Title	英文抄録
Sub Title	
Author	
Publisher	慶應義塾経済学会
Publication year	1973
Jtitle	三田学会雑誌 (Keio journal of economics). Vol.66, No.10 (1973. 10) ,p.1- 4
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00234610-19731001-0102

Le problème foncière devant la Révolution française

par Kunihiro Watanabé

La liberation du sol—Le régime féodal, soutenu par des coutumes séculaires, l'intérêt des privilégiés et de la bourgeoisie riche, des praticiens et gens de loi auxquels il assurait des profits, résistait à toutes les attaques et rien ne permettait de prévoir que son règne allait bientôt finir. C'était l'opinion des esprits éclairés. Seul un ébranlement social pouvait l'anéantir. Son abolition, dont la suppression des tenures foncières perpétuelles compléta les effets, a été l'une des parties excellentes de l'œuvre de la Révolution. Cependant, on critique plus ou moins âprement les voies et moyens décrétés parle législateur révolutionnaire pour réaliser sa réforme foncière.

Les translations de propriétés—La propriété du sol de la France était, en 1789, répartie entre les trois ordres, dans des proportions, d'ailleurs, fort variables, suivant les lieux. Mais c'est un fait incontestable qu'un grand nombre de paysans étaient propriétaires. Les réfomes de la Révolution ont modifié profondément la répartition de la propriété foncière entre les différentes classes sociales, accrus la division du sol et augmenté le nombre des petits propriétaires. Ce résultat a été essentiellement la conséquence des nationalisations, c'est-à-dire de la mise à la disposition de l'Etat des biens du clergé, d'une part, de ceux des émigrés, des déportés et des condamnés à mort par les tribunaux révolutionnaires, de l'autre.

Family Size and Income in the FIES Data: 1963-1971

by Ross E. Mouer

The Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES), which is conducted every month in a continuous fashion by the Bureau of Statistics in the Office of the Prime Minister, provides the most reliable information on income distribution in Japan. One problem in using this data, however, is the fact that the earning unit is the household. Therefore, if the number of household members can be shown to vary, either directly or inversely, with household income, the relative amount of inequality in the distribution of income between households units will differ from that which exists between individuals. In his book, *Income Distribution and Social Change: A Study in Criticism*, Richard M. Titmuss showed that the differential between these two dis-

tributions can be considerable, and that changes in the size of the household unit over time can seriously affect estimates on the relative inequality of income distribution. This paper examines the interrelation between family income and family size, as observed in the FIES data from 1963 through 1971.

In contrast to what the Japanese saying, *binbōnin no kodakusan*, which infers that the poor produce like rabbits, would lead us to believe, the fact is that family size seems to vary directly with income. Looking at the data as arranged according to income groups, household size increases slightly with successive increments in income, thereby offsetting slightly the income differential between households. However, when the data is arranged according to the number of household members, income increases with household size but the successive increments come nowhere near to compensating for the additional household members. In other words, the monthly income of an eight-member household is 1.42 times greater than that for a two member household, whereas its income in per capita terms is only one-third that of the later. The result is that the distribution between individuals is considerably more unequal than that between households.

In explaining the positive correlation between household income and household size, the life cycle of the household seems to be an important factor. This life cycle includes two component factors. One is the age or life cycle of the household head whose income increases with age up until the age of 45–49, afterwhich his income begins to drop. A second factor is the household's pattern of work force participation. The wife works for two or three years after marriage until she bears her first child. The household then depends upon the income of the household head whose income is increasing with age when between the ages of thirty and fifty. Finally, although the income of the household head decreases after that time, the rather sharp decreases in income are more than compensated for by the entry of the children into the labor force. Thus, not only family size but also work force participation seem to increase as the household head ages and household income increases.

Looking at changes in the household unit over time, household size has dropped steadily from an average of 4.19 members in 1963 to an average of 3.87 in 1971. The number gainfully employed has hardly changed, being 1.53 persons in 1963 as opposed to 1.54 persons in 1971. The percentage of household members employed has thus risen three percentage points from 36.5 percent in 1963 to 39.8 percent in 1971. Comparing the Gini coefficients (based upon the Lorenz curve) for the distribution of the income of household heads only with those for the distribution of total household income, secondary earners can said to have been playing an increasingly significant role in offsetting inequalities between the major earners (the household heads). In other words, they have been contributing to the trend toward a slightly more egalitarian distribution.

In the final section, the relationships between household income, household size, the number of household members in the labor force, and the age of the household head are examined for variations when set within the other social subsystems. The interaction between these variables

is set against variation in geographical location (nine regions and five city-size groupings), industrial affiliation (10 groupings), occupational classification (10 groupings), and firm size (nine groupings). It is shown that the three variables related to the household life cycle—family size, the age of the household head and the number of household members in the work force—consistently vary together even when these other subsystem variables are changed. However, none of these three can be said to vary consistently with household income. Indeed, when arranged by city-size groups, the data show a strong negative correlation between income and each of the other three variables related to the household's life cycle. In the rural areas, where household income is lowest, household size is largest, participation in the labor force is greatest and household heads are the oldest. In the largest cities where household income is the highest, the reverse is true.

The paper concludes that the relationship between household income and household behavior, including household size, is very complex. One final paradox is suggested by the fact that labor force participation increases steadily with increments in total household income while decreasing with successive increments in the earnings of the household head. Thus, the findings of Paul Douglas nearly fifty years ago, as presented in *The Theory of Wages*, can be said to be partially relevant to the Japanese setting today. Household behavior and labor force participation vary on a geographical basis in terms of city-size income differentials and in terms of the earnings of household heads. Finally, the most crude comparisons between the United States and Japan would show the latter with something less than half the former in terms of income per capita while having nearly fifty percent of its population in the labor force as compared with slighly over forty percent in the case of the United States.

The research reported on here is part of a much broader study on the FIES, including a look at its methodology and income differentials within the various social subsystems. A similar though abridged report on this research will be abailable in English in the *Keio Economic Studies* (vol. X, no. 1, 1973 and vol. XI, no. 1, 1974).

Demand Aralysis for Durable Goods.

by Yoko Moriizumi

Considering the demand for durable goods, the important point is not quantity determination under certain price mechanism, but determination of the kinds of durable goods that consumer purchases.

To approach this problem, we must take into account both the velocity of popularity of goods and diversify of consumption. The former significantly relates to the saturation of goods.

The first step that we take is to introduce the concept of long-term demand and short-term one, and the intertemporal consumer behavior.

From this point view, we find that the famous two hypothesis i.e, the stock adjustment hypothesis and the habit formation hypothesis, is not an alternative hypothesis but a complemental hypothesis. The stock adjustment hypothesis represents a short-term aspect, while the habit formation hypothesis represents a long-term aspect of the demand for durable goods.

The second step is to represent the characteristic of the goods by the parameter of the utility function. This characteristic is classified into four groups, we estimate four kinds of durable goods from 1963 to 1970 in Japan, and classify these goods into the four groups.

Under these conditions, we conclude that the characteristic of durable goods can be found by the two parameters of the utility function, i.e, the velocity of popularity and the diversify of consumption.

Moreover we conclude that this approach is useful for the determination of the kinds of durable goods.
