

[65] 史淵表紙奥付等

<https://hdl.handle.net/2324/2335098>

出版情報 : 史淵. 65, 1955-06-15. Faculty of Literature, Kyushu University
バージョン :
権利関係 :

History of the Studies in Japanese Manor

1st part—From the point of view of the approach manner—

by R. Takeuchi

It was not until the end of the 19th century that the studies of Japanese manor were done scientifically. Since that time, we can find two main currents in the manner of these studies. The one is called "The Transitional School", which traces the transition in the domination of manor or the lord of manor. The other is called "Inner Sfructural School". The latter endeavours to analyse the inner structure of manor as land system and social-economic system (namely, the bistribution of land among peasants, their land-holding, the differentiation into class and the problem that the farmer was yeoman or serf). Moreover, both of the schools advanced the studies under the influence of the inner political and international circumstances in the given times. Recently, in answere to the demand of "Down with Feudalism.", students are doing their endeavours to make clear the relation between the formation of Japanese feudal society and the manor.

Justus Møser's Political Interests

by E. Kobayashi

In "History of Political Thought in Germany from 1789 to 1815" (1939), R. Aris asserted that Justus Møser was a typical conservative and particularist, and that the idea of a politically united Germany appeared to him one of the "anaemic generalisations" which he hated. We find similar opinions in some historians today. But there are authors who think that Møser was too national to neglect the necessity of a great state of "Deutsche Nation", and so was not such a perfect particularist as appeared to Aris and others. (For exzemple: E. Hölzle, H. M. Peterssen, W. Pleister, P. Wiegler, Fr. Meinecke.) It is said that there are preserved several manuscripts written to the purpose of "Patriotische Phantasion".

Considering his position in Osnabrück and the severity of censorship in those days, we can presume that Möser could not express his true opinions on the political problems of Germany. A new light, therefore, may be projected to Möser's attitude, if such "Sämmtliche Werke" as Herder's edited by Suphan (containing different manuscripts in foot-notes) will be published. It seems to me, however, even by examining the imperfect "Sämmtliche Werke" edited by Abeken, that Möser, in spite of his famous "provincialism", recognized the abuses of particularism and suggested implicitly the necessity of political unity (not Staatenbund, but Bundesstaat) of Germany. So I cannot agree to Aris.

The Citizens and Polity in medieval Cities

by R. Imaki

I have intended in this article to trace the course of political evolution in Italian cities. In northern cities the minorities of strong mercantile class had earlier established the oligarchic organ which administered the community. But in Italian cities "Grandi" i. e., the territorial nobilities obstructed the prevalence of the mercantile class, and the struggles between the principals were complicated by the movement of lower citizens. The split in Patriciate caused ultimately the rise of signori, i. e., new executive officers who concentrated powers in the hands.

T. Roosevelt and the Monopoly

by Y. Fukumoto

It has been said that T. Roosevelt's policy was progressivism. It has been said also that he was a revolutionally politician against the monopoly capital. The chief ground of this theory is the fact that T. Roosevelt dissolved the trusts. But I deny this ground, for his dissolution of trusts did not mean the dissolution of the monopoly capital. On the contrary, it was the means of the big money trusts, especially Morgan Capital, to conquer American economic world. So I insist that T. Roosevelt was not a progressive politician, but a champion of big money trusts.