

# What Are Citizens?

## — Prolegomena to Global Citizenship Studies (1) —

SHOJI Kôkichi

### 市民とはなにか？ —地球市民学序説(1)—

市民とは、自分が生きる社会の主権者のことであり、その制度的保障は普通選挙にもとづく代議制民主主義である。このように定義すると、本当の市民は意外に新しく、先進諸国でも完全な普通選挙が実施されるようになってから100年もたっていない。そのうえ、社会主義諸国で実施されてきた一党独裁のもとでの事実上の信任投票が必ずしも普通選挙とはいえないこと、そのほかにも宗教上の理由や歴史的な理由などによってまだ明快な普通選挙が実施されていない国があることも考えなければならない。普通選挙が定着したと見える国でも、選挙制度のあり方によっては市民の意見が正確に政治に反映されないこともあるし、グローバル化が進んでいる現在では、超大国の一方的な行動などで少なくない国の市民たちの意向が無視されることもありうる。自分たちの社会のあり方を自分たちで決めていくことが負担になりうるような状況もありうるので、市民であることの意味をくり返し反省しなければならない。

市民たちの社会は、西洋中世の自治都市から出発し、市民革命をつうじて世界に広まった。イギリス革命は下層市民の急進化を恐れて立憲君主制で妥協し、アメリカ独立革命は植民地化された現地の人びとや奴隷として導入された人びとの人権に気づくまでに時間がかかったが、フランス革命は社会の全階層を巻き込んで徹底し、ヨーロッパの周辺諸国から世界へと市民たちの社会を広めた。しかし、市民社会が世界に広まったのは、それらの主なものがナショナリズムの形をとってまとまり、世界の遅れた地域を植民地にしながら領土拡張の争いを続けることをつうじてであった。帝国主義はそうした行為の集約であり、20世紀の前半に二度もの世界大戦を起こし、米ソの核軍拡競争をふまえた冷戦で人類を絶滅の淵にまで追いつめた。

このようなことになったのは、市民たちの先頭に立ってきたのが、資本主義で経済を成長させ、それを基礎に社会を発展させようとする資本家であったからである。近代資本主義のもとになった産業資本は宗教改革で禁欲的な生活態度を身に着けた人びとから出てきたという説がある。その面もあるが、産業資本はいったん動き出してしまうと、利潤追求をふまえた資本蓄積の衝動に駆られ、ほとんど自動的に展開する「鉄の檻」のような巨大な機構をつくりあげてしまう。その結果は1929年からのそのような世界的な大恐慌であることもあり、多くの犠牲をとらなう。世界大戦のもとになった帝国主義についても、それが一時的な政策なのか、原理的な必然なのかをめぐって論争があったが、それは資本主義の独占段階における必然であり、世界戦争の危機を革命にもちこんで社会を変えていけばよいという考え方は今日では相対化されている。むしろ、これらすべての過程をつうじて犠牲になり続けてきた旧植民地・従属国の人びとの眼から、市民たちの社会のあり方を見直していくことがもっとも大切なのではないか。

## 1 Citizens Decide What Their Society Is and Shall Be

### 1.1 Universal Citizens

Citizens, *shimin* in Japanese, are ordinary members of ordinary societies.

Occasionally we consider those who live in cities as citizens. In this sense those living in villages are not citizens. But usually we regard members of a society in general as citizens wherever they live, like US citizens, EU citizens and so forth. Citizens are universal in this respect.

In Japan we frequently use, perhaps more so than *shimin*, a word *kokumin* which literally means a national or a nation. Especially political parties, from the rightist to the leftist, usually say 'we follow *kokumin's* will', 'we defend *kokumin's* interests', and so on. To my understanding this is mainly due to the terminology of the Constitution of Japan. We find there plenty of terms like '*kokumin's* general will', '*kokumin's* rights and duties', etc.

Then, if we see the English version of the Constitution, we find the word 'people' coinciding *kokumin* in most cases. The Japanese word meaning people is strictly *jinmin*. For example, we use this word meaning people when we translate Abraham Lincoln's famous phrase 'Government of the People, by the People, for the People'. I guess they avoided this word *jinmin*, because mostly leftist people had been using it since before World War II in such phrases as *Jinmin Sensen* (People's Front), *Jinmin Shikan* (People's View of History, actually Marxist Historical Materialism), etc. (In China they have been using overwhelmingly *renmin* (*jinmin*) starting from the country name People's Republic of China, but this country was built in 1949, three years after the promulgation of the Constitution of Japan.)

I regret the word *kokumin* sometimes functions to enclose Japanese people in such a narrative as 'there is no Japanese *kokumin* (nationals) involved in an overseas accident or event (so we can feel easy)'. So, I will examine problems of nationalism later. Here, pointing out that *kokumin* also means Japanese citizens, we can take steps forward, since the Constitution of Japan has been declaring that Japan pursues Peace on the basis of the general will of the *koumin* (people) and that the sovereignty belongs to Japanese *kokumin* (citizens).

## 1.2 Citizens as Sovereigns

Then, what are citizens as universal? As the Constitution of Japan says, we are sovereigns of our own society. We decide what our society is and shall be. This is institutionally ensured by some universal suffrage system.

We elect our representatives for different classes of assemblies and governments. In Japan the Prime Minister is elected by the members of the Diet due to the parliamentary cabinet system while heads of local governments are directly elected by citizens as is the President of the United States. As the judges of the Supreme Court are appointed by the Cabinet and are trusted by the national referendum in the nearest election, so we directly or indirectly elect members to execute three separated powers --- legislation, administration and judicature.

Although forms to separate three powers and ways to elect their executors

vary from nation to nation, in principle we citizens decide in contemporary democratic societies what our own society is and shall be mainly by electing executors of three separated powers. Civic democracy nowadays is, in this sense, by and large indirect and representative. We know direct democracy is easy to understand like those of ancient Greek poleis, some Swiss systems and some American town meetings. Simultaneously we recognize direct democracy is difficult and impossible in most cases in our contemporary huge and complex societies.

However, we should not forget that some referenda have great meanings when we have to make any decision on some controversial issues like building nuclear power plants, changing the taxation system, revising the constitution, etc. In Japan we have not had many referenda except some regional referenda on building nuclear power plants, integration of local governments, etc. and never national ones. However, the Japanese Constitution has established to enforce a national referendum to amend any of its articles.

### 1.3 Citizens Are New: History of Several Decades

Citizens have emerged in many countries and regions of the world in these several decades. As stated above, the institutional insurance of a civil society is some universal suffrage and many years have been taken for it to be established even in advanced nations.

Though being considered as the top runner on modern democracy, Britain (the United Kingdom) had allowed for long only a small part of its population to vote. The first electoral reform gave the voting right mainly to newly emerging entrepreneurs in 1832 and this stirred up workers to raise the Chartist Movement under the banner of the People's Charter. Thirty-five years later in 1867 most of urban workers acquired the voting right by the second reform, but as this was not sufficient yet, so agricultural workers and others fought to gain it by the third reform in 1884. Almost universal suffrage was reached as far as men were concerned.

Yet, there was no right for women to vote. Even the fourth reform in 1918, just after World War I, gave the voting right to men older than twenty-one years, but barely to women older than thirty. The long war of the suffragettes since the 19<sup>th</sup> century bore fruit by the fifth reform in 1928 that gave the right to vote to all adults more than twenty-one years old. It took almost one hundred years for British people to become universal citizens regardless of sex and age.

In France the universal suffrage for men was realized in 1849 as the fruit of the February Revolution in 1848. Yet, women had been long excluded until the reform in 1944 at nearly the end of World War II. It took also about one hundred years for the sexual equality to be attained.

In the United States the universal suffrage for men was realized in each

state by the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and many states came to give the right to vote to women in the second half of the same century as far as elections on and under the state level were concerned. As the result of the serious Civil War, Afro-American men were allowed to vote on the federal level. But since women had been excluded from federal elections, long and aggressive movements were fought by American suffragettes up to the realization of truly universal suffrage in 1920. It is common knowledge, however, that Afro-American men and women had been substantially excluded up until the Civil Right Movements bore fruit in the 1960s.

In Germany, the universal suffrage for men was realized in the Northern Federation in 1867 and this was extended in the whole empire (*Reich*) as the unification was accomplished in 1870. Yet, women had been excluded too until the Weimar Constitution established a perfect universal suffrage in 1918. This Constitution has been praised for its progressiveness because German women joined the universal suffrage earlier than the United States and the United Kingdom, not to mention France. We should remember, however, that it was New Zealand that gave women the right to vote for the first time in the world.

In Japan, universal suffrage for men was enforced in 1925, but women had to wait for acquiring the voting right until 1945 just after World War II.

In Russia, Nikolai II promised in his 'October Declaration' in 1905 to open *duma* (parliament) and enforce universal suffrage, but they were fulfilled quite insufficiently under the reactionary election law. Then there followed a series of political turmoil up to the Great Revolution in 1917 that brought about a completely different political system.

Except Latin American nations most of which gained Independence in and after the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it was only after their Independence after World War II that most Asian and African nations which had been colonies or subordinates enforced any form of universal suffrage.

#### 1.4 Citizens Are New: Peoples Who Are Not Citizens Yet

Citizens are new, also because there are not so few peoples who have not become citizens yet. First I said citizens are ordinary members of ordinary societies, but there are not so few nations or societies where universal suffrage has not become 'ordinary' yet.

As well-known, the confidence voting under the communist one-party rule used to be 'ordinary' in Soviet and East-European socialist regimes, while it is still so in China, Vietnam and Cuba, not to mention North Korea. In the 1950s and 60s, some people would say that socialist democracy was proletarian or people's one, that communist parties belonged to workers, peasants and people, and therefore that democracy based on confidence voting would be more democratic than bourgeois democracy in capitalist nations. After the collapse of Soviet and East-European regimes around 1990, there has become and will

be no people who accept this assertion.

In Soviet Union Gorbachev launched *Perestroika* (Reform) in 1985, enforced general election in tolerance of plural candidates in 1988 and introduced the Presidential System in 1990. However, these reforms were too late to stop successive collapses of East-European and Soviet socialist regimes. Involved in the global capitalist system, these nations saw plural political parties emerge so as to fight each other in 'ordinary' universal suffrage systems.

On the other hand, political systems remain basically the same in spite of 'Open and Reform' in China and *Doimoi* (Reform) in Vietnam both of which have already succeeded in initiating economic development. Cuba has not changed its political system although they have had harder situations after losing the Soviet support. North Korea is a peculiar case among socialist regimes where the highest leader was succeeded from Father to Son. This is an obvious contradiction to the country name 'People's Democratic Republic of Korea'.

It is heard that in China some people have been trying to change elections by putting up plural candidates (or by standing up themselves as candidates) for lower classes of public offices closer to the people. Yet, there is no hope for 'ordinary' universal suffrage in the national scale to be enforced in the near future. Moreover, besides ex-socialist and still-socialist nations, there are a considerable number of nations who have not taken any universal suffrage system yet due to religious backgrounds and so on.

We have no right, of course, to force these nations to accept Western ideas of freedom and democracy neglecting their historical and cultural backgrounds. But, if we stand on the basic position that citizens should decide by themselves what their society is and shall be, we cannot but say that peoples of these nations have not become citizens yet.

### 1.5 Not Sufficient to Become Citizens Once

One may ask, then, "Is it enough to have universal suffrage?" Of course, not. At least we need some institutions for it, but their realities are also big questions.

From the standpoint to ask reality, even the advanced nations might be more or less far from being true citizens' societies yet. I dare to take British and American peoples as examples. Most people consider the former as the top starter of civic democracy and the latter as those who have universalized and diffused it all over the world. Therefore, many of us tend to think that their two-party system and single-member constituency system must be judged as the best institutions. Is this true?

We understand why and how these two nations have historically taken their two-party systems and single-member constituency systems. But this is one thing and how to evaluate them another. We have seen more and more dif-

ferent opinions emerging as any civil society develops. It is quite natural for citizens to have more and more various opinions to debate each other freely in order to decide what their society is and shall be. Then, it must be pretty rare for these various opinions to be converged always into two. More natural are cases where opinions be arranged into more than a few and less than several so that it would be better to take a combination of two or three than to take only any one.

This means it would be best for citizens to reflect a variety of their different opinions on the parliament through multi-party system and to have a coalition government of two or more parties in order to run their political system. For this, any single-member constituency system is worse, not to say worst, and even if we use it as the basis of election system, it is much better to get a result which is infinitely close to that of any proportional representation system. A proportional representation based on single-constituency system is better while a single-constituency system simply added by proportional representation is worse. It is most important to always reflect a variety of citizens' opinions on the issues as exactly as possible.

Citizens must become more aware of their responsibility in this type of electoral system. Problems of non-voters in a universal suffrage system have long been discussed. Some of them might have been caught by traditional or modern political apathy. Yet, I am afraid that most of them must be reluctant to come to vote because they cannot find a way to express their opinions through any party and more because they are frustrated that they cannot follow how and to what extent their opinions affect the actual politics.

Therefore, it is not enough to become a citizen only one time however important is to acquire the right to vote. In societies which constantly tend to transcend domains of nation states to be world-wide or global, citizens may be deprived of their voting right or sovereignty itself if the Super Power does any huge politics over their heads such as 'Wars against Terrorism' of the United States in Afghanistan and Iraq. Citizens, therefore, should deeply imprint on their mind the necessity to resume actual citizenship over and over whenever deprived.

## 1.6 Risks of Being Citizens

Moreover, we should be aware of risks immanent in being citizens. Being a citizen is naturally to decide one's own way of life as is to decide what one's society is and shall be. We say in Japan to 'rely on gods and Buddha' if no other way, but citizens cannot rely on any divine protection in the highest urgencies.

Even if we rely on gods or Buddha, we have to decide what kind of gods or Buddha to rely. Though I respect humans of religion, I hope one's God or Buddha should not indulge one in crucial occasions. I believe the true God or Bud-

dha should urge one to make up one's mind by oneself when one has to make an important decision like 'to be or not to be'.

At least we should not seek someone like God or Buddha in any leader or group whom we are not sure to trust, even when we are seriously uneasy or when we feel entirely free in that we have to decide our own fate. In the 1930s in Germany citizens elected Adolf Hitler and his Nazis in a lawful suffrage due to their anxiety and inadequately oriented expectations, so as to allow the birth of the worst dictatorship in the history of humankind. It is well-known that a sociologist Ehrich Fromm called this process the 'Escape from Freedom' (Fromm, 1941).

In about the same age, Marxism, that had been created by one of the most free and critical spirit in the West, was made something like a religion to worship one specific leader like God so as to mobilize most people's 'faith' which was much more primitive than 'Escape from Freedom'. Japan's ultra-nationalist militarism leading to World War II was the effects of similar mobilization of primitive faith through the Emperor worship which was utilized as the ideology of Japan's imperialist expansionism (Maruyama, 1969).

German Nazism and Japanese Militarism were defeated to collapse in World War II and the Soviet and East-European socialist' regimes also collapsed after the end of Cold War. But, as pointed above, there are not a few countries where peoples cannot become citizens yet and we have repeatedly witnessed even in advanced civil societies religious or religionist political movements which remind us of 'Escape from Freedom'. Referring to these past and present movements, citizens should over and over reflect on the risks imminent in being citizens.

## 2. Birth and Diffusion of Civil Societies

### 2.1 Starting from Self-Governing Cities

Where were citizens born and how have they been diffusing all over the world? We have to review critically the basic processes of birth and diffusion of citizens' societies – civil societies.

The word citizen came from city as *citoyen* from *cit * in French. There is another word *bourgeois* coming from *bourg* in French as *B rger* from *Burg* in German. And in Japanese *shimin* means *min* (people) of *toshi* (cities). All these words show that citizens originally were and in some cases still are people who live in cities.

Of course, there were various cities in various civilizations since the ancient times, but most of them were strategically controlled by the Empires. Exceptions were Greek poleis where the prototype of democracy emerged. Athens' democracy reached its zenith in the fifth century BC where even property-

less citizens participated in politics. However, slaves, foreigners and women were excluded and military conflicts among poleis laid themselves open to the Macedonian Empire's attack. The Roman Empire, absorbing fruits of Greek and Hellenistic civilizations, nurtured lots of cities, but no democratic one appeared.

After the West Roman Empire fell, the Frankish Kingdom, the Holy Roman Empire and others appeared in West Europe, but most of them were relatively weak in comparison with other empires in the other parts of the world. The West European feudalism was mostly decentralized. Under this feudalism, villages formed as manors grew gradually more than autarkical forces and began to yield surplus agricultural products to be exchanged in cities. In the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries markets came to be opened in many cities as 'weekly markets' etc. to develop exchange economy, which later historians would call the 'Commercial Renaissance'.

Seven times of the Crusader Expedition from the 11<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> centuries, activation of long-distance trades for Asian spices, general development of transportation and others made cities grow in Italy, Northern Germany, Flanders, London, Champagne in the North of Paris and so forth. More and more of these cities took charters from feudal lords to become self-governing and most powerful ones united themselves into leagues such as the Lombardian and Hanseatic ones.

In corporate cities there were strict divisions of ranks within merchant guilds and within craft guilds and these two sorts of guilds continued to fight each other to seek hegemony. Citizens were not democratic from the beginning. Yet, powers of cities grew through the age of crises of feudalism in 14<sup>th</sup> through 16<sup>th</sup> centuries and some powerful bourgeois families appeared like the Fugger in Augsburg and the Medici in Florence: the former swayed the Emperorship of the Holy Roman Empire and the latter sent a Pope into the Roman Catholic.

As the authority of the Roman Catholic declined, movements to the Reformation emerged here and there throughout Europe, some of which were connected with peasants' uprisings. These changes, hand in hand with the Renaissance and the Great Voyages, created economic, social, cultural and political conditions for Citizens' Revolutions.

## 2.2 English Revolutions Compromised

Citizens' Revolutions started from the Puritan Revolution in the middle of 17<sup>th</sup> century in England. On the tradition of absolutism James I insisted on the theory of the divine right of kings to continue autocracy. To stop it, the parliament adopted the 'Petition of Right' in 1628, but it was not effective. Then, the parliament, convoked in 1640, was prolonged where they tried to restrict the King's rights one after another. The conflicts between the Royalists and the



Parliamentarians became increasingly furious. Against the King moving to invoke the power, Oliver Cromwell reversed the situations by reforming the army.

As the Parliamentarians was divided into the Presbyterians and the Independents, Cromwell oppressed the former based on the latter's support by utilizing the emergence of the Levellers to promote the revolution. Charles I was executed in front of watching citizens of London and this was the zenith of this revolution. Oppressing Scotland, Ireland and the Levellers, Cromwell ran to dictatorship, took the post of the Lord Protector of the Commonwealth in 1653 and died of illness in 1658. Two years later the Restoration was done by the enthronement of James II, but this did not mean the end of parliamentarianism in England.

Yet James II tried to revive the Catholic in order to strengthen the power of kings. Then the Parliament overthrew him and invited his eldest daughter Mary and her husband, the stadtholder William III of Orange-Nassau, to accept the constitutional monarchy, the parliamentary democracy. The interests of Tories and Whigs coincided with each other not to allow the Catholic to revive so as to strengthen the right of kings. This revolution came to be called the 'Glorious Revolution' since the violence was not used at least in its major processes. Through this revolution, the Petition of Right was heightened into the 'Declaration of Right', more into the 'Charter of Right' and became the prototype of modern declarations of human rights.

Then, to what extent citizens grew through these revolutionary processes? It is true that citizens' powers had been accumulated in and out of London by experiencing the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Great Voyages in the rapidly expanding world. However, only their richest part could send their representatives to the parliament to counter clergymen and aristocrats. The progressives made use of citizens' support to restrict the kings' power as they utilized even the voices of some urban lower class people represented by the Levellers in the Puritan Revolution. But they turned to 'compromise' with the Conservatives in keeping the constitutional monarchy in the Glorious Revolution for fear that such a radical movement would arise again.

It is also clear that both the Progressives and the Conservatives would not change their attitudes toward Irish people whom they had been making use of as basic labor forces to build their capitalism. Later this was criticized as the 'internal colonialism' (Hechter, 1974) and it is also true that the British capitalism could develop only on the bases of this internal colonialism — not to mention 'external' colonialism extended on all over the world. English revolutions had many serious problems as the outsets of citizens' revolutions.

### 2.3 American Revolution Neglected Minorities

The English Revolutions spread to its American colonies in a century. Brit-

ain had joined races to colonize the non-European world to follow up Portugal, Spain and Holland and gained the major part of North America through the Seven Years' War in Europe and the French Indian War in North America by the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. And just after this victory the confrontations between Britain and its American colonies became serious.

The American colonists from Britain, having the memories of the Citizens' Revolutions and the Charter of Rights, had not been accepting the homeland's policies which one-sidedly treated the colonies as colonies. The colonists reacted against the Stamp Act in 1765 insisting 'No Taxation without Representation', and had the 'Boston Tea Party' against the Tea Act in 1773. They formed in Philadelphia the Continental Congress with representatives of the Provincial Congresses or their equivalents and, by making this as a provisional national government, launched wars of independence against Britain. Thomas Payne published his "Common Sense" in 1776 to show that it would be a war of common sense based on the English Citizens' Revolutions and the Charter of Rights (Payne, 1776).

The Thirteen Colonies issued the 'Declaration of Independence' on July 4<sup>th</sup> in 1776, piled victories to get the Peace Treaty of Paris in 1783, enacted the 'Constitution of the United States of America' in 1788 and established a Republican State with the First President George Washington in 1789.

There have been long controversies on to what extent this was a citizens' revolution. As far as we see the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the "Ten Amendments" added later to it to reassure its constitutionalism, this was clearly a citizens' revolution. Especially the Constitution that established the idea and outline of the first modern republican state and the Ten Amendments that was called the 'Bill of Rights' of the American Revolution were overwhelmingly clear and distinct comparing with the Documents of Rights issued through the English Revolutions. We can say that the former showed the universality of civic democracy to the whole world.

However, it is also clear that there were no considerations among the people from Washington down that performed this revolution, on the aboriginal people who had been much suffered from the colonizing races of European Big Powers and on the people who had been brought from Africa as slaves in shortage of native labor forces. It was only in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century that some people became aware of citizens' democracy having to be applied to these native people and to imported people as slaves if it be universal. Substantially, discrimination against Afro-American people would not be disappeared even after the Emancipation and native Americans were described as though bad enemies even in the 20<sup>th</sup> century movies in spite of their damages almost reaching to the Genocide through the whole age of development of the West.

## 2.4 French Revolution Fluctuated

Nevertheless, the American Revolution of Independence was reflected to the European Continent especially to influence the greatest country, France. Since the contradictions of its ancient regime were extremely aggravated, the revolution was thoroughly performed.

The French Revolution was triggered by the aristocrats' resistance against the King in 1787 and was developed into the Great Revolution involving all social strata in 1789. After the Storming of the Bastille on July 14<sup>th</sup>, feudal privileges were abolished on August 6<sup>th</sup> and the 'Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen' was published by the National Assembly on August 26<sup>th</sup>. Describing in seventeen articles the bases of a society based on Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, this Declaration was even more clear and universal than the American Declarations so as to be considered as the model for all declarations of human rights up to nowadays.

After this, the Revolution was rapidly developed to move into a republic, the National Convention executed the King and his relatives and the leadership of the moderate Girondes was taken over by the radical Jacobins' dictatorship. The leader, Maximilien Robespierre, was a true believer of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's social thought and tried to realize a society based on the 'general will' (Rousseau, 1762). Yet his dictatorship did not last long because he was not a professional soldier like Cromwell. Even after the Thermidorian Reaction the revolutionary government was not stabilized and was gradually reshaped into another dictatorship by the general Napoleon Bonaparte that tried to disseminate the ideals of the Revolution by forces in and out of France.

The process was somewhat similar to that of the English Revolutions in that the French one was also radicalized by mobilizing the lower strata of citizens and was taken over finally by the military dictatorship. However, through the repeated expeditions over the boundaries the ideals were disseminated all around the European Continent so as to make irreversible its trend toward civil societies despite of the Reactions after Napoleon's collapse. France after Napoleon was fluctuated by the Royal Restoration, the July Revolution of 1830 followed by Louis Philippe's monarchy, the February Revolution of 1848 followed by the Second Republic, the Second Empire by Napoleon III in 1852, the War against Prussia in 1870 followed by the Pairs Communes and the following Third Republic. And these processes affected neighbor nations to move into civil societies, starting from the national unifications of Italy and Germany.

In Italy a unified kingdom was built in 1861 and it annexed Rome to make it the capital in 1870. In Germany, though it took time even after the March Revolution of 1848, a unified Empire was built in 1871 with the victory over France and the German rapid modernization was triggered under the leadership of Chancellor Bismarck. Nearly in the same age, Japan moved from the

Tokugawa shogunate system to a roughly modern state based on the Emperor system and the major han cliques and, controlling the Freedom and People's Rights Movements influenced by early liberal Spencer, Rousseau etc., promulgated the Constitution of the Japanese Empire in 1889 so as to open the National Diet consisting of two Houses next year.

As for this process of Japan's modernization, there have been controversies since before World War II between a view to consider it as the establishment of a sort of absolutism and another to interpret it as a variation of bourgeois revolution. This difference was quite serious in the prewar age because the former was seen the strategic basis for a bourgeois democratic revolution while the latter for a socialist revolution. The communists took the former while the socialists the latter.

Anyway, the Great French Revolution, different from the English ones that compromised and the American one that neglected the minorities, affected the whole processes of global change toward civil societies, as a, not only political, but really social revolution involving all social strata in any country.

## 2.5 Citizens in Nationalisms

Thus the citizens' revolution was diffused to all over the world and it is important that this diffusion was done through nationalisms. As nationalism is a principle to make 'nation' the supreme value, so this diffusion means that citizens were integrated spontaneously or intentionally as nations after they had overcome the stage of integration in city sizes. This was natural in a sense as citizens were hardly able to integrate themselves directly in a global size. Yet, as nations were imagined or even fantasized communities based on transportation and communication networks which developed on modern economy (Anderson, 2006), so they brought about many problems when they collided with each other.

Britain, in about half a century after the Glorious Revolution, initiated the Industrial Revolution before the rest of the world. Adam Smith emphasized the great power of division of labor, was optimistic about competitions in the market and asserted free trade backed up by the overwhelming productive forces of his own nation (Smith, 1776). This was the first spontaneous nationalism.

In France, on the other hand, experiencing the citizens' revolution a century later than Britain and being also late in economic development, nationalism rose furiously against the interventions to the revolution and enlivened Napoleon's leadership, the Bonapartism. Before, in and after the revolution, Francis Quesney insisted in his economics on the interrelations of all parts of the economy on the basis of agriculture (Quesnay, 1758) and Henri de Saint-Simon emphasized in his sociology industrialism as new social and economic forces (Saint-Simon, 1823-24). This was the revolutionary and countervailing nationalism.

In the United States they chose isolationism after the Independence in order to build their own economy first and the fifth President Monroe, having an eye on Central and South America, manifested the non-interventionist policy against European powers. On the other hand, they had been eager to advance into the Pacific Ocean and East and South East Asia as the Commodore Perry came to Japan as early as in 1853. After the Civil War, they got into the real industrial revolution, acquired Cuba and the Philippines as colonies on the military victory over Spain and became, as an imperialist nation, similar to the European Big Powers. This was the isolationist and independent nationalism.

In contrast to these three, Germany was later than France in building a unified modern state and in starting its industrial revolution. In 1841 Friedrich List published his book where he emphasized a theory of national economy and productive forces against Adam Smith's theory of people's economy and exchange values (free trade) (List, 1841). Nevertheless, it was in the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century that the German economy began to develop rapidly under the strong leadership of Chancellor Bismarck from the top so as to modernize the whole nation. This was the first type of follow-up nationalism.

In Italy where a unified nation state was barely built with Rome as the capital in 1870, economic development and industrial revolution were disturbed by the North-South problems up until the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This was the second type of follow-up nationalism.

In Japan where a modern state was built with the problematical Constitution and Diet, industrial revolution was performed in the 1890s and the 1900's leaving most villages semi-feudal or pre-modern. Victories over China and Russia in the Wars fought in this period made impossible the leaders' and the people's cool-headed judgment on their long-term economic and military capabilities. The lucky position they got in World War I accelerated their ill-founded self confidence. This was the third type of follow-up nationalism.

Nowadays it is well-known how these three forms of follow-up nationalism were inflated and to what extent they damaged the world up to and in World War II.

## 2.6 Colonialism and Imperialism

More serious problems of nationalisms were that all the conflicts and wars among them accompanied colonization of the rest of the world and wars to re-divide those colonies. Comparing the ideas manifested in the declarations of human rights symbolizing citizens' revolutions with the realities of colonization of the most part of the world through so many wars by modern nation states, we must deliberately grasp as a whole the ambivalent processes of expansion of civil societies.

Portugal and Spain first launched the Great Voyages and made so many

colonies in the early stage. Holland followed them up. Yet, it is needless to say that furious scrambles for colonies since the 18<sup>th</sup> century were fought by major powers that succeeded in citizens' revolutions and in building nation states on the bases of these colonies. The top runner was obviously Great Britain.

In the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, desperate struggles between the nation states that had many and broad colonies like Britain and France, and those that would wedge themselves into them like Germany, Italy and Japan, were developed into even the World Wars to re-divide the whole world. The atomic bombs were invented at the end of World War II and the nuclear armaments race, especially between the United States and the Soviet Union, brought the humankind into the total destruction crises.

Why did citizens' revolutions, while extending civil societies all over the world, yield nationalisms, colonialisms and imperialisms so as to bring us, the humankind, into the extinction crises?

### 3. Bourgeois, Capitalism and Civil Societies

#### 3.1 Citizens as Bourgeois

Let us think again on the meaning of the word citizen. We have made sure that citizen is *shimin* in Japanese, *citoyen* or *bourgeois* in French and *Bürger* in German. The distinction between *citoyen* and *bourgeois* is also made in English between citizen and bourgeois and even in Japanese we make the same distinction between *shimin* and *burujoa* (bourgeois), while in German *Bürger* means both since there is only one word. In all these cases *shimin*, *citoyen* and citizen mean universal citizen.

Then, what kind of citizen does bourgeois mean? As seen in the last chapter, it was especially rich citizens that took the lead in committing the parliament and the state power on their way of development from the self-governing citizens. Since only their activities were visible for long, they were considered as both citizens and bourgeois in a terminology which made no distinction of them. However, as also seen in the last chapter, citizens of middle and lower strata became far from negligible in the processes of citizens' revolutions spreading from West Europe to all over the world.

This made it clear that it was rather middle class citizens who raised various industries and sold all kinds of merchandise to become rich and powerful in the citizenization processes of the world through nationalism, colonialism and imperialism. Since the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century one have come to call these industrialist and industrial capitalist citizens 'bourgeois' and 'bourgeoisie' as a class. Then, this also means that it was the bourgeoisie and their civil societies and nation states that swelled nationalisms based on citizens' revolutions, divided the rest of the world as their colonies and gave rise to the impe-

rialist wars in order to re-divide them.

For what reasons did all these happen?

### 3.2 Was Spirit of Capitalism First?

Capitalism is the bourgeois way or the way of bourgeoisie to do enterprises with their own money (private properties) and get margins (profits) in the market. Capitalist society is a society where their way has so deeply permeated that production and distribution of goods, services and information are done overwhelmingly by this way. And capitals are pronouns of individuals and corporations who do enterprises by the same way.

Capitals were at first overwhelmingly commercial ones. It was easier for the rich to buy goods with their own money and sell them in the market as more expensive as possible to gain profit margins. Yet, a society could not become rapidly affluent by this way, even if becoming more or less affluent because of circulations of goods, because real values were not increased. It was necessary for a society to become rapidly affluent that capitals began to produce goods, which had been produced in agriculture and handicraft, in organized ways, first in manufactures and increasingly in large factories equipped of more and more machines and that these products became to be sold by the same or similar capitals in similarly organized ways in a larger market.

The capitals, that came to do this, developed into industrial capitals and modern capitalism began to grow truly as industrial capitalism. There were arguments in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries in Germany on where and how modern capitalism had emerged. The 'Emancipation' theory contended that it was initiated in order to satisfy human needs and desires emancipated in Renaissance while the 'Asceticism' theory insisted that it was created by the people who came to take a rather strictly ascetic way of life influenced by Reformation. At first glance the former seems plausible, but it is commercial capitals that would try to do business for profits in simply responding to emerging demands. One would not be able to create only with any profit motives an entirely new way to produce goods by building factories, employing labor forces and introducing machines.

Concerning this, Max Weber pointed out that some Protestant sects influenced by Jean Calvin, who took reformative activities in Switzerland, made grow among the people a sort of ethos, *Ethos*, a very deep way of life permeated into its whole aspects (Weber, 1904-05). Calvinists were told that it had been predestined if one would be saved in the Last Judgment or not and that in order to ascertain one having been chosen one would have to pour one's entire energy into one's vocation, *Beruf*, although this word itself was created by Martin Luther. They thought that one's vocation should be the God's 'calling' and that one could get the confirmation of salvation by living in a strictly ascetic way to restrict individual needs and desires.

Thus, there emerged industrial capitalists who would not first consider on profits, would not spend margins in showy life even if blessed consequently, would do their best in their vocations and enterprises and would try to enlarge them by re-investing unexpected profits into them. Their life was strictly organized by asceticism. Needless to say, what would make a capital to live or die depended on if one could or not repeat one's production cycle again and again and if one could or not enlarge it through repetition in order to continue capital accumulation. Competition would be inevitable if capitals would want to survive in the market and this was more and more so for not commercial but industrial capitals since they had not only to sell general goods but to sell their own products. Competition should be fights with real swords.

These industrial capitals grew through the English Citizens' Revolutions and became strong enough to perform the Industrial Revolution from the later half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century on. And we can see there was the spread of Protestantism at the background even if only with fact that the English Revolutions were threaded through by Puritanism, one of the representative sects influenced by Calvinism. Cromwell as the leader of the Independents led the revolution to success by fighting even against the Presbyterians who were at the same position not to seek leadership outside their church, not to mention fighting against the Catholic and the Anglican that was in a sense similar to the former in taking Episcopalianism and Ceremonialism.

At a glance it seems that Weber defended the modern capitalism by explaining the spirit or ethos of the creators of the industrial capital. But the truth is the reverse. Weber's greatest point was to point out that the industrial capitalism, thus raised, came to bring about a huge 'Iron Cage' which would automatically develop toward profit seeking and capital accumulation so as to lose the early 'Spirit of Capitalism'.

So, was the spirit of capitalism first?

### 3.3 Capitalists Drawn by Capital Accumulation

Then, we need next another theory to explain the causes and processes why and how this huge mechanism of Iron Cage developed far and away over the intentions of the creators and has actually rapped all over the globe. Weber disliked Marxists saying like a formula that consciousness would not determine existence, but existence would define consciousness. Yet, even if agreeing with his theory of multi-determination, what we must call for here is Marx's theory.

Marx started to take up commodities which had been widely circulated with the development of capitalism and, not taking them for granted, tried to analyze historical and social relationships condensed in them (Marx, 1867-1894). In any society people must have started from direct exchange of a thing with another as was symbolized in a Japanese myth of a fisherman exchanging



fish with rabbits of a hunter (barter). Then money (G) was invented as a mediator and things became commodities (W) through exchanges mediated by money (W-G-W). Money was first a means to exchange, but it became the object to save as exchanges with money spread. This made it possible for one who saved money to buy something in order to sell them for margin profits. Primitive commercial capitals emerged in a society which young Marx (and Engels) called a 'civil society as a kitchen stove for history' (Marx & Engels, 1845-46).

However, as Weber also emphasized, this sort of capitalism in the widest sense was found everywhere in human societies since they had been civilized. The problem is when and how modern capitalism emerged and developed if we see from the Marxian standpoint. Inquiring into the British history where modern capitalism arose earlier than any other country, Marx found that capitals had been accumulated in such primitive ways as plunders from newly found overseas lands and enclosures for sheep to expel peasants in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century enclosures were enforced in a much larger scale under the law so that peasants moved to urban areas, where it became increasingly easier for industrial capitalists to do enterprises with increasingly cheaper labor forces. Thus, the commodification of labor forces as mass phenomena was rapidly promoted and this increased industrial capitalists who launched and developed various enterprises with commodified labor forces and means of production—factories, machines, raw materials, etc. which were also made easier as commodities to buy.

Commercial capitals used only to get margins by selling goods they bought with their own (and borrowed) funds (G-W-G', G'>G). Medieval craftsmen used to sell goods to which they had added their own labor, but margins were limited because added values were small due to very little division of labor (G-W-A-W'-G', G'>G). However, modern industrial capitals began to buy labor forces and means of production as commodities with their own (and increasingly borrowed) funds, produce commodities in increasingly enlarged factories with increasingly improved machines and gain huge margin profits by selling them in a continuously expanding market (G-W[A, Pm]-P-W'-G', G'>>G). On the other hand, workers in factories would have to work for at least contracted hours to get contracted wages as their employers would tell them to do. Nevertheless, net increased values or surplus values (M), left after deducting wages and the cost of means of production from gross increased values, should all go into the capitalists' hands (M=W'-W).

What Weber clarified is that even in these cases both capitalists and workers, who had deeply internalized the spirit of capitalism developed from the ethic of Protestantism, worked calmly under the imposed disciplines in order to ascertain the predestination of salvation by considering their vocations as the God's calling and that thus the Iron Cage of capitalist mechanism emerged

to swell infinitely like an automatically booming machine. However, since it was also true that on the one side of this Iron Cage was accumulated the huge wealth of successful capitalists while on the other were produced the mass of workers who could barely get along however hard to work, another theory should also be needed to explain this historic reality.

### 3.4 Capitalist Extension and Panic

Marx's theory on causes and processes of capitalist extension is like this. First, modern workers, the proletariat as a class, being liberated as 'free' humans through citizens' revolutions on the one hand while being made 'free' by confiscation of means of production such as land, farm implements, etc. on the other, were doomed to be 'free in a double sense' so as to be employed by anyone (capitalist) to survive and to desperately compete each other for it. On the other side, industrial capitalists, who would develop enterprises by employing workers, were also exposed to the market of labor forces and means of production as well as to that of their products as commodities so that they similarly had to continue to survive furious competitions with their fellow capitals.

In a country or a society, capitalist economy cannot get along unless exchanges between the first sector (the sector producing means of production) and the second sector (the sector producing consumer goods) is done smoothly, because the former cannot produce consumer goods while the latter means of production. If the total value of means of production ( $P_m$ ) of the first sector is  $C$  (constant capital because to be transferred not as increased to commodities), the total value of labor forces (A, wages)  $V$  (variable capital because to be transferred as increased to commodities) and the total surplus value through the production process ( $P$ )  $M$  (*Mehrwert* in German), the total value of the first sector in a term is  $C+V+M$ . Similarly, if each value of the second sector is  $c, v, m$  accordingly, the total value of the second sector in the same term is  $c+v+m$ . If workers spend all their wages to live and capitalists consume all their surplus values in their hands for life, luxury, etc, exchanges are necessary in that  $C=C$  within the first sector,  $v+m=v+m$  within the second sector and  $V+M=c$  between both sectors.

This is a case of simple reproduction or unchanged economy where the totality of values is not increased. Yet, in most cases capitalist economy rapidly or slowly extends (grows positively) or reduces (grows negatively), since some capitals in each sector invest a part of surplus values in their hands into the next cycle of production while the others diminish investment or even retreat from their enterprises in the next cycle. Then, formulae of balances within the first sector, within the second and between both become increasingly complicated. These are formulae of capitalist reproduction process and, in order to continue making these formulae realized, there must be any agency which constantly watches the whole processes of reproduction in a societal scale and

coordinates various capitals or enterprises in each sector and between both. However, in a liberalist capitalism individual capitals used to behave on their own different intentions to increase their profits in the first, the second or between both sectors and there was entirely no coordinating agency because the state should be a 'night watch state' to simply control robbers and any other criminals not to be rampant. Adam Smith expected the 'invisible hand' to coordinate the market since he believed that capitalists would not behave only on their own profit motives because sympathy should be naturally gifted to all humans (Smith, 1759). This was an unbelievable wishful thinking in view of the whole processes of industrial revolution and after.

In this sense capitalist economy is basically anarchical. Therefore, if various exchanges are not smoothly done, some commodities are over-supplied while others under-supplied against demands and then some enterprises become bankrupt so that some capitalists fall down into proletariat while many workers lose jobs to be turned adrift. As far as these cases are sporadic, they may be barely got through. Yet, if problems are accumulated, they explode at a point of time into a panic. After these panics were repeated, the greatest one exploded at Wall Street, New York, in 1929 and extended to all over the world.

### 3.5 Imperialism and World Wars

However, before reaching this Great Panic, capitalism already experienced more miserable explosion of its contradictions. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century major capitalist nations other than Britain got into industrial revolutions like France, the United States, Germany, Japan etc. and after the middle of this century monopolization and oligopolization of capitals were gradually or rapidly promoted in these major capitalist countries. Surviving cutthroat competitions, only a small number of great capitals came to promote monopoly and oligopoly in terms of cartels, trusts and conglomerates, enclose not only internal but also overseas markets including colonies and try exclusively to control them with backups of their states and nationalist ideologies. These were imperialisms accused by Kōtoku Shusui (a Japanese socialist executed in the frame-up of High Treason in 1910), John A. Hobson, Vladimir I. Lenin, and others as soon as the 20<sup>th</sup> century began.

Kōtoku's theory can be evaluated as the first critique of imperialism, although insufficient yet as a theory of political economy. Hobson's theory influenced European and other theoreticians since being substantial as built based on his experiences of South African War as the first imperialist one (Hobson, 1902). In the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century controversies emerged among German theoretical leaders on the basis of the Social Democratic Party that had been rapidly growing among the people. Karl Kautsky as influential as the most orthodox Marxist, considering imperialism as expressions of 'world policy'

which big capitals forcing their state to take, contended that there would be possibilities of political compromises among major capitalist states even on territorial re-division of the world (Kautsky, 1913-14). On the contrary, Rosa Luxemburg re-examined Marx's theory of capital accumulation or capitalist reproduction written in *The Capital*, insisted to have found that capitalism would inevitably go out of its homeland to seek alien customers because of the impossibility of repeated capitalist reproduction within a country due to the continuous pauperization of internal workers, and considered imperialism as its expressions (Luxemburg, 1913).

It was Lenin who concluded this controversy with a theory which was most persuasive in the context of world situations at that time. Making skillful use of Hobson's critique and applying an Austro-Marxist Hilferding's theory of finance capital (Hilferding, 1910), he argued that there would be stages of capitalist development and that imperialism would be inevitable on the stage of monopoly, especially dominated by finance capitals, though this not being generally maintainable in other stages such as that of free competition (ЛЕНИН, 1917a). In other words, he contended that a world war for its territorial re-division would be inevitable, contrary to possible compromises that Kautsky had expected, because it would be crucial for major capitalist nations on the monopoly stage to get hold of more territories including more colonies, although being unable to insist, as Rosa did, that capitalism theoretically could not but go abroad to seek customers.

When Lenin published this theory of 'Imperialism as the Last Stage of Capitalism', World War I was already in the final phase and he was successful to actually inaugurate Russian Revolution with another theory on 'State and Revolution' (ЛЕНИН, 1917b). Tsarist Russia as the 'weakest ring' of the imperialist world ruling system had left only a few steps to collapse. Then, in this situation his theory and strategy was beautifully applied that the revolution would succeed if the vanguard party rather than the proletariat themselves capture the state power militarily and politically through transforming 'Imperialist War into Civil One' since theoretically the state would be from the beginning only a means of dictatorship of the ruling class.

### 3.6 Colonies as the Real Lead from the Beginning?

Today we can have a cool view to whatever extent since we know what kind of fate the gigantic state, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, have taken. Yet, World War II was also a series of imperialist wars to re-divide the world between the Allied Powers (the Haves) and the Axis Powers (the Have-Nots). And Lenin and his major followers such as Stalin, Mao Zedong, and others exercised great influences for thirty to forty years since in this War the Soviet Union had gained victory with such democratic nations as Britain, France and the United States, so as to promote the continual birth of socialist

nations in East Europe, East Asia and Cuba.

Then, if we liberate ourselves from these influences and reexamine the history of civil societies as 'societies led by bourgeois' or 'capitalist societies' from a moderate viewpoint of citizens, we will say the following:

First, in the world after World War II, cooperation rather than confrontation came to prevail among major capitalist (ex-imperialist or even new imperialist) nations, firstly because they had to counter together the Soviet Union as the Super Power and secondly because too big gaps of power were made between the United States as another Super Power and the other major capitalist nations whether victory ones like Britain and France or defeated ones like Germany, Italy and Japan. And, as this has been looking true even since Russia began to become 'capitalist' after the collapse of Soviet and East-European socialist regimes, it seems that Kautsky's theory of imperialism is ironically most adequate to the present situation in that it emphasizes possibilities to compromise each other. Yet, this does not mean that his theory will be really useful in analyzing the *status quo* of world capitalism, but on the contrary we need an entirely new theory which boldly sublates Lenin's and others' theories of imperialism. We citizens now have to wrestle with problems of 'dependence' of advanced capitalist nations on the Super Power and with problems of 'Empire', a new world ruling system in the age of globalization (Hardt & Negri, 2000).

Secondly, is it not more urgent and more important to point out that the colonies have been the real lead from the beginning in the history of world capitalism? The spirit of capitalism that Weber clarified is of course important. The mechanism of primitive accumulation and extended reproduction of capitals that Marx explored is also indispensable. However, as the greatest premises for all these, there were the Great Voyages of European nations through which they plundered and exploited uncountable treasures and goods in Asia and especially in American continents so as to make new markets in Britain and neighbor regions of West Europe. Without these riches there would have been no places where the Spirit of Capitalism functioned to consequently build the swelling huge Iron Cage of continuous capital accumulations (Wallerstein, 1974). In this sense, is what Rosa Luxemburg said just before World War I, that capitalism could not continue its reproduction in its own territory but go out of it to seek alien customers, true at least as historical facts even though being inadequate as a consistent theory of capital accumulation?

In order to answer these questions we then have to reexamine the history of civil societies from points of view of workers and colonized peoples.

## References

Anderson, B., 2006, *Imagined Communities: reflections the origin and spread of*

- nationalism*, rev. & enl. ed., Verso.
- Fromm, E., 1941, *Escape from Freedom*, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Hardt, M. & Negri, A., 2000, *Empire*, Harvard University Press.
- Hechter, M., 1975, *Internal colonialism : the Celtic fringe in British national development, 1536-1966*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975, University of California Press, 1999, with a new introduction and a new appendix by the author, Transaction Publishers.
- Hilferding, R., 1910, *Das Finanzkapital*, 1973, Europäische Verlagsans.
- Hobson, J. A., 1902, *Imperialism: a study*, James Nisbet.
- Kautsky, K. J., 1913-14, „Der Imperialismus“, *Neue Zeit*, Jg.32, Bd.II.
- Ленин, В.И., 1917а, *Империализм, как высшая стадия капитализма, Полное собрание сочинений*, 5 из., 27, 1962.
- Ленин, В.И., 1917б, *Государство и революция, Полное собрание сочинений*, 5 из., том 33. 1964.
- List, F., 1841, *Das nationale System der politischen Ökonomie*, 1950, Verlag von Gustav Fischer.
- Luxemburg, R., 1913, *Akkumulation des Kapitals : ein Beitrage zur ökonomischen Erklärung des Imperialismus*, 1969, Verlag Neue Kritik.
- Maruyama, M., 1969, *Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics*, ed. by I. Morris, expanded ed., Oxford University Press.
- Marx, K. & Engels, F., 1845-46, *Die deutsche Ideologie*, Marx-Engels Werke 3, Dietz, 1958.
- Marx, K., 1867-1894, *Das Kapital*, Bd.1,1867, Bd.2,1885, Bd.3,1894, 1962-64, Marx-Engels Werke 23-25, Dietz.
- Payne, T., 1776. *Common Sense, 1894, The Writings of Thomas Payne*, vol. I, G. P. Punam's Sons.
- Quesnay, F., 1758, *Tableau économique*, 1766, *Formule du Tableau économique*, 1969, *Tableau économique des physiocrats*, Calmann-Lévy.
- Rousseau, J. J., 1762, *Du contrat social; ou principes du droit politique*, Chez Marc Michel Rey.
- Saint-Simon, H. de, 1823-24, *Cathéchisme politique des industriels*, 1966, *Œuvres de Claude-Henri Saint-Simon*, tome 4, Editions Anthropos.
- Smith, A., 1759, *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, New ed. 1853, London: Henry G. Bohn.
- Smith, A., 1776, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, New ed., 1822, London, Ed. by W. Playfair, Intro. by W. Rees-Mogg, 1995, William Pickering.
- Wallerstein, I., 1974, *The Modern World System: capitalist agriculture and the European world economy in the sixteenth century*, The Academic Press.
- Weber, M., 1904-05, *Die protestantische Ethik und der "Geist" des Kapitalismus*, 1920, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, Bd. I, 5. Aufl., 1963.