

MAX WEBER'S VIEW OF ASIAN SOCIETY

—with Special Reference to His Theory
of the Traditional Community—

HISAO ŌTSUKA

Historical and sociological studies in Asian societies occupy a fairly large part in the voluminous achievements of Max Weber. In this article his understanding of Asian societies is analysed from a definite point of view. The author focuses his attention on Max Weber's theory of traditional communities, and develops the general theory of the historio-social pre-conditions of the break-up of the traditional communities as basic components of the Asian social structure.

I

HOW did Max Weber conceive the historical characteristics of the Asian societies from the sociological point of view? In this article I propose to follow up this question as far as I am able. As is well known, however, his studies in this question are extremely voluminous and many-sided, and it is natural that some limitation should be imposed on the field treated in a short paper. Therefore, this present article is centred on *his theory of the traditional community* in particular. Reasons for it may be stated as follows.

The so-called North-South problem, which has come to have an extremely important significance on a world scale, would seem to manifest itself in a multiplex of problems, even in its social and economic aspects only. Firstly, as an international problem, it is, as is well known, much before our eyes in the form of relations between North and South over trade and investment. Secondly, in this matter, domestic questions in the underdeveloped countries of the South come into view in direct connexion with these international problems.¹ What is at issue is the building of economies which will serve as

* In this article in reference to Max Weber's writings the following abbreviations are used :
GAzRS=*Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, 3 Bde, Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1920.
GAzSW=*Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1924.

WG=*Wirtschaftsgeschichte. Abriss der universalen Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, München and Leipzig, Duncker und Humblot, 1923.

WuG=*Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 4 Aufl., herausgegeben von Johannes Winkelmann, 2 Halbbände, Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1956.

¹ In addition to this, domestic questions in the advanced countries also come into view in direct connexion with these, and they also possess a decisively important significance, but they are not taken up for discussion here.

the material bases for national independence or national unity and this is also connected with the so-called industrialization or modernization of these countries.² Now, enquiring into these questions we are obliged, because of the necessary character of this industrialization or modernization, to go further and to consider the traditional social systems and institutions which have made up the frameworks of the societies of these countries. By this we mean that without effective removal or dismemberment of these traditional social systems or institutions, economic construction of a kind which will accelerate modernization or serve as the basis for industrialization in the underdeveloped countries will either prove to be impossible or at the least will be halted at a certain level. Further, we may say that what comes up as the focus of these problems is the demand for land reform in the underdeveloped countries, and studies of the land systems of these countries.

These circumstances are the immediate reason for focusing my attention on an elucidation of Weber's theory of the traditional community, but I feel that there is need to add a little more by way of explanation.

First, the land question in the underdeveloped countries does not appear in the simple form as is found in advanced countries where landownership has already been thoroughly modernized. That is to say, in the underdeveloped countries landownership is not separable from other social relations and more or less as such, as it is in the advanced countries, and it would seem permissible for us to say that it appears deeply intertwined with traditional social institutions and is scarcely to be separated from them. The traditional community, which is the subject of this paper, constitutes the basic social institution in pre-modern society, as Weber pointed out,³ embodying by nature the two essential components of land occupancy (or landownership) and societal functions. Thus land reform in the underdeveloped countries must, as a matter of course, consider the question of these communities, nor will land reform be effective unless it does so. I think that we shall be able to understand this fact if we consider how the land reforms carried out in Japan after the Second World War have succeeded only when they have brought about not merely the abolition of the landlord system but also the break-up of the old village system itself, centred on the break-up of the so-called "*Kazoku-seido*" ("family system").⁴

The second point concerns Weber's own terminology. In Weber we find

² Regarding the use of these two terms in the present article, see Hisao Ōtsuka, "Modernization Reconsidered—with Special Reference to Industrialization—," *The Developing Economies*, Vol. III, No. 4 (Dec., 1965), reprinted in Seiichi Tōbata ed., *The Modernization of Japan 1*, Tokyo, Institute of Asian Economic Affairs, 1966.

³ Weber, *WuG*, SS. 215-218; *WG*, SS. 55 ff., 60 ff. Similar facts had already been clearly pointed out by Marx from a different theoretical standpoint. For example, see Karl Marx, *Formen, die der kapitalistischen Produktion vorhergehen*, Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1952 (hereafter abbreviated as *Formen*).

⁴ If one were to express the semantic content of this term in its scholarly sense, in European language, I think that Max Weber's "*die patrimoniale Herrschaft*" or "*der Patrimonialismus*" would be one of the most suitable expressions. See in particular Weber, *WuG*, SS. 588-592.

at least the two terms "*Gemeinschaft*" and "*Gemeinde*" as corresponding to "the traditional community" of the present article. Furthermore, it would seem that considerable importance is attached to the meaningful difference in semantic content between these two terms. Now since with the latter of these two the present article is particularly concerned, I propose to add, *in my own fashion*, some preparatory explanation regarding Weber's use of the term "*Gemeinde*."⁵ (1) Firstly, in Weber the term "*Gemeinde*" includes the two mutually connected categories of the religious *Gemeinde* and the secular *Gemeinde*, and it seems that the mutual relation and tension between these two is endowed with important significance in historical dynamics,⁶ but on this point we shall put forward no more than the merest of suggestions. The present article is particularly concerned with the secular *Gemeinde*. (2) According to Weber, this secular *Gemeinde* is a body which is produced in the developing process of societalization (*Vergesellschaftung*) within the primitive neighbourhood community (*Nachbarschaftsgemeinschaft*) and in connexion with political control by taking all forms of activity into the communal activity of the member (*Gemeinschaftshandeln*), and it may perhaps be said that which, before anything else, constitutes its material basis, is the occupancy of economic interests of various kinds, and in especial the *occupancy of land*.⁷ Consequently, the historical forms of this secular *Gemeinde* exhibit different forms according to the type of *Gemeinschaft* as the primary body of occupancy of economic interests, particularly occupancy of land, namely either the tribe, or the city, or the village. We shall give some explanation regarding this point later, in so far as it is required. At any rate I should like the reader to bear in mind that the "community" in this article refers, strictly, to this secular *Gemeinde*, and particularly to the *Gemeinde* which has come into being on the basis of the occupancy of land.

II

In the first half of his famous paper "Hinduismus und Buddhismus" Max Weber carries out a close sociological analysis of the Hindu social

⁵ I use the original word *Gemeinde* in this case because I cannot judge accurately which English expression corresponds to it. Marx also uses the two words *Gemeinschaft* and *Gemeinde*, and, moreover in senses which at certain points are very close to those employed by Weber, and in his case these terms are taken to correspond to *communauté* and *commune* in French. Marx, *Formen*, and Briefe an Vera Zasulich, Konzept I u. III, in *Marx-Engels Archiv*, herausgegeben von Ljanzanov, Bd. I, Frankfurt A. M., Marx-Engels Archiv Verlagsgesellschaft M. B. H., 1926.

⁶ For example, see Weber, *WuG*, SS. 293 ff., 350 ff.; *GAzRS*, I, SS. 542 ff.

⁷ Weber, *WG*, SS. 215-218, 275 ff. We may observe, however, that Weber's use of the term secular *Gemeinde* is fairly fluid according to the object, and in particular not only is it not often used with reference to the village, but on occasion it also seems to be obscure in meaning. There are also parts which I cannot succeed in understanding completely. Consequently I would ask the reader to accept my interpretation for the meantime as a provisional one.

system,⁸ and in it he gives an excellent account of the historical characteristics peculiar to the Indian village system,⁹ relying principally on Baden-Powell.¹⁰ We may regard the description of this part as providing a good point of departure for our aims.

Weber gives a number of facts established by Baden-Powell's account as being the most notable characteristics of the Indian village system, interspersing them with inferences from other regions in Asia.¹¹ But rearranging them after my own fashion we will get the following.

(1) First, while the land system of the Indian village exhibits some similarity to the land system found in the mediaeval European village, it possesses basic points of difference from it. More than anything else, we do not find here that characteristic virgate system (*Hufenverfassung*) based on the scattered strip system (*Gemengelage*) which characterizes the mediaeval European village system, and the distribution of land among the villagers is carried out in accordance with entirely different principles. But it appears that a little supplementary explanation is necessary here.

At this point let us attempt, very briefly, to recall the typical form and aspect of the "virgate system" in the mediaeval European village.¹² The peasant families permanently settled in the form of the village occupy, first of all, their several house plots and the small piece of land, or crofts (*Wurt*), attached thereto. Around the periphery of the village extend the so-called "common fields," divided into 30 or 60 of the so-called furlongs (*Gewann*), and the cultivated land privately occupied by each of the peasant families is, typically, dispersed among the furlongs in rectangular strips of more or less one acre (*Morgen*), and the utilization of this land is placed under the control of the village as a collectivity. It is the scattered strip system. The standard total area of land occupied by a peasant family is 30 acres, and in some cases it is half of this, or 15 acres, and again, with the passage of time, the numbers of those with small areas of cultivated land less than this go on increasing. Around the periphery of the common fields there extends the so-called common (*Allmende*), and each of the peasant families possesses a stint (*Allmendrecht*) in proportion to the area of its cultivated land—for example, that of a family with 30 acres is twice that of one with 15 acres—which confers rights, for example, to pasture a certain number of domestic animals, to cut a certain quantity of wood, etc. Further, these three rights in respect to land enjoyed by the standard peasant family, that is to say, the sum of the croft attached to the house, the 30 acres of cultivated land, and the stint proportionate thereto, were called the "virgate" (*"Hufe"*).

⁸ Weber, *GAZRS*, II (Hinduismus und Buddhismus), 1923.

⁹ Particularly Weber, *GAZRS*, II, SS. 78-84.

¹⁰ Particularly B. H. Baden-Powell, *The Land Systems of British India*, 3 vols. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1892.

¹¹ Weber, *GAZRS*, II, SS. 79 ff.

¹² Weber, *WG*, SS. 19-26. For the rest, if required, see E. Lipson, *Economic History of England*, I, Revised edition, London, Adams & Charles Black, 1937, pp. 32-87, etc.

As regards the above, the points which have an important meaning for us at present are the following. In the case of the village system of mediaeval Europe, (a) by means of the unit of occupancy, the "virgate," which possessed a certain fixed content, the extent of the rights in respect to land possessed by the peasant families was expressed quantitatively, as, for example, 1/2 virgate, 1 virgate, 2 virgates (b) Furthermore, the principle of formal equality which Weber calls *formale Gleichheit*,¹³ ruled the distribution of land within the village, where each peasant family owned 1 virgate as a standard at least, regardless of productive abilities or economic necessities.

In the Indian village, too, private occupancy of small pieces of land corresponding to the above-mentioned croft is found everywhere,¹⁴ but the distribution of the land other than this differs essentially from the mediaeval European village system. The inherited cultivated land of each family¹⁵ was frequently dispersed in pieces of land of differing qualities, and a kind of rotational system of cultivation is sometimes found, but over the whole the land merely forms blocks which cannot be compared quantitatively among each other in point of size. By this we mean that not only is the correspondence between the number of ploughs owned and the area of cultivated land at any particular time important for the individual peasant family, but, since, in the present circumstances, there is surplus land to spare, there is no need at all to calculate the area of the land.¹⁶ What is more, the redistribution of cultivated land is carried out for equalizing the standards of living of the several peasant families.

Thus, in the Indian village, not only is there no furlong as found in mediaeval Europe, but it was impossible for any clear and precise essential distinction to arise between the common fields and the common, and consequently even when a common existed the mediaeval European stint was found, at least in the past, only exceptionally. Indeed Weber says that no institutions or ideas corresponding to the "virgate" existed at all. It goes without saying that in this case, too, the distribution of land is controlled in accordance with a principle of equality of a certain kind. However, this principle is not that of formal equality as found in the mediaeval European village but is one of an entirely different kind, one which Weber calls the principle of material equality (*materiale Gleichheit*), and under it land is assigned

¹³ See Weber, "Der Streit um den Charakter der altgermanischen Sozialverfassung usw.," in *GAzSW*, SS. 546-556. I should like to add here a word regarding a criticism which is apt to occur—if the principle of equality ruled, should we not then suppose that inequality would not arise? According to Weber, formal equality is not the same principle as material equality, but rather these two frequently contradict one another. Consequently, he says, as a result of the carrying through of the principle of formal equality, it rather happens that a specific corresponding material inequality arises.

¹⁴ Weber, *GAzRS*, II, SS. 93 ff.; *WG*, S. 37.

¹⁵ I here omit from consideration differences in the form of the family from that of the peasant family of mediaeval Europe.

¹⁶ In contrast to this, irrigation water was relatively scarce, and its distribution was controlled.

to the peasant families in response to their productive abilities (that is to say, the number of their ploughs) and the necessities of their livelihood.

For the rest we may add that, as is well known, there are within the Indian village, along with the peasant families, permanently settled craftsmen and other people who have been given crofts or small pieces of land, and we wish to make mention of these again later when we deal with Weber's "*Demiurgie*."

(2) Next, what form and features are exhibited by the sovereign body in land occupancy of the Indian village? The following will probably already be clear. In both the mediaeval European village and the Indian village the manner of land occupancy includes communal and private occupancy, which exist alongside each other and are intertwined together. Rather than this it might be better to say that private occupancy is developed within the outer framework of communal occupancy. On this point the circumstances are more or less similar in the two cases. However, it would seem difficult to deny that in the Indian village, in comparison with the mediaeval European village, apart from the establishment of the croft, the institutions of the furlong and the stint as in mediaeval Europe are not found, that is to say, the degree of development of private occupancy is markedly inferior, and conversely communal occupancy still remains overwhelmingly predominant. Now it is natural that the sovereign body in communal land occupancy in these cases must of necessity be a social body of some sort, but in comparison of the Indian village with the mediaeval European village how does this social body differ, and what manner of historical characteristics does it exhibit?

Regarding this point Weber summarizes as follows. "The tribe (or its component parts the phratries) have been regarded as the possessors of the area occupied, and have undertaken its defence." Further, "reclamation and conquest" by such tribes "were the original title to the possession of land." That is to say, while in the mediaeval European village the meaning possessed by old tribal ties of kinship had, for a variety of historical reasons, been reduced to a minimum, so that we may say of it that a neighbourhood community which had attained to its marginal level (*Grenzfall*), or, to express it differently, the village community (*Dorfgemeinschaft*) itself, had become the sovereign body in communal occupancy, in the Indian village the tribal community (*Stammgemeinschaft*),¹⁷ which may well be called the oldest in historical terms, or the phratries which were component communities within it, remain the sovereign body in communal occupancy. Recalling once again Weber's terminology as we explained it at the beginning of this article, and

¹⁷ This term is fairly unstable in its denotation, and the words "the sib (*Sippe*)—a component community of the tribe (*Stamm*)" are frequently used. For example in the village community of old China this is particularly so. Weber, *GAZRS*, I, SS. 349 ff.; II, S. 56, Anmerk. 1. For the rest, *WG*, SS. 40 ff. At various points, however, the actual boundaries between the sib and the tribe are extremely fluid, and which of the two is better would seem to be a question which cannot easily be determined.

attempting to express this in accordance with it, the result would be as follows. In India a certain area of land is communally occupied as a result of the permanent settlement of a tribe, and the first beginnings of private occupancy of land arise and grow up within the outer framework provided by this communal occupancy, leading to the establishment of a community (*Gemeinde*), and consequently the sizes of the village communities and tribal communities as the sovereign occupant of this land do not necessarily coincide. In contrast to this, in the mediaeval Europe the kinship system as the essential character of the tribal community had been minimized and the village community (*Dorfgemeinschaft*) which we may describe as its marginal case had become the sovereign occupant of the communal land already in the earliest stage,¹⁸ and by the development of private occupancy of land within this outer framework—development to an extreme degree from the point of view of the community—there came into being the village community with an extremely distinctive land system from the historical viewpoint of the world. This is the situation.

However, I want to add a word here that in both the above cases Weber uses the term 'village community' (*Dorfgemeinde*).¹⁹ This is consistent throughout Weber's sociological theory, and is significant, but in a case such as the present, in attempting to show forth clearly and precisely the special nature of the social structures built up on the traditional communities of Asia, particularly in a comparative study of them with those of mediaeval Europe, his terminology becomes somewhat inconvenient. For this reason, in the following argument we denote by the names "Asian community"²⁰ or "kinship community" those village communities in which the tribal (-sib) community appears as the sovereign occupant found in India distinguishing from the mediaeval European village community and recognized by Weber as persisting strongly in old China and in other regions in Asia.²¹ I should

¹⁸ Weber, *GAzRS*, I, S. 375. *Lex Salica*, Chaps. 45, 60. For the rest, see, for example, R. Köttschke, *Allgemeine Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Mittelalters*, Jena, Gustav Fischer, 1924, SS. 209 ff., 213 ff., etc.

¹⁹ Regarding India, for example, Weber, *GAzRS*, II, S. 80. For the rest, *WuG*, S. 294.

²⁰ He who uses this term in more or less the same sense is Karl Marx. For example, see *Formen*. Now the reasons why we may suppose there to be no objection to our using this term in introducing the theories of Weber are as follows. In Weber, as in Marx, it is precisely from the break-up of the tribe (-sib) community—or from that which caused the break-up of the tribal or sib community—that the history peculiar to western Europe, dating back to classical antiquity, begins, and consequently while in Occidental history these communities are found only as bare survivals among the Slavs and Celts, in Asia (and the Orient) not only did social structure in which the tribal (-sib) community possessed basically important significance possess a long period in antiquity during which they were universal, but the fact that *deeply-rooted* survivals of them are still to be found up to the present day is regarded as of extreme importance. This, in a certain sense, may be said to be the leitmotive of Weber's famous paper "Stadt" (*WuG*, Zweiter Teil, Kapitel IX, 8. Abschnitt).

²¹ Weber, *GAzRS*, I, SS. 349 ff.; *WuG*, S. 753.

like the reader to bear this point in mind below.

(3) The fundamental difference in the natures of the "community" in the two cases which we have considered above has, in the natural course of events, no alternative but to render the social structures built up on them of a very alien nature one from another. On this point Weber summarizes as follows. "Under the Indian agrarian system institutions corresponding to the manorial system (*Grundherrschaft*) or feudalism of the mediaeval Europe are scarcely to be found, and sib or tribal relations among conquerors on the one hand, and the bestowal of the right of tax collection as a feudal stipend on the other, have had decisively important significance." That is to say, in mediaeval Europe there arose the peculiarly characteristic manorial system,²² feudalism, and the division of society into "estates," but in India these proved scarcely capable of developing at all, and the principle of clan charisma (*Gentilcharisma*)²³ inherent in the kinship systems of the tribes continued to have a decisive significance for establishing the power structure in society. "The clan charismatic chiefs of [the tribe and] the phratries distributed the conquered land, giving overlord rights to members of their own sibs, and agricultural land to the simple members of [the tribe and] phratries. The body of phratries distributed here and there over the conquered region ruled by the tribe and the gens of overlords constituted the ruling class."²⁴ The ruling tribe which took this form levied taxes from the "kinship communities" under its rule, and consequently, through their community organizations, from individual peasant families. It is of course true that therefrom manorial system in the broad sense (that is to say, landlord-tenant relations in general) and relations of rent-collection proved capable of branching out,²⁵ but Weber emphasizes that on a scale covering the whole of society it was always the state, that is to say, the relations of tax collection by the ruling tribe, which holds basic significance.²⁶

The general schema of the above matters in terms of Weber's sociological theory could be summarized as follows.

In the establishing process of the "kinship community," first the so-called patrimonial domination grows from the pure patriarchalism inherent in tribal-

²² On the subject of the place in world history of what Weber calls *die okzidentale Grundherrschaft*, see *WG*, SS. 70-78.

²³ On clan charisma see Weber, *WuG*, SS. 679 ff.

²⁴ Weber, *GAzRS*, II, SS. 55 ff.

²⁵ Weber, *GAzRS*, II, SS. 78 ff.

²⁶ *Ebenda*. However, if we call these "taxes", as Weber does, there may be some room for misunderstanding. This is because they were not derivatives from rent or profits as in Europe, but were rather, conversely, the basic form of expropriation. Marx points out the fact that taxes and rent coincide as being one of the important characteristics of the Asiatic mode of production, and his occasional use of the term 'tribute' (*Tribut*) may perhaps be due to this. Marx, *Das Kapital*, Volksausgabe, Moskau, Marx-Engels-Lenin-Institut, 1932, III, SS. 357, 841. We may also note in passing that to a certain degree a similar situation can be found in the situation of the agricultural village during the Tokugawa period in Japan.

ism.²⁷ As need hardly be said, this is accompanied by the growth of qualitative and quantitative inequality in the distribution of land. When this patrimonial domination has spread out to cover the whole tribe the gens of overlords, standing on the principle of clan charisma, begins to manifest itself within it, and further to this, the *oikos* and *coloni* also arise in correspondence with it.

Now through this development a tribe which has become overwhelmingly strong in comparison with the others conquers these other tribes and enlarges a "network of extra-patrimonial political domination," and the pure patrimonial state (*der echte Patrimonialstaat*) comes into being. Within this patrimonial state, in which the patrimonial form of domination assimilates to itself, and transforms, the extra-patrimonial form of domination and the "kinship communities" upon which it is based in specific ways appropriate to each, a variety of forms of the state have been produced in the course of history.²⁸ All the ancient despotic states of the Orient and Asia may be said to be of this kind, but among them Weber particularly cites ancient Egypt and ancient China as two contrasting types.²⁹ In brief, the former is thoroughgoing *corvée* labour state (*Leiturgiestaat*) under the overwhelming supremacy of the *oikos* of the Pharaoh, and the latter a unique bureaucratic state possessing a stratum of mandarin officials dependent on non-official income (*Sportel*), and in comparison with this the Indian state may be described as a status (caste system) taxation state, and on some points it would seem to be an intermediate type between Egypt and China.

III

In the preceding section we attempted to seek for a clue to understanding of Weber's view of Asian society, using his account of the Indian village. According to Weber, in the broad sense the social structures of old China, India, and many other regions in Asia, as traditional societies built on the basis of the "community," possess an aspect certainly in common with mediaeval Europe. But, trying out a penetrating examination we find that the traditional communities as the foundations of Asian societies, at least in certain decisive points of them, are of a nature markedly different from those of mediaeval Europe. Hereupon we have given them the temporary designation of "the Asian community" or "the kinship community." Now again these social structures in the societies of Asia, built on them, cannot but be, in the nature of the case, structures based upon markedly different principles of the feudal society³⁰ in mediaeval Europe. Weber also concisely designates

²⁷ Weber, *WuG*, SS. 588-592.

²⁸ Weber, *WuG*, SS. 592-611.

²⁹ For a splendidly concise account of the characteristics of these two forms of the state, see Weber, *WuG*, SS. 615-619.

³⁰ As in the case of the term *Kapitalismus*, Weber skilfully uses the term *Feudalismus* in a broad and a narrow sense. Weber, *WuG*, SS. 148-155, 633-649, 658-661. According

this kind of social structure as a hierarchy of personal domination (*Klientel-hierarchie*), and in one place he skilfully expresses its nature in the words “*Nulle homme sans maître*,” modelled on the proverbial expression of mediaeval Europe, “*Nulle terre sans seigneur*.”³¹

Now in the course of history, as is well known, social structures built up on this principle first flowered in profusion in the despotic states of the ancient Orient and Asia, and in a manner unparalleled in any other age. The history of the Occidental world, which began from the culture of the cities of classical antiquity round the shores of the Mediterranean, while on the one hand richly continuing this cultural inheritance from the Orient on the other hand cleared away the social principle inherent in it, and went on to build up the “traditional community” and the social structure on the basis of a new principle.³² In contrast to this, in the Orient and Asia, the areas which aforesaid had produced the gigantic despotic states, while of course these areas contained moves in the direction of breaking free from the old pure patriarchal principle, it was extremely difficult, if not impossible, for them to negate completely the old social structure, hindered as they were by all manner of historical, geographical, and other circumstances inherent in them or deriving from international relations.³³ Consequently, in spite of various historical changes which implied a break with the old principle—for example, the case of Japan, where, as the wave-summit of this process, feudalism in the mediaeval European sense had arisen spontaneously and where consequently even the conditions for the easy acceptance of capitalist culture were provided³⁴—in the various regions of the Orient and Asia the old pure

to Weber, the instances which are in the category of *Feudalism* in the narrow and strict sense (that is, *ständischer Patrimonialismus*) are those of mediaeval Europe and of Japan, but in a broad and loose sense *Feudalism* can be found in Asian society also. In the present article the word is always used in the narrow sense.

³¹ Weber, *WuG*, S. 415; *GAzSW*, S. 66.

³² As we have mentioned above, the parting of the ways between the history of the East and that of the West, as considered in this sense, is the leitmotive in Weber's famous paper, “Stadt” (*WuG*, Zweiter Teil, Kapitel IX, 8. Abschnitt). To this we may add, regarding a matter which we also mentioned above, that this does not get rid of the fact in Europe survivals of the Asiatic principle could be found among the Slavs and Celts until later times.

³³ In particular I should like the reader to consider Weber's so-called theory of the frontier revolution. See Weber, *GAzSW*, SS. 99-101, 106-109; *GAzRS*, III, SS. 219 ff.

³⁴ This was how Weber thought of Japan. In addition to the passages cited above, see in particular *GAzRS*, II, SS. 295-300. Now we have reason to believe that it would be a fairly difficult task to show empirically in terms of Weber's theory that the social structure of Japan in the Tokugawa period, and particularly the village community, is “feudal” in the same sense as mediaeval Europe. This is because we have to find the principle of “formal equality” in a social structure which is deeply coloured by survivals of an “Asian” character (as can easily be seen, for example, from the excellent account in Thomas C. Smith, *The Agrarian Origins of Modern Japan*, Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, 1959, particularly Part I). However, as an excellent attempt to find

patrimonial social structure survived deep-rootedly in greater or lesser degree, and, under these conditions, underwent a variety of specific developments. Because of these circumstances the social structures of the Orient and Asia, in contrast to the West, that is, of Europe and the United States of America, have continued in greater or lesser degree to be burdened by the historical legacy of the "kinship community" and the social relations based upon it right down to the present day, and whatever else may be said the fact that such social structures are particularly designated by such names "the Asian community" or "Asian Society" is one for which I think we may say there is ample reason.

Indeed, the kinship community in the author's sense characterizes the societies of Asia, but at the same time, as frequently noted, it is also the oldest form of the traditional community from the historical point of view. Weber clearly thinks so.³⁵ He says that all the peoples in history set out from the primitive kinship community and in one form or another come to break away from it. Weber denied, of course, any stage theory of development such as Marx conceived the social history as to arise in succession out of natural necessity and to have the character of "laws," but this does not mean that Weber does not think in terms of stages in some sense or other. Furthermore, when we examine the content of the stages in terms of which Weber thinks, we find that *on certain points* they may be said to be almost similar to those of Marx.

For example, in practice he gives ample consideration to the historical stages of development which begin from the society of the ancient Orient based on the hierarchy of personal domination, lead on to the appearance of the slave-owning society of classical antiquity on the shores of the Mediterranean which took over the cultural inheritance of the Orient and at the same time broke away from the social principle inherent in it, and from this, after passing through a feudal society based on serfdom, a system embodying a different principle, finally arrive at modern society based on capitalist culture. If we would exposit his view of historical stages of development with reference to the forms of the traditional communities which provide the foundations for these several social structures, the result would probably be as follows. In the new community which appears round the shores of the Mediterranean and transcends the Asian kinship community in the way we have described above, the sovereign occupant of communal land is a "city community"³⁶ which is a markedly relaxed, or atonic, form of the

evidence on this point with regard to "the distribution of water" for use in agriculture (which must be regarded as a part of the land) I feel that we must certainly mention here the studies by Prof. Kazuhiko Sumiya and Prof. Hiromichi Yoden. K. Sumiya, *Kyōdōtai no Shiteki Kōzō-ron* (Historical Structure of the Community), Tokyo, Yūhikaku, 1953, Chap. V; H. Yoden, "Suirikumiai to Burakukai (Hydraulic Co-operative and Village Association)" *Jinbun Ronkyū* (Kwansei-gakuin University), Vol. VII, No. 2, (1958).

³⁵ Weber, *WG*, SS. 54 ff.; *WuG*, SS. 212-222.

³⁶ See foot-note 39 below.

kinship system and may be described as "a warriors' guild,"³⁷ but although the principle governing the distribution of land within it is still that of material equality, the *familial piety* characteristic of the kinship system has now lapsed from this social structure.³⁸ In this way the characteristic culture of the city grows up, and *latifundia* and the cruel slave system make their appearance. Transcending this "city community" of classical antiquity, in mediaeval Europe the village community was formed in accordance with the principle of formal equality, and on the base thus provided the manorial system, that is to say, what Weber calls the Occidental manorial system and its characteristic feudal system comes into being, but at the same time in this society of mediaeval Europe a characteristic town community³⁹ (the so-called "mediaeval town") also makes its appearance alongside, or rather in antithesis to, the village community, and it is equipped with guilds of merchants and craftsmen which were not found in the cities of antiquity. Next after this, the traditional community and, consequently, the traditional land system intertwined with it, lapse completely, and from this modern European capitalist society is at last born. We may say that this is the outline of what Weber thinks.

Thus as regards the development of Occidental history from the ancient Orient to modern Europe the content of Weber's views is notably close to that of Marx. But this is not all, for I think that in regard to the historical development of Asia, too, Weber continues,⁴⁰ on some points, this schema, or way of thinking in terms of stages, will be clear to us if we recall only the single fact which we mentioned above—that he thinks that in Japan feudalism in the Occidental sense was formed spontaneously, and that consequently the conditions for an easy acceptance of capitalist culture were provided. However, in the case of Weber, as opposed to that of Marx, this schema of

³⁷ Weber, *WuG*, S. 817. Just as Weber calls this a *Kriegerzunft*, so Marx calls the city of antiquity *die kriegerisch organisierte Gemeinde*. Marx, *Formen*, S. 9.

³⁸ Weber, *WuG*, S. 590.

³⁹ Since this community is a city (or town) community the objects of its occupancy include more commercial and industrial interests in addition to land than in the case of the village community. In particular, in the case of the mediaeval town, which may be called a community of persons engaged in commerce and industry, although land occupancy always retained its basic significance in greater or lesser degree commercial and industrial interests come to prevail with the passage of time, even in the content of communal occupancy itself. In contrast, in the case of the city of antiquity land occupancy was overwhelmingly predominant throughout, and consequently no village community separate from the city was caused to come into being. Further, and on some points directly conversely to this, in the societies of the ancient Orient no city community (*Stadtgemeinde*) having the character of an independent body was formed, in spite of the fact that cities in the broad sense of the term were found in these societies, and these cities were rather composed of people belonging to a number of kinship communities. Weber stresses that this became a tradition in the Asian region, and that even in Japan the growth of town communities was very slight. *WuG*, SS. 745 ff.

⁴⁰ For a particularly interesting passage on this point, see Weber, *GAzRS*, II, SS. 363-378.

development based on the facts of Occidental history is entirely "relativized" by the pluralistic mode of thinking which is characteristic of him, and particularly by his emphasis on the significance possessed by religion in the dynamics of history. His methodological originality is shown with extreme clarity in his treatment of the historical development of the various regions of Asia possessing long traditions of magical religions of a variety of kind along with the world religions such as Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Taoism, in which the religious situation is entirely different from the case of Occidental history, with its unbroken tradition from Judaism to Christianity. Thus he maintains that under the influence exerted by a variety of historical and geographical conditions, especially those of the religions involved, the stage development in social history of the kind comes to exhibit complicated development in directions which differ markedly from that of Occidental history, as seen, for example, in India and China, either stagnating or causing extremely ancient circumstances to survive in greater or lesser degree.⁴¹

Now the reasons for which we have taken the trouble to determine the existence of a certain kind of thinking in terms of stages in Weber are none other than the following.

First, even if we accept that the kinship community is found only exceptionally throughout the course of history as far as the social and cultural base of the Occident is concerned, in the other regions of the world, in particular in the so-called underdeveloped countries, the situation is entirely different. Among these regions there are some, as, for example, among the African countries, where tribalism is still powerfully maintained up to the present, and where, consequently, we may suppose that the kinship community bears an important significance at the present time, and again it is not difficult to imagine that among them, in the regions which are attempting to break away finally from the bonds of feudalism, as, for example, in the countries of Central and South America and in Turkey (and also in Japan prior to the Second World War), the question of traditional communities which have broken away from the principle embodied in the kinship community in varying degrees will stand out with an important present-day significance. But it is not only the case that, as we have already noted, the historical burden of the kinship community continues to weigh upon these societies, particularly in the various regions of Asia. Setting aside certain

⁴¹ According to Weber, the stage development of social history which can be set out in such schema as we have mentioned corresponds to the advance of stages of formal rationality in the Occidental history, and in particular as regards the community it represents the stage development of the principle of formalization through the separation of "person" from "landed property." But in the various regions of Asia, for example, in India and China, it happens that a different advance of rationalization peculiar to these regions is found, eventually based on the principle of substantiality. For example, see Weber, *GAzRS*, I, SS. 252 ff, 265 ff.; *WuG*, Anhang (Die Rationale und soziologischen Grundlagen der Musik).

survivals of primitive tribalism, in the course of history a variety of traditional communities has been produced which in varying degrees have broken away from the principle embodied in the original kinship. For example, a) the Indian village community, which, while including a variety of differences in form, was caused to function as the unit in tax-collection by the state,⁴² b) the village community of China before the revolution, which, while undergoing a variety of historical changes continued to maintain its strong tradition of autonomous government by the sib,⁴³ and c) the Japanese village community of the period before the Second World War, which, while remaining deeply coloured by survivals of the kinship system (the so-called familism!), attained to something near, *in point of social principle*, to the village community in the mediaeval European sense, all exhibited development peculiar to themselves. Weber thinks that the societies of the Asian region, while including this diversity, exhibit, as a whole, characteristics peculiar to themselves which are markedly different from the Occident. I think that we might well say this as representing the way he thinks.

Second, in this sense, society in the underdeveloped countries is not levelled in a certain stage of development but various stages are set out shoulder by shoulder as a whole. History is still alive and is mapped ecologically, in other words, several historical stages of the traditional community and of social relations built upon them survive at present spatially in such a society. In this situation, is it possible for us to discern *history* in the *present state* of these countries, and to adjust our view of them from the standpoint of the stage theory of development? If we consider the matter in this way there will naturally canalize mutual contacts between studies of the underdeveloped countries and studies of economic history (or history in general). By this we mean the following. When land reform is planned as a part of the economic development of the underdeveloped countries it is necessary, as we noted at the beginning of this article, to grapple with the question of the break-up of the traditional communities which are inseparably intertwined with the traditional land systems. Now although the oldest form of the community in historical terms, the kinship community, has been progressively losing its original form in the various regions of Asia, it is still not yet entirely broken up, or again, as we have already noted, it weighs on these societies as a historical burden in the guise of deeply-rooted survivals in a variety of forms. Why is it then that in these various regions of Asia, in spite of differences of degree, the break-up of the kinship community, and further to that, of the traditional communities in general, has still not proceeded smoothly as in the course of Occidental history, with the result that these social structures have persisted to the present day? Again, what should we do in order to lead these communities effectively to their dissolution? In order to answer these questions *at least part of our attention* will naturally be directed to the history of events now past. That is to say, within the sphere of our knowl-

⁴² Weber, *GAzRS*, II, SS. 78 ff.

⁴³ Weber, *GAzRS*, I, SS. 349-395.

edge at present, under what circumstances in the course of world history does the kinship community, and further to that, the traditional communities in general, proceed smoothly to dissolution, and in what circumstances do they fall into stagnation? By following up these points we should be able to present not only some measure of concrete description of break-up and stagnation in the community throughout the course of history, but further to this—and it is necessary for the present purpose—we should be able to present at least part of the material indispensable for setting out the conditions for break-up and stagnation in the community (and consequently in the kinship community) with as much theoretical precision as possible.⁴⁴ Bearing this problem in mind, I wish in the next section to continue to introduce more of Weber's theory of the community.

IV

How then does Max Weber theorize matters regarding the historical conditions governing break-up and stagnation in the community, particularly the kinship community? Even in his early years we can discover a deep interest in this question.⁴⁵ But his theoretical framework was established only in his later years, and particularly in his last lectures, *General Economic History*.⁴⁶ Therefore, in the following we shall follow up his theory of this question, mainly using passages from his *General Economic History* as clues. Even so, however, attention should be drawn to the following points. He theorizes the historical process on the basis of a kind of stage concept on the one hand, but on the other he relativizes the theory from a pluralistic viewpoint, particularly taking into consideration the decisive influence of religions in history. In introducing his theory, from the viewpoint of economic history, I should like the reader to bear fully in mind this basic theoretical position of his.

Before all else Weber discusses the influences exerted in economic history by "intra-community" and "inter-community" division of labour as directly opposing to one another.⁴⁷ It is of course true that the relation between

⁴⁴ In this way historical studies are seen to be an indispensable part of studies of the present state of society. May we not say that it is precisely in this point that we can find at least part of the reason for the fact that hitherto Japanese social scientists have had a marked attachment to historical studies, and, further, have at the same time shown a strong orientation towards theorization in historical studies?

⁴⁵ In particular we refer to Weber, "Agrarverhältnisse im Altertum," in *GAzSW*. In particular I should like to draw attention to the appearance of the concept of "die lokale Marktbildung." For example, *GAzSW*, S. 256; *WG*, S. 127.

⁴⁶ As is well known, this work is Max Weber, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte. Abriss der universalen Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, compiled after the author's death by Hellman and Palyi. In connexion with this point we may add that we think it extremely unfortunate that Weber left unfinished the manuscript of the chapter entitled "Die Marktgemeinschaft," in *WuG*, Zweiter Teil, Kapitel VI.

⁴⁷ It seems to me that Marx takes more or less the same view on this point. For example, see *Das Kapital*, I, S. 369; III, SS. 357-361. But since this is directly opposite to the overwhelmingly common interpretation I shall do no more in the present in-

these two is, to use Weber's accustomed expression, 'fluid' (*flüssig*), and at all times it can move mutually from one to the other. For example, throughout history we easily find cases of intra-community division of labour being broken up and reorganized into inter-community division of labour, and conversely, of inter-community division of labour being broken up and reorganized into intra-community division of labour. But in spite of this, while the development of intra-community division of labour, *in itself*, causes eventually the community, and social structures built upon the community to break up,⁴⁸ inter-community division of labour exerts its influence in precisely the converse direction, eventually causing the fixation of the community's structure, and, if anything, cherishes and preserves the traditional social relations built up on the community.⁴⁹ Let us then continue our exposition a little more deeply into these points.

First, what is known as 'intra-community division of labour' is, of course, the development of a social division of labour found inside the community, but this is not all. Rather accurately it means the development of a social division of labour within the community and then spreads outward towards the external environment. We say this because even in the intra-community division of labour the involvement of other communities from outside is naturally always occurring in this process of development.

However, this intra-community division of labour reveals itself first, according to Weber's terminology, in the form of "*Demiurgie*."⁵⁰ As is indicated by its etymology, the word *Demiurgie* means the various kinds of labour other than farming performed in the service of the traditional community and refers to that state of social division of labour in which workers other than farmers are comprehended within the land occupancy relations of the traditional community, and Weber finds the kinship community in its primitive form in Asia and in particular in the Indian village community, a community which underwent a process of development and fixation peculiar to itself and which persists in this form to the present day.⁵¹ Taking into account all manner of regional variations, he generalizes the situation of the Indian village as follows. The village artisans, called "the establishment" by the English, are in fact a species of "*famuli*," and they are not servants of
stance than to point out the fact.

⁴⁸ At certain stages intra-community division of labour can become the driving force in the formation of a new form of community, but since Weber's treatment of this point is not necessarily sufficient, *at least from the theoretical point of view*, I do not touch upon it here. But see, for example, Weber, *GAzSW*, SS. 108 ff., 266, 270.

⁴⁹ The truth is that these points are developed as a part of Weber's general theory of the dual structure of the community—intra-community economy (*Binnenwirtschaft*) and extra-community economy (*Aussenwirtschaft*)—and the question of intra-community ethic (*Binnenmoral*) and extra-community ethic (*Aussenmoral*) corresponding thereto, but regrettably a full-scale introduction of these matters must be omitted from the present article. For the present purposes, see, Weber, *WG*, SS. 300–315, and *WuG*, SS. 214–218.

⁵⁰ Weber, *WuG*, S. 68; *WG*, SS. 36 ff., 117 ff.

⁵¹ See Weber, *WG*, SS. 36 ff.; *GAzRS*, II, SS. 58 ff., 58 Anmerk. 3, 93.

particular individuals but Helots in the service of the village community. They are each given a croft and are permanently settled, and work for the villagers. As in wage-work (*Lohnwerk*), they do work provided with the raw materials, and receive an equivalent value for their work not of an individual character but in the form of a grant by the village community of a certain fixed sum in kind or a certain fixed sum from the harvest. The main content of this *Demiurgie* of course comprises such artisans as carpenters, blacksmiths, shoemakers, potters, leather-workers, and washermen, but also includes, in addition to these, water-carriers, gardeners, barbers, singers, astrologers, village watchmen, and schoolmasters, and also all manner of petty religious office-holders. This socially self-sufficient structure of the village community had already, as is well known, been excellently pointed out by Marx.⁵² Weber writes, "Karl Marx has characterized the peculiar position of the artisan in the Indian village—his dependence upon fixed payment in kind instead of upon production for the market—as the reason for the specific 'stability' of the Asiatic peoples. In this, Marx was correct."⁵³

Now because of circumstances in the various regions of Asia, except Japan,⁵⁴ the primitive form of *Demiurgie*, that is, the *Demiurgie* of a natural economy, either continues to have its development blocked at its first beginnings, or develops in ways peculiar to itself, as in India, but in general it gradually changes its form into the *Demiurgie* of a money economy, in the manner of development typically shown in Occidental history. In detail, it first takes the form of wage-work,⁵⁵ after which comes production for a clientele (*Kundenproduktion*). Further, transcending this, and as liberated from all regulation from the traditional community, the *free* commodity production presents itself and the character of *Demiurgie* is entirely lost.⁵⁶ As we explain later, macroscopically this development in *Demiurgie* occurs in the advanced stages of the traditional community or in correspondence with the degree of break-up of the community, but at all events Weber says that in either case the advance of intra-community division of labour leads to the break-up of the

⁵² Marx, *Das Kapital*, I, SS. 374 ff.

⁵³ Weber, *GAzRS*, II, S. 109. The English translation follows Hans H. Gerth & Don Martindale trans. and ed., *The Religion of India: The Sociology of Hinduism and Buddhism*, Grencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1958.

⁵⁴ Weber does not touch on this point at all, but if one follows his views one must naturally think so. For historical fact providing grounds for this, see, for example, Hisao Ōtsuka, "The Market Structure in the Early Stage of the Development of Modern Capitalism," in *The Second International Conference of Economic History at Aix-en-Provence*, Vol. I, Paris, Mouton, 1965, pp. 457-472.

⁵⁵ We follow the terminology of Karl Bücher. This is not modern wage-labour but *Lohnwerk*, which constitutes the early stage of *Preiswerk* or *Handwerk*. The same is true of *Kundenproduktion*, for although it is a form of commodity production as *Preiswerk*, it is done for a specific traditional clientele, and is not a form of *free* commodity production for a general market. It is not the case that Weber clearly and explicitly thinks if this *Kundenproduktion* as being included in *Demiurgie*, but I think that from his theory we might naturally suppose so.

⁵⁶ Weber, *WG*, SS. 124, 126, 269 ff.

traditional communities and the traditional social relations intertwined with them.

Second, "inter-community division of labour," which is conceived as standing in a completely antagonistic relation to this, means literally a social division of labour which develops between community and community, but it would seem necessary to note that Weber uses this term in a slightly wider sense referring to the question of the underdeveloped countries at the present day. That is to say, the relations of a social division of labour established between a community and its external environment—even if the external participants in these relations be the industries of the most advanced countries—possess, at least for the community, exactly the same effect as those of intra-community division of labour.

Among all the various phenomena produced by this kind of inter-community division of labour, Weber would seem to have attached particular importance to two points. Firstly, the relations of exchange which link the traditional communities partake eminently of the nature of commerce, and hence cause the early appearance of capitalism in the broad sense (Weber's 'irrational capitalism').⁵⁷ Weber even speaks of this phenomenon in rather exaggerated terms as being "as old as the history of humankind,"⁵⁸ but at any rate he says that in all pre-modern societies the development of a money economy (and particularly commerce) on the foundations of an inter-community division of labour has always, in the past and at present, and in greater and lesser degree, contrasted markedly with the strong tendency to natural economy within the community itself. Secondly, when these relations develop further, in addition to 'the agricultural community' based on agriculture and land occupancy, there appear 'occupational communities' in which some one occupational division (including non-economic occupation) other than agriculture, particularly a specific handicraft, is made into a specialized occupation of the whole. The members of these communities come to carry on commodity production intended for other communities, and moreover while being subject to regulation from the part of their own community. Of course, communities specializing in commerce or finance also make their appearance. Sometimes these occupational communities are itinerant, and sometimes they occupy land and are permanently settled.⁵⁹

In the course of history this kind of inter-community division of labour takes a variety of differing forms, corresponding to the stage development in the basic form of the traditional community, and in this case, too, Weber seeks the archetype in the earliest stage, the inter-tribal division of labour (*die interethnische Teilung der Arbeit*)⁶⁰ and the resulting formation of tribal

⁵⁷ Weber, *WuG*, SS. 96, 382-385, 348-350.

⁵⁸ Weber, *GAzRS*, I, S. 42.

⁵⁹ Weber, *WuG*, SS. 82-86.

⁶⁰ It would seem that the word *interethnisch* frequently used by Weber does not refer to relations between one *ethnische Gruppe* and another *ethnische Gruppe* in his terminology, but is clearly to be understood as meaning "between tribe and tribe." Our reasons for supposing so are (1) that the *ethnische Gruppe* in itself does not constitute a *Gemeinschaft*

handicrafts (*Stammgewerbe*) (and consequently, 'occupational tribes').⁶¹ In the course of Occidental history the occupational communities possessing this kind of archetype proceed in the direction of their dissolution in a very smooth manner from the macroscopic point of view, while changing their forms from stage to stage. That is to say, taking the form of Weber's "unfree guild" (*unfreie Zunft*)⁶² found at the beginning and the end of the period of classical antiquity, they proceed through the widespread formation of "free guilds" (*freie Zunft*) in the mediaeval towns, and finally break up to the production for the free market. It is nevertheless true that even in the history of the Occident we can find some markedly stagnant forms, such as those of the Jews specializing in commerce and finance or the weavers' villages (*Weberdorf*) in Silesia. But it is not that in the history of the Asian regions only the break-up of the occupational tribes was retarded by historical and geographical conditions, in a manner which is rather in antipodal opposition to Occidental history. Passing through transformations markedly different from those of Occidental history, these were finally fixated in peculiarly distinctive forms. In China they were fixated as the unfree guilds of the cities, which were such as to fit in with the persistence of the strong sib community in the agricultural villages,⁶³ while in India even the move towards the formation of such guilds in the cities was frustrated, and they arrived at their fixation in the peculiar caste system.⁶⁴

However that may be, Weber thinks that inter-community division of labour, while being accompanied, both in the case of the primitive inter-tribal division of labour and in that of the inter-urban and inter-village division of labour by the formation of a variety of occupational communities of the kind we have described above and a variety of transformations corresponding thereto, in the last analysis operated in the direction of cherishing and preserving permanently the traditional social relations intertwined with the traditional communities.⁶⁵

(*WuG*, S. 234), and (2) the fact that Weber, in accordance with the etymology of the word, always distinguishes *ethnos* from *phyle*, and seems to use the word in the sense of a tribe which has not lost the character of an independent community, that is, in the sense of 'Stamm' (*WuG*, S. 777). At any rate, it seems certain that by understanding the term in this way his works, and particularly *WG*, become very easy to understand.

⁶¹ Weber, *WG*, SS. 115 ff.

⁶² On these concepts see Weber, *WG*, SS. 127 ff.

⁶³ Weber, *GAzRS*, I, SS. 291-298.

⁶⁴ Weber, *GAzRS*, II, SS. 32-39, 84-98.

⁶⁵ The ultimate cause of this is the following. As a result of the influence exerted by a money economy the relative weight of land occupancy may be expected naturally to decline, and in its place, in the realm of inter-community division of labour, commerce and other economic interests come forward as important objects of communal occupancy. But in the present article we shall do no more than to point out this fact, and a detailed exposition of it must be left to another occasion.

V

According to Weber, intra- and inter-community divisions of labour mentioned above, while on the one hand standing in fluid relations of mutual movement, on the other hand, as such, operate in completely opposed directions. That is to say, while the former produces conditions to bring about the break-up of the social relations built up on the traditional communities, the latter rather produces conditions to maintain them, and, in certain cases, to strengthen them further. Now as the second section of this article, at the level of politics the traditional social relations based on the community produce various patrimonial states—including the feudalism considered by Weber to be the marginal type of such states—each relating to the stage or type of the communities as its foundations, and if we would explain the above matters on the basis of this still wider field of vision, we will probably get the following.

Firstly, intra-community division of labour first leads to the break-up of the traditional communities and shakes the political domination of the patrimonial state. Hereupon, as we shall show later, the patrimonial state suppresses such developments of intra-community division of labour, and rather makes efforts to organize the development of inter-community division of labour. For a variety of historical and geographical conditions, intra-community division of labour seeks out weak points in political domination, and, particularly in frontier regions,⁶⁶ grows all the more. And from this there are formed either new types of traditional communities and of social relations intertwined with them (and consequently new types of the patrimonial state), or, beyond this again, eventually, through the disappearance of all traditional communities, the free industrial state (*Industriestaat*).⁶⁷ It is said that, macroscopically considered, the advance of intra-community division of labour exhibits this kind of development.

From the macroscopic point of view the smooth advance of this kind of development can be clearly seen in the course of Occidental history stretching from the ancient Orient to modern Europe. I think that the fact that Weber thought so may be fully apparent if we merely recall the following facts pointed out by him in the work of his earlier years. First there is the fact that *Demiurgie* having the attributes bestowed by a money economy early appeared in ancient Greece which emerged as the frontier region of Persia, and that it was here that coins, and furthermore, coins as an intra-community money (*Binnengeld*), made their appearance for the first time in the history of the world.⁶⁸ Next, against the background of the so-called 'return to a

⁶⁶ We have already referred to Weber's theory of the frontier. See foot-note 33 above.

⁶⁷ In connexion with this last point we must touch on Weber's theory regarding the dual structure of the inside and the outside of the traditional community (intra- and extra-community economy) and the disappearance of this structure, but regrettably this must be omitted from the present article. Cf. Weber, *WG*, SS. 300-315.

⁶⁸ Weber, *GAzSW*, SS. 108 ff.; *WG*, SS. 209 ff.

natural economy' resulting from a decline in long-distance commerce found in Gaul in the final period of classical antiquity, the period which provides the foundations for the development of mediaeval feudalism, Weber draws attention to a *Demiurgie* having in even greater measure the attributes bestowed by a money economy, that is to say, to an advance in the social division of labour on a local basis, and he calls this 'the shrinkage of the market area' (*Verkleinerung des Marktes*).⁶⁹ This is also the reason for the town community being formed alongside the village community in mediaeval feudalism, in contradistinction to antiquity, and he points out that it was the local division of labour advancing from this basis, and the development of money economy in this form, which eventually led to the formation of modern industrial society.⁷⁰

Secondly, the inter-community division of labour, while differentiating out a variety of occupational communities, conversely strengthens the traditional communities which constitute the foundations of the society, and through the principle of 'divide and rule' operates in the direction of stabilizing, on the contrary, the political domination of the patrimonial state. Consequently, the patrimonial state suppresses intra-community division of labour and attempts, conversely, to organize the total area under its domination in the form of inter-community division of labour, and it produces from above a variety of occupational communities. Now, inter-community division of labour appears most eminently in the form of the development of commerce (and irrational capitalism), and it is precisely on this basis that relations of co-operation between the political domination of the patrimonial state and commerce (and consequently irrational capitalism) appear in the course of history,⁷¹ and again the break-up of traditional social relations resulting from the advance of intra-community division of labour causes the decline of long-distance commerce and the shrinkage of the market area.

Such a development of inter-community division of labour and its conservative operation are of course to be found to a certain extent in the course of Occidental history also. But in the Orient, and particularly in the various regions of Asia, in general the development of intra-community division of labour has been markedly suppressed by a variety of historical and geographical conditions, and development has proceeded in a variety of individual directions in a manner directly converse to that of Occidental history. Bearing well in mind the fact that he mentioned the point that among these cases Japan, while remaining deeply coloured by Asiatic char-

⁶⁹ Weber, *GAzSW*, SS. 256; *WG*, S. 127.

⁷⁰ Weber, *WG*, SS. 115-127. However, the theoretical grasp of these points in Weber's case can scarcely be said to be sufficient, perhaps because it was subject to restrictions imposed by the level of studies in economic history at that time. An article which intends to make some sort of contribution on this question is the above-cited H. Ōtsuka, "The Market Structure in the Early Stage of Development of Modern Capitalism," *op. cit.*, pp. 457-472.

⁷¹ Weber, *WuG*, SS. 648-650. Weber says that this fact "has hitherto been overlooked by scholarship" but that it "frequently possesses an important significance in history."

acteristics, had nevertheless spontaneously developed feudalism in the Occidental sense, and consequently had produced conditions favourable to the acceptance of a capitalist economy from the West, it is the cases of China and of India which, as is well known, bulk large in Weber's voluminous works as the two most important types in world history.

Taking the historical result in China first, we may say that Weber thinks as follows.⁷² The patrimonial state in the form of a great Empire was formed, having under its command its characteristic body of patrimonial mandarin officials, and having as its foundations the village communities which in all things preserved the strong system of autonomous government by the sib and which were accompanied by the development of a certain landlord system. But the state did not merely cause the inter-tribal division of labour to be fixated from above, but went on to reorganize the merchants and handicraftsmen in unfree guilds permanently settled in the cities, and kept control of them under the direct rule of patrimonial officials. Granted that in China the frequent moves towards caste organization did not in the end come to fruition, in one way or another the entire social structure came to be fixated in this form.

Next, regarding India he thought as follows.⁷³ In Indian society standing on the foundations of tribal village communities as described above, because of a variety of historical and geographical conditions this society underwent a development which on some points was even more thoroughgoing than in China. That is to say, the development of inter-tribal division of labour suppressed even the move towards the formation of guilds based on the city which is found at certain periods and developed over and beyond them, finally producing a caste system unparalleled in world history which enveloped the entire structure of society. In other words, a variety of handicraft tribes still remained around the periphery of Indian society, while a stratum of permanently settled artisans lived in the cities, and further a stratum of artisans of the kind characteristic of *Demiurgie* existed in the villages as described above, but over and beyond these distinctions the artisan stratum, along with the other strata in society, was fitted into the caste system. In particular, even the stratum of village artisans of the kind characteristic of *Demiurgie* which may be supposed to have contained within itself the possibility of breaking up the traditional communities as a form of intra-community division of labour was enveloped in the principle of the inter-community division of labour contained within the caste system in a manner directly converse to the case of Occidental history, and it was forced to become 'the ground for the unchangingness of Asiatic society.' Thus in India there was established that caste system which enveloped within its strong framework, and *without contradictions*, not only the basic mechanisms of patrimonial domination but also the development of the landlord system—and perhaps even the phenomenon of capitalist industrialization.

⁷² Weber, *GAzRS*, I, SS. 292–298, 350 ff., 380 ff., 388.

⁷³ Weber, *GAzRS*, II, SS. 84–98, 122–133.

Now, apart from the above, there are a number of extremely important explanations which we must make regarding Weber's views of the characteristics of Asian society. We shall conclude this article by mentioning these points briefly below.

As we have already noted,⁷⁴ in comparing the characteristics exhibited by Occidental and Asian history, and further, when attempting comparisons between the characteristics of the differing kinds of development which took place in China and in India, Weber, naturally differing on this point from Marx, employs a pluralistic form of explanation. He always takes into consideration a variety of historical and geographical conditions, including what may be called 'significant accidents.' But it would probably be no exaggeration to say that he places his main emphasis particularly on the economic factors, the religious factors, and on the political factors which may be supposed to have intermediated between the two. Further, it need hardly be said that in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, the religious factors are brought to the forefront.

Now if we attempt to explain what we have said above at this theoretical level, his views would probably be as follows.

While in the course of Occidental history from the ancient Orient to modern Europe the religious ethos of the Christian religion, which was born out of Judaism and continued to possess overwhelming significance, was a powerful spiritual force breaking up all traditional communities, and not only the kinship community as such, by its thorough sweeping away of the magical elements accompanying the kinship system (that is, by *Entzauberung* or 'disenchantment,'⁷⁵) in the various regions of Asia which were covered by a religious atmosphere in which, particularly, magical elements coexisted in greater or lesser measure, the religious ethos, working together with the historical and geographical conditions, produced severally differing end-products in accordance with the special nature of each religion. First, in China, Confucianism, as the orthodoxy which constituted the religious dimension of the stratum of patrimonial mandarin officials, while forming what may be called a dual religious structure with Taoism and other cults as the heterodoxy constituting the religious dimension of the masses, acted as a great spiritual support for the purposes of fixating the ruling structure of the patrimonial state for a long period of time in the characteristic form which we have described above.⁷⁶ Next, in India the mixture of a great variety of races, on top of repeated military conquests, made it difficult for any "common ethnic culture" ("*ethnische Gemeinsamkeit*")⁷⁷ to come into being which would turn society in the direction of the formation of ethnic groups of greater size among the various tribes. Further, in addition to this, the

⁷⁴ See p. 285 above.

⁷⁵ This, as need hardly be said, forms the subject of his famous essay, "Die protestantische Ethik und der 'Geist' des Kapitalismus," in *GAzRS*, I.

⁷⁶ See particularly Weber, *GAzRS*, I, SS. 512-536.

⁷⁷ Concerning this concept, see Weber, *WuG*, SS. 240 ff.

religious ethos of Hinduism—the doctrines of *karma* and *samsara*—which, sweeping away Buddhism and Jainism as heterodoxy, eventually succeeded in gaining control of the whole of Indian society as orthodoxy, by frustrating the first beginnings of cities and unfree guilds eventually became the spiritual driving force which caused the inter-tribal division of labour to result in the caste system with its incomparably conservative character.⁷⁸ However that may be, may we not consider as a view very worthy of attention at the present time the fact that Weber conceived the establishment of the caste system as an astonishingly thoroughgoing fixation of inter-tribal division of labour which took place with the backing of a mixture of races and the religious ethos of Hinduism at the stage when the pure patrimonial state was at last beginning to break up?

⁷⁸ Weber, *GAzRS*, II, SS. 8-22, 51-57, 122-133.