)

## A Process of Forming the Concepts of Maximizing Group Welfare (2)

—Some Characters in Theoretical  
Structure of Paretian Concept—

by *Tamotsu Matsuura*

The purpose of this study is mainly to point out some characters in these structures of Pigovian and Paretian concept, which are derived by analytical comparison between Cambridge and Lausanne school on maximization concept of group welfare.

Generally welfare economics is classified into two groups by the criterion whether individual utility can be measured or not: old welfare economics and new welfare economics, so that in the theoretical retrospect we recognize that new welfare economics has appeared as critics of old welfare economics in 1930's.

But, from the historical point of view, the origins of two welfare economics were born contemporaneously. In 1909 Pareto tried to form the optimal condition of group utility maximization in the mathematical appendix of "Manuel de l'Economie Politique" and Pigou published the same problem in "Wealth and Welfare" in 1912.

Therefore, we could suggest in this context that, from the historical point of view, Paretian and Pigovian concept stemmed from the different historical background of economic thought. Consequently it could be sure that these two systems are quite different in their nature and analytical apparatus.