

みんなのポジトリ

国立民族学博物館学術情報リポジトリ National Museum of Ethnology

Economic Institutions and Social Institutions

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 公開日: 2009-04-28 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 端, 信行 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://doi.org/10.15021/00003191

Economic Institutions and
Social Institutions

NOBUYUKI HATA
National Museum of Ethnology

1. Economic (Industrial) Structure and Economic Institution	Japan
2. Changes in the Industrial Structure and the Employment Structure	6. The <i>Samurai</i> Class under the Modern Tokugawa Shogunate Regime
3. What "Wage Earner" Means	7. Stipends to the <i>Samurai</i> Class
4. Social and Economic Functions of the Wage-Earning Population	8. What " <i>Han</i> [domain]" Means
5. Archetype of the Wage Earner in	9. Modern Japan as Viewed from Its Social Institutions

1. ECONOMIC (INDUSTRIAL) STRUCTURE AND ECONOMIC INSTITUTION

The word 'economy' usually suggests phases of economic activity, such as production activities including the output and the component ratio of production in each production field, distribution activities including the movement of goods or flow of money, and personal income.

This symposium on "Comparative Studies of Economic Institutions" is intended to discuss not real phases of economic activities and their structures, but the institutions which support economic activities. An economic institution is what structures the economy, not what the economy produces.

To put it concretely, employment structures and business organizations for production activities, and marketing and financial systems for distribution activities will be taken up as themes for analysis. With respect to personal income, of structure household economy as related to personal consumption and social structure will also be taken up for analysis. (see Table 1.)

The constituents of such economic institutions are, as a matter of course, related to one another, and the structure of the relations among these constituents will be a subject of discussion.

Table 1. Real Phases of the Economy and their Institutions

Economic Fields	Real Phases of the Economy	Economic Institution
Production	Industrial output Industrial structure	Employment structure Enterprise organization
Distribution	Transfer of products Financing	Distribution (transportation, marketing) Financial systems
Consumption	Personal income	Structure of household economy Social structure as viewed from the perspective of livelihood

2. CHANGES IN THE INDUSTRIAL STRUCTURE AND THE EMPLOYMENT STRUCTURE

It is obvious that the turning point in the industrial development of modern Japan occurred during the Industrial Revolution in the Meiji era (1867–1912). From the 20s on to the 30s of Meiji (from the late 1880s to the late 1890s), with the development of modern manufacturing industries, the economic structure of Japan was converted into one centered on manufacturing industry. It may be said that this conversion modernized the economic (industrial) structure of Japan.

What changes did this economic (industrial) conversion bring about in Japan's economic structure? The establishment of new and modern business organizations and changes in the structure of employment are among the most outstanding changes. The change in employment structures was due to an increase in the size of the wage-earning population.

It should be noted that wage earners, who often are indiscriminately placed in the same category as laborers, employees or clerks, describe, in a basic sense, those who live on wages (salaries). And it may be said that the structure of relations between business organizations and wage earners, which did not exist in premodern Japan, is a core theme for study of the economic structure of modern Japan.

3. WHAT "WAGE EARNER" MEANS

It is important, I think, to inquire into the concept and meaning of "wage earner" when we analyze the structure of relations between newly established business organizations and wage earners, which is a core theme for the analysis of the economic structure of modern Japan, as I mentioned above. The reason is that the concept of the wage earner has hitherto been rather lightly thought of in economic and social analyses.

Especially in relation to economic analysis, wage earners are treated only as a constituent of the occupational composition for each industry, or are analyzed under the concept of labor (laborers, employees, etc.) against management (capitalists, employers, managers, etc.) within business organizations, or, on the

other hand, are regarded in the same light as consumers when considering consumption activities as a part of economic activities.

The word 'salary man' which has already become fixed in the Japanese language, generally means male wage earners who form a social stratum.

Attention should be paid here to those who live on wages (pay, salaries). The focus of analysis should be placed on how important the function of the wage-earning is as one of the foundations of economic institutions [HATA 1986, 1987, 1989].

The percentage of wage-earners within the population of a community is a major factor determining the community's economic structure. The reason is that the existence of wage earners is fundamental to the establishment of a modern way of life in the community. The modern way of life is, as you well know, the life of a family in which one member supports the family on pay (salary) earned by working for a business organization.

This way of life, though very common to us at present, played an important part in changing the community. My long career of ethnological research in Africa, taught me that the most fundamental phenomenon of social change was this change in the way of life. The new way of salary life changes the traditional way of life (mainly of farmers) and creates a new system of social values. With regard to Africa, the modernization of developing communities there may be reduced to the problem of how the traditional way of life and the modern way of life can be combined to function as an economic mechanism. This problem must have arisen in the historical process of modernization in every community that is now modern.

4. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FUNCTIONS OF THE WAGE-EARNING POPULATION

What are the functions the wage-earning population performed in establishing the modern way of life? The results of various research projects carried out in the past must be useful for this question.

The functions of wage earners may be classified roughly into two kinds, as far as their social and economic activities are concerned; their function as a worker and their function as a consumer. This is because the wage earner has two sides, that of earning wages and that of consumption.

Earning wages is one function of a worker, but in this case it is not appropriate to regard a worker as an enterprise employee. The reason is that, at the early stage of development of every modern community, the wage-earning population was composed mainly of government officials, military men and school teachers. Later, as industries developed, enterprise employees as wage earners increased in number, but at the early stage, they did not represent a wage-earning population supporting a modern way of life.

Which member, husband or wife, of a family is to be the wage earner supporting the family depends largely upon the cultural tradition of the community. It is a well-known fact that, in Japan, the cultural tradition of a household division of

labor based on the husband working (wage earner) and the wife staying at home (housewife or homemaker) was established at an early stage in the development of the modern way of life. In most households in Japan, wives mind the household accounts and hold the purse strings. It is said that, even at present, wives hold the purse strings in about 80% of the households.

The fact that salaried workers are usually referred to as a 'salary man', not a 'salary woman', probably comes from such a traditional household division of labor. And this may be the reason why various problems concerning business organization have been analyzed solely from the point of view of masculine traits.

The function of the wage earner as a consumer will not require a full account here. Needless to say, growth of domestic industry depends upon the size of the wage-earning population, which is a major source of domestic demand. This function is another way in which the wage-earning population performs as an economic institution.

As the above may make clear, the concept of 'wage earner' as used here is the concept of 'wage earner' as a whole. Analyses made in the past, with respect to various fields related to the wage earner, were partial, taking up this or that function. I will not deny the significance of past analyses, but, as Professor Tadao Umesao pointed out in his keynote speech, a wholistic approach, though rough in a sense, is, I think, necessary to analyze civilization.

5. ARCHETYPE OF THE WAGE EARNER IN JAPAN

It is obvious from the two functions defined above, that the wage-earning population as an economic institution was closely connected with the establishment of many enterprise organizations in the development of modern industrialization. In Japan, from the 20s to the 30s of Meiji (from the 1880s to the late 1890s), a time when modern industries made rapid progress, the wage-earning population apparently expanded. During this period, I think, the structure of relations between business organizations and wage earners as a new economic institution began to be formed.

In this connection, I will make a brief explanation of the past movement of the Japanese wage-earning population. It was around 1955 that the wage-earning population exceeded 50% of the total population. In this statistical treatment, the population belonging to primary industry including agriculture, forestry, the marine products industry, and the wholesale and retail business, both mostly regarded as self-employed, was counted in the non-wage-earning population. In 1950, the non-wage-earning population still represented about 60% of the total. It declined to 48% in 1960. Referring to the various relevant statistics available, I am sure that the wage-earning population exceeded 50% of the total around this time. And at present it is estimated to represent about 80% of the total. Judging from the recent trend of increasingly incorporating wholesale and retail businesses, the percentage of the wage-earning population may indeed be higher. In any case, the wage-

earning population in Japan surely increased sharply after World War Second, and the structure of relations between enterprise organizations and wage earners as an economic institution of modern Japanese society has come to attract attention.

The problems to be examined here are these: What was the process through which the structure of relations between enterprise organizations and wage earners was formed in the course of the modernization of Japan? What were the peculiarities of this structure of relations? How was it connected with premodern Japanese society? Can any aspect of its original model be found in premodern Japanese society or was it formed as a brand-new model?

Here, attention should be given to the wage-earning population at the early stage of the Meiji era. This stage was a transitional period following the last days of the Tokugawa shogunate. Typically, the institutions of the early Meiji era were inherited from the Tokugawa era. The structure of the wage-earning population during this transitional period should be taken note of here.

It is no exaggeration to say that the wage-earning population during the early Meiji era was represented by government officials, military men and teachers. This is not only the case with Japan. This transitional type of structure may be observed in the formal origins of every modern state. The problem to be examined here, therefore, is what degree of continuity the wage-earning population at the early stage had in relation to the social institution of the preceding days in each society. This means that, in the case of Japan, the structural relations of the wage-earning population at the early stage should be examined with the social institution of the Tokugawa shogunate in its last days or during a longer period since the medieval times.

6. THE SAMURAI CLASS UNDER THE MODERN TOKUGAWA SHOGUNATE REGIME

When we examine the concept of the wage-earning population supporting the modern way of life, the actual condition of the *samurai* (warrior) class in the Edo era is an interesting subject for analysis. Their duties (jobs), wages, views on property, etc. are quite similar in substance to those of the modern wage earners.

The population of the *samurai* class (including their family members) in the last days of the Tokugawa shogunate represented several percent of the total population. (Some feudal *daimyō* domains, such as the Hagi *han* [domain] had *samurai* representing more than 10% of their total populations, respectively.) The percentage hardly fluctuated throughout the Edo era. The employment structure in those days, therefore, was that more than 90% of the total population was composed of non-wage-earners roughly classified into agricultural, industrial and mercantile classes. Their way of life was based on their respective occupations, and, therefore, it may be called an "occupational way of life". Among these classes, only the *samurai* class, which was the ruling class in those days, realized the modern way of life based on stable wages.

I will give here an outline of the actual conditions of the *samurai* class in the Edo era, taking the case of the Owari *han* [domain] as an example [KAGA 1970, NIIMI 1965].

Each *daimyō* domain had its own conditions, but the common criteria for ranking *samurai* were the following: (1) the amount of *roku* (stipend), (2) lineage, (3) office, and (4) status. People often believe heritage was everything in the feudal system, but this was not always the case with *samurai* in the Edo era. It seems that they were ranked according to the above four criteria as occasion required. For example, *karō* (top retainers of a feudal lord) were appointed from among a fixed number of establishment families, but their official posts were individually decided, not hereditary. *Daimyō* (feudal lords) and *hatamoto* (direct feudatories of the *Shōgun*) were hereditary. *Daimyō* were feudatories that held a fief yielding more than 10 thousand *koku* of rice. The *daimyō* was ranked according to his official post. *Kachū* (retainers of a *daimyō*) were divided into the eight ranks of *karō* (top retainer), *bantō* (head clerk), *kachi gashira* (head foot-soldier), *monogashira* (head accountant), *umamawashi* (stablemen), *kachi* (foot-soldier), *ashigaru* (footman), *chūgen-komono* (flunky). This arrangement is based on the same principle as the military organization. In the Edo era, as you know, there were no wars, and, therefore, *karō*, *bantō*, *kachi gashira* and *monogashira* also designated non-military jobs. These jobs were mostly in household management, personal attendance and protection of the *daimyō*, and civil administration by *jishabugyō* (magistrate of shrines and temples), *kanjōbugyō* (magistrate of accounting), *machibugyō* (magistrate of town affairs), *daikan* (local governor), etc. *Samurai* were employed and promoted in rank in accordance with fixed standards. Their stipends were decided in accordance with the posts in their charge. In some clans with the system of hereditary stipends (*se-roku*) or household stipends (*ka-roku*), each post had an additional allowance for responsibility (*yakudaka* or *yakuryō*). In case the hereditary stipend was less than the post allowance, the difference was covered with what was called *tashidaka* (additional stipend).

Retainers of a *daimyō* were local government officials in the current terminology. *Chigyō* of stipends were payments to government officials, essentially.

7. STIPENDS TO THE SAMURAI CLASS

Stipends in the Edo era were classified into (1) *chigyō* (fief), (2) *chigyōdai* (fief stipend), (3) *kirimai* (rice stipend), (4) *fuchi* (rations) and (5) *kyūkin* (wages). There were, of course, differences in name and content, but the concept was the same among the different clans. *Chigyō* was based on a fief, while *chigyōdai* was not. There were two kinds of *chigyōdai*; one was counted in *koku* or bushel, and the other was counted in number of straw rice bags (*hyō*). *Fuchi* was rationed at the rate of 5 *gō* (1/1,000 *koku*) of rice per man per day. In some clans, the *kirimai* stipend was paid in cash instead of rice.

The Owari *han* in 1799, established a hereditary stipend system, by which it was

stipulated that the household stipend (*ka-roku*) be half the amount of the current stipend. After the start of this system, a clear line came to be drawn between household stipend and post allowance.

Due to such a background, it is not clear whether *samurai* inherited the rights of the family, the household stipend, or the post. Generally, though, *samurai* inherited the family name and half the amount of his father's stipend. His post, which was, as a rule, not higher in rank than his father's, was not hereditary.

This means that what constituted a *samurai's* private property was not clear. Ownership was made more definite in the process of various administrative reforms carried out by the Meiji Restoration Administration. That is, in the first year of Meiji, all farms were restored to the farmers. This means that *samurai* did not have established rights to land in the Tokugawa shogunate regime. At that time even the dwelling houses of *samurai* were not their private property.

In the fourth year of Meiji, the Government made compensation to the old *samurai* class for the abolition of clans and establishment of prefectures in accordance with the household stipend of all *samurai* throughout the country, based on the list of stipends of *samurai* and their subordinates submitted by the old *daimyō* domains [SONODA 1979]. That was called "*chitsuroku shobun*" (disposition of old ranks and stipends), and was, essentially, compensation for the loss of official posts rather than for the confiscation of property. The *daimyō* (feudal lord), whose castle was not even his personal property, was conceptually only the chief of the local administration (in fact, old *daimyō* served as governors of the new prefectures for the first two years of Meiji), and his stipend was reduced to one-twentieth of his old fief by the "*chitsuroku shobun*" (disposition of old ranks and stipends) [WATANABE & YAMAMOTO 1933]. This was the same with the *samurai*. In the case of the Owari *han*, stipends above 3,000 *koku* each were reduced to one-tenth that amount, and stipends below that level also were reduced accordingly. Public bond certificates were issued as compensation. That is similar with the retirement allowance of today. Details of the "*chitsuroku shobun*" will be omitted here.

What was the *samurai* class of the Tokugawa shogunate regime like, after all? When compared with the absolute monarchies of Europe, the Japanese *samurai* class corresponds to the class of government officials that developed under royal authority there. The Japanese *samurai* were military officers essentially, but functionally they were for the most part local government officials. Their controlling power was so limited that even their dwellings were not privately owned. In this sense, the issue of what *samurai* were like is closely connected with that of what the *han* from which they received their stipends was like.

8. WHAT "*HAN* [DOMAIN]" MEANS

The "*bakuhan-sei*" or shogunate regime, to which I often referred in this lecture, is a word based on a new concept. According to Tatsusaburo Hayashiya, who made an analysis of the *han* [domain] as a structural unit of the Japanese

culture, the historical concept of the shogunate regime was first used in the ninth year of Showa (1934). The word "*han*" [domain], appearing often in documents concerning the above mentioned "*chitsuroku-shobun*", was first used as a technical term in the Meiji era [HAYASHIYA 1972].

In the Edo era, the word "*han*" was usually not used. The *daimyō* was called "*jōshu*" or lord of the castle, not lord of the *han* [domain]. Disputes about succession in the *daimyō* families often occurred, and they were called "*oie-sōdō*", or dispute about the succession to the house (*oie*), not to the domain (*han*). *Samurai* were called "*kerai*" (retainer) or "*kachū*" (one within the family), not "*hanshi*" (*samurai* class of domain). Judging from these facts, there probably was not a *han* [domain] consciousness, but a family consciousness with the *daimyō* family in the center of the social system.

Another thing to be noted is home-province consciousness. It is said that people used to talk about their local traits out of pride in their home province, and character sketches of personages on the basis of their native province were published in book form named "Jinkokki". Such home-province consciousness began to take a clear form in the Genroku period (from 1688 to 1704). In this period, luxurious habits prevailed, and most *daimyō* suffered from financial difficulties from heavy burdens including "*sankin-kōtai*" (*daimyō*'s duty to go to Edo [Tokyo] for alternate-year attendance), construction work, military service, etc. for the shogunate. To cope with these situations, each *han*, without exception, began to place priority on its financial policy, including the development of local industries and the encouragement of frugal life-styles. The Kyoho Reformation by the eighth Shogun Yoshimune was aimed at the strengthening of the bureaucratic system, enactment of state laws and establishment of financial policies. In the following Tanuma period, the development of local industry was supported by commercial capital and government regulation.

Shundai Dazai wrote in his "*Keizai Roku*", an essay on economics, "In these days, one who has rice and cloth, but no gold and silver, will find it difficult to rise in the world, —Provinces, big or small, have their own products, plentiful or not. In provinces poor in products, people should be guided and supervised to cultivate whatever plants are suited to the land, in addition to cereals to make the products more plentiful. Furthermore, people should be taught manufacturing techniques and guided to manufacture useful goods during the off-season of farming. Trade with other provinces should be encouraged in order to satisfy domestic needs. These are the ways to enrich the province." This statement is obviously an expression of a "Wealth of Nations" attitude, and is a theory of economic policy based on home-province consciousness. According to Hayashiya, the clan as the concept of a state was established during this period.

Here I think that the clan as an economic structure was simultaneously established by a combination of family consciousness and state consciousness. The financial difficulties of the *han* were connected to those of the respective clansmen. Cases decreased in number after the mid-Edo era, but the extinction of the lord

family meant loss of employment for clansmen. It is natural, therefore, that clansmen felt a strong sense of unity with regard to their livelihood, to the *han* domain as their family and state. What do you think of my opinion that such an economic concept of *han* organization had an influence on the way merchant houses of modern Japan were organized managerially?

9. MODERN JAPAN AS VIEWED FROM ITS SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

As a historical fact, the relations between *han* domain and clansmen ceased to exist in the process of the Meiji Restoration. How did this happen? It is not clearly known which part of the social class of the old regime constituted the wage-earning population, including governmental officials, military men and teachers, of the early days immediately after the Restoration. It is not necessarily reasonable to think that the *samurai* class was the main constituent of the modern wage-earning population, but they surely were a support and driving force behind the modern way of life in the Meiji civilization. Their presence must have created a kind of social value.

In and after the 20s of Meiji, as modern industries developed, a structure for relations between enterprises and wage earners began to develop. This relational structure, though apparently new at first glance, had its roots in the structure of relations between the *han* domain and the clansmen in the Edo era, I think. Furthermore, the present structure of relations between enterprises and employees seems to be based on the same principle as the structure of relations between the *han* and the clansmen of the Edo era.

I think this relational structure was based on the household principle and the state principle. The concept of household underwent a great change in Meiji. Since the concept of household was employed in the family system in the Meiji civil code system, the household has become the concept representing the Japanese family system. As has been explained above, the *han* in the Edo era was based on the concept of household, which was closely akin to the principle of organization. Through the above analysis, an original model for the structure of relations between enterprises and wage earners forming the core of the economic institutions of modern Japan is found in the relations between the *han* and *samurai* of the Edo era. Judging from the fact that the *han* in the Edo era was organized on the principle of household organization, we may well think that the concept of household functions as the organizational principle for the business system, rather than for the family system.

Conversely speaking, this may be proved by the fact that the Japanese family system, which seemed to be based on the principle of household, has easily collapsed after World War Second. In other words, the tradition of the Japanese family system was not necessarily based on the principle of household.

If the principle of household is at work in the business organization of today, it must therefore explain some features of the Japanese enterprise organization. For

example, it may be a reason why the Japanese enterprise organization has features that the theory of capital alone cannot explain. In some Japanese enterprises, even a consciousness of ownership is not clear, nor are the consciousness of independence and equality clear. The corporate subsidiary system may be similar to the concept of household branches.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

KAGA, Kishiro (加賀樹芝郎)

1970 『元禄下級武士の生活』 雄山閣出版。

HATA, Nobuyuki (端信行)

1986 「〈家庭〉 = 〈社会〉 系の成立」 Nobuyuki HATA (端信行) (ed.) 『日本人の人生設計』 ドメス出版, pp. 13-28.

1987 「共同体から共遊体へ」 Yasuyuki KURITA (栗田靖之) (ed.) 『日本人の人間関係』 ドメス出版, pp. 41-55.

1989 「経済“神話”の論理」 Hirochika NAKAMAKI (中牧弘允) (ed.) 『現代日本の神話』 ドメス出版, pp. 72-89.

HAYASHIYA, Tatsusaburo (林屋辰三郎)

1972 「藩一発想と実態一」 『人文學報』 33: 1-24, 京都大学人文科学研究所。

NIMI, Yoshiharu (新見吉治)

1965 『下級武士の研究』 巖南堂書店。

SONODA, Hidehiro (園田英弘)

1979 「郡県の武士—武士身分解体に関する一考察」 Tatsusaburo HAYASHIYA (林屋辰三郎) (ed.) 『文明開化の研究』 岩波書店, pp. 35-76.

WATANABE, Ushinosuke (渡辺丑之助) and Mitsuo YAMAMOTO (山本三生)

1933 「秩禄處分顛末略」 Hyoe OUCHI (大内兵衛) and Takao TSUCHIYA (土屋喬雄) (eds.) 『明治前期財政経済史料集成』 Vol. 8, 改造社。