

Economic System and Distributive Rules : An Introduction

—the direction and analytical viewpoint of
modern distributive rules—

HIROTO TSUKADA

Contents:

Introduction

1 Subjective factors

2 Objective factors

Conclusion

Introduction

Distributive structure is one of the main economic problems in any society. In order for a society to exist as one, there must be established the kind of distributive structure of labour and product among social constituents (here used as humans) stable enough to make possible the endurance of the society for a certain period¹⁾. In this sense, humans living in a modern economic and social structure are at the same time

1) Here, "distributive structure" is used both in the meanings of how it is and how humans of their age "think" it should be or change. In this paper, emphasis is put more on the latter.

living in a distributive structure which has certain characteristics. The content of distributive structure and its change affect each of the social constituents deeply. This grave significance of distributive structure has made people fight or cooperate among themselves in history for advantageous structural change for oneself. We have to keep paying attention to the possibility of improvement and change of such distributive structure which gives so much influence upon humans.

Generally, there not only exist various kinds of distributive structure together, but also a rule in the direction of change, such as from feudalistic one to that of civil society²⁾. And even if there should not exist such a general changing rule, it is clear that such a distributive structure can be changed according to the change of social constituents' will. How can such a change be brought forth? How should social constituents of today can change it or why should they change it? To answer these questions, it is first of all necessary to extract the factors that make change distributive structure and to make clear how they act there.

In social reform, if we could fix the reforming direction, humans could put all of their efforts in realizing that direction. But the starting

2) Here it is supposed that distributive structure or from a broader point of view, the changing procedure of economic system is as follows. At one point in history, a strong part of social constituents reaches to the stage where they come to have the will to change distributive structure or distributive rule by violence or by the force of democratic majority. The reasons for such movement are nothing except for a change of productive power and a change of social constituents' prospects of life pattern following that. The result is up to the negotiations among social constituents who try to take advantage of this change. Generally, where plural interest groups propose different distributive structures as best, the "power" relations among them will decide the changing direction.

point to find out what to be reformed or the reforming direction, is usually the most difficult.

After civil society was founded, this question has been referred to for example in Locke's theory of ownership restriction, in Smith's co-existence of contradictory issues of labour value and distribution according to ownership, in Marx's denial of exploitation and private ownership and in Keynes's negative attitude toward inheritance succession³⁾. The object of the question there would after all be distributive structure or distributive rule of resources and products.

3) John Locke, "Two Treatises of Government", Hafner Publishing Company, 1969, sections 31-51. "The same law of nature that does by this means give us property does also bound that property, too... But how far has he given it us? To enjoy. As much as any one can make use of to any advantage of life before it spoils, so much he may by his labour fix a property in; whatever is beyond this is more than his share, and belongs to others." "property in that [the earth] , too, is acquired as the former. As much land as a man... can use the product of, so much is his property." (p.136) Following this, Locke says under such conditions inequality in private property did not occur, but since the invention of money, surplus products became possible to be accumulated and people came into endless competition for the acquisition of land and so on, which enlarged inequality. (pp.137-146) Against such progress, Locke does not describe clear criticism or countermeasures, but it seems to me that the way he argues this problem, for example the usage of such words as "a disproportionate and unequal possession of the earth" (p.145) or more than anything else former argument for the restriction of private property, shows it clear that this is a problem to be solved. Concerning this point, Masayasu Yoshizawa offers a different interpretation of Locke's argument that Locke admits the enlargement of unequal land ownership. ("Gendai Keizai Taiseiron". ["Modern Economic Systems"] , McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1988, p. 20.) Adam Smith "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations", Randam House, Inc., 1937, Book I, chapters 5, 6. Karl Marx, "Das Kapital", Erster Band, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1962, Siebenter Abschnitt, Vierundzwanzigstes Kapitel, 7, Geschichtliche Tendenz der kapitalistischen Akkumulation. J. M. Keynes, "The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money", Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1936, 373-374.

Among them, it is Marx who has drawn out the changing distributive structure itself in phased changes in an effort to try to understand it in evolutionary development. But the interpretation of the phased changes drawn out there is based upon nothing more than the extraction and interpretation of some of the factors for change of that particular age. From today's point of view when a century has passed since then and those factors have changed both in items and contents, these interpretations wouldn't provide effective analysis concrete enough for today. So we must note that the question of distributive structure is one that changes according to environmental conditions and one that must be repeatedly asked from age to age. The thoughts from Locke to Marx are thus not judged effective enough for every stage of civil society. And since entering 20th century, this has not necessarily been dealt with as a prime subject for a long time. But recently, evoked by the appearance of Rawls's theory, questions of this field have aroused again vast interest concerning the proposed 'justice as fairness'⁴⁾.

4) John Rawls. "A Theory of Justice", 1971, Harvard Univ. Press. In Japan also argument on this matter has recently become very lively. In its 1979 annual meeting, the Japan Economic Policy Association has taken up the question of efficiency and fairness as the main topic.

About the reasons why after 1970s', economists' interest has been aroused so much on this matter, see its annual report (published in 1980), pp. 1-2. Also, as an overview of the studies of this field including those of Japan, see, for example, Kazumi Kurokawa's survey, "On Arguments on Efficiency and Fairness" (ibid.). Yuichi Shionoya, who made a report in J.E. P.A.'s 36th meeting, published "Kachirinen-no-kozo" ["The Structure of The Idea of Value"] in 1985 (Toyokeizai-shinpo-sha book co.) and argues in detail on fair distribution, whose study has been delayed compared to other themes of economics, efficient allocation of resources. In his report, he argues that "it has been the ruling idea since 1930s that comments on distributive justice must be eliminated. . . On the contrast, today's recognition of this problem is that we have to take up the question of distributive

Why is it that we have witnessed such an active argument in such forms recently? One of the fundamental reasons is the strengthened subjectivity of each social constituent which is expressed as the progress of political democracy brought about during these several centuries in civil society, and another is that the modern form of objective conditions for existence of each individual brought about by the progress of productive power has made it necessary for each one to reconsider the distributive structure for assuring each subject's own existence.

It can be said that the factors that change or formulate distributive structure can be divided in subjective and objective ones. As distribu

justice in some form" (ibid. p. 7). Here he describes clearly that the heart of the problem of efficiency and fairness exists in distributive justice. His answer to this question seems in a sense similar with that of Rawls. (cf. "The Structure -".) He says that social fundamental goods necessary for achieving one's purpose of life set by oneself should be the objects of distributive rules and that this is the standpoint of right theory. And Rawls says distribution should be carried out according to his famous distributive principles containing difference principle. But the very problem is why and to what degree these goods should be distributed under the name of 'right'.

Rawls explains this by veil of ignorance, but as far as he stands on such unrealistic premise, his conclusion can not necessarily be applied to the real conditions with full force. On this question of "why", some consideration is given in this paper in the form of extracting the objective fields concerning this problem.

It may be better to add that the fact that the problem of distribution has come to be regarded important recently is beginning to lead to the idea of possible change of framework of economic theories. There, detached from the way of thinking that exchange economy should be the main object framework of economic analysis, a new way of thinking that non-exchange economy is also important and should be included in the analysis is being proposed. There is pointed that not only pure exchange economy but also voluntary and compulsory transfer economy has come to be a bigger object to be studied in the real economy. K. E. Boulding's idea of grants economy and Paul A. Samuelson's frequent emphasis after 1970's on the importance of "free lunch" are part of this trend. (K. E. Boulding, "Economics as a

tive structure occupies the major part of human social behaviour, its content is naturally regulated by the motive of human social behaviour. This is the problem of subjective factors. The other problem, the existence of objective factors is that the realised form of such subjective motive is restricted by objective outer conditions. The above described recent vivified argument of distributive question seems to reflect the change of these factors or the growth of these factors to be questioned. In the following, the items and objects to be questioned of the content of these factors for the change in these two fields will be clarified, which is the major theme of this paper. And in addition to it, a supplementary consideration will be given to how these factors will restrict the changing direction of future distributive structure.

1 Subjective Factors—Motives of Social Behaviours

That humans act socially means they come into distributive relations with others. Their purpose is just like other living subjects, the attainment of self existence and breeding of one's self⁵⁾. This is not at all

Science", McGraw-Hill, 1970. "Redistribution to the Rich and the Poor, the Grants Economics of Income Distribution", Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1972. Boulding, "The Economy of Love and Fear, A Preface to Grants Economics", Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1973. Boulding ed., "The Economics of Human Betterment", Macmillan Press Ltd., 1984. Paul A. Samuelson and William D. Nordhaus, "Economics", 12th ed., MacGraw-Hill, 1985. Samuelson, "Economics from the Heart", Thomas Horton and Daughters, 1983.) This field of study is however only at its beginning and the main task of "why" is yet to remain unanswered.

5) Such "biological" understanding has naturally been placed as the starting point of orthodox economics. cf. Adam Smith, "the two great purposes of nature, the support of the individual and the propagation of the species" ("The Theory of Moral Sentiments", ed. by D. D. Raphael and A. L. Macfie, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1976, p. 87).

different for humans who seemingly act in a quite more complex way than other animals.

Although the fundamental purposes remain whenever the same, the concretely demanded distributive structure from age to age by each one varies according to the change of concrete forms of "daily life". For example, in primitive ages the content of demanded "life" was little more than living like animals. But today what is demanded is one with a modern certain "height of culture". The significance of this age-culture standard is so big that humans feel despair when that height is not reached. In this sense, although the attainment of "one's existence and breeding" is a fundamental motive or purpose, we must understand the changing content of the demands of each age in its characteristic forms for each age.

2 Objective Factors—Environment or Conditions for Behaviours

What constitute objective environment as environmental conditions consists of what given to humans and what humans have made. These regulate the realized forms of subjective motive of former section. Here we consider on some of these conditions which have to do with social science. The factors that affect humans' choice of distributive structure seem to be three, subject deciding distribution, distributive object and distributive rules. Following are the internal factors these three have.

1) Subject deciding distribution--its content and changing direction

① subject recognition--from individual to group

② voluntary degree--from compulsion to consent

2) Distributive object--its content and changing direction

① the change of object's content--from product to resources

② causes of the change--Marx's theory and the development of productive force

a) Marx's theory

b) the development of productive force:weakening of the rule of distribution to ownership

3) Modern distributive rules--main changing direction (=direction "toward equality") and factors that regulate it

① changing direction--equality "of certain degree"-

② causes of the change

a) causes for the change to equality

b) regulative factors for the degree of equality

α) subjective recognition--enlargement of self

i) development of division of labour

ii) enlargement of contact with others caused by the development of division of labour

iii) the appearance of problems demanding cooperation caused by the development of division of labour

β) change of the recognition of fairness: the strengthening of the rule of distribution to work

γ) change to strengthening mutual security: the strengthening of the rule of distribution to needs

1) Subject deciding distribution--its content and changing direction

Distributive relationship is decided through negotiation of plural humans. Recognition of subject and degree of voluntary degree will affect the distributive content decided gravely.

① Subject recognition--from individual to group

The human that becomes the object or purpose of each individual in the consideration of distribution is of course oneself, but that self is not a perfectly isolated one. In any age, the understanding of "oneself" usually and naturally contained his (or hers, the same below) families. And sometimes it was understood to be a category containing broader people like distant relatives, friends and weak ones, so forth. And the development of society based on division of labour has enlarged the unit of behaviour for the subjects who have identical interest from blood relation groups to territorial groups and furthermore to economic interest groups. As the last one is not bounded by territorial space, an individual can belong to various interest groups at the same time.

One significant example of the enlargement of this category is the understanding of class groups as major subjects judged by the ownership of means of production. And furthermore, "social welfare" or a subject category enlarged to social constituents in general of a country wide has come to exist, tacitly or apparently. But, to think about distributive structure or rule by enlarging the scale of one's own group to a country wide unit has not taken root as deep as the thinking by smaller economic group unit as classes. Anyway, the problem here, it seems, is that it is not answered yet clearly or still remains vague why such subject recognition by group unit is born or how much we demand the enlargement of group thought or self recognition⁶⁾.

6) The solution of this problem will be a help not only to understand how distributive structure itself exists in general but also to the study of the direction of welfare spending which is a big issue today. The fundamental questions of social welfare, that are what is social welfare, how much spending we admit, or how much welfare payment we would wish to receive, cannot be answered without clear understanding of how social

② Voluntary degree--from compulsion to consent

Whether a deciding subject is forced to obey a distributive structure or he can take part in the process of deciding it and can consider the content as the object to be given mutual consent will regulate the changing direction of the content of that structure. The latter, decision by consent, should be worth the name of a distributive 'rule'.

Historically, the general changing direction can be said to be from the former to the latter, so to speak the flow toward democratic construction of distributive rules.

Supposing it right to understand the words of distributive rules as the result given by social constituents when they participate in the deciding process on equal positions, it is after civil society was established that such phenomenon appeared. Until the end of feudal age, although distributive relations had long been under the name of contract as protection and compensation for it between lords as landowners and serfs, it was really a compulsory one because the serfs had no freedom to end it. And after entering civil society, the right to participate in decision of distributive relations, although was enlarged compared to the preceding age, was for a long time restricted to a little amount of social constituents.

But in this new society, that right kept expanding and now in almost every country all adult people have come to hold it. Such expanding of participating right works as a big factor to regulate the content of decided distributive structure. So, to know the content and the changing

distributive structure is to change. On the problem that how the self recognition of a subject who gives or receives social welfare affects the content of welfare, see Michiko Inukai, "Yoropa-no-kokoro", ("The Heart of Europe"), Iwanami Book Co., 1991, pp. 232-233.

direction of distributive structure, it becomes important to make clear the interest of the mutual-interest majority group and how their will can really converge as an united one⁷⁾.

2) Distributive Object--its content and changing direction

The change of content of distributive object also affects the content of change of distributive structure or rules. Distributive object is usually called wealth or goods.

① the change of object's content--from product to resources

First we have to recognize the big change really occurring in the understanding of distributive object. In a word, it is the flow from private distribution of products to collective resource-product distribu-

7) Concerning the possibility of forming one, unanimous consent, let's refer to the general possibility theorem of K. J. Arrow. He proposed a theorem that it is impossible for social constituents to choose one social system through democratic procedure. ("Social Choice and Individual Values", New York: Wiley, 1st ed., 1951.) It is argued that when there are at least three social alternatives, there does not exist any social aggregation rule which satisfies four axioms or loose enough conditions such as unrestricted domain, Pareto principle, independence of irrelevant alternatives, non-dictatorship. (ibid., chapters 3 and 4.) As fundamental premises, he places individual's ordinal number preference table and social alternatives of more than three, and then sets the question of making the social preference table. The setting of an ordinal preference table means the comparison of welfare among individuals should not be approved. But this setting must be accused of its unrealistic nature which is quite different from the real aggregating rules chosen and working in the real democratic society. Namely. in modern democratic society, people's choice is done through majority rules. First, each one's welfare is supposed to be comparable in the shape of one equal vote there.

tion. Here resources means natural resources necessary for securing one's own existence. It includes outer resources and inner resources which is one's born-with capacity. The distributive object at issue since civil society was established till 19th century was, except for the land redistribution from old rulers to new ones in its beginning, was not this resources but restricted to income as product. That means even in the beginning of civil society, the redistribution of land or the most important outer resources of that age was not decided as the result of distributive procedure decided fairly by that large number of social constituents who participated in the social reform, but was decided by the advantageous leading people of reform of that age⁸⁾. The distribution of that land which had been owned by the old ruling class and was

Second, the number of alternatives for individuals is not more than three but two there. The real aggregating procedure of choosing one from many is really a choice between the chosen one and the others. We do not adopt the procedure to choose plural alternatives and order them, but we are satisfied enough with such 'one choice' system. Take, for example, the selection of representatives. Voters do not select plural representatives in order at a time. He chooses only one. As a result, the aggregation procedure is only to compare the total votes for each candidate like the following.

voters	votes won for candidates A~C		
	A	B	C
①	1		
②		1	
③	1		
total	2	1	0

When it is agreed that each vote has the same weight, -and it is the way in modern democratic aggregating method-, choice is done without difficulty. If we could suppose the setting of the argument like this, we do not worry about the possibility of the existence of rules and can proceed to the question of the content of rules.

8) The dividing pattern differed in countries. Let's refer to the example of England here. That fief of king and lords on king's side confiscated was sold to the leaders of the new government and their parties. There, the old

taken away from them by the newly established society or government was not decided by the consent of the social constituents as a whole.

But under the stage of growth of self recognition at that age, that dividing situation was on the whole quite normal. People were on the stage where they only started to think about 'equality of humans' in general under the influence of the Renaissance, the recovery of civil equality thought of in the ancient times and the teaching of everyone's equality under God by religious reformation then. For those who had endured to live through the long feudalistic human relations, that field where they could demand equality in concrete form was only where their endurance against inequality or oppression reached almost to the limit and such a field was only a small one. Of course, even then, it was not so hard to talk about abstract category of equality as a direction as abstracted as desirable direction generally from concrete examples. But to adopt it to the fields which did not grow big enough to threaten

peasantry system was left untouched. (Kazutoshi, Kato, "Jiyuu-to Seigio -Motomete-'Winstanley and English Civil Revolution'", ("Searching for Freedom and Justice-'Winstanley and English Civil Revolution'"), Koyo -Shuppan book co., 1990, p.30.) Winstanley, who worked for communal ownership of land, given the revelation of God, had following thought. Humans are made equal by God. No ruling relationship is there. But there occurred selfish mind in them and so the private ownership of land and rules for others after that. Puritanrevolution did not solve the problem. And he argues that although people made a contract to get rid of the King, his power is only transferred to those who have no more claim on it than themselves, and as a result, a great amount of people must suffer hardship under others' rule. So, it becomes necessary to abolish private ownership of land and make it communal, then this hostile relationship would disappear. (see, *ibid.*)

He pointed at the field of the problem, but never succeeded in pointing at the cause and curing measures. Namely, the deep root of this problem is the occurrence of human selfish mind according to him. But why did it occur? Curing measures won't be found as far as this question remains unanswered.

ones' existence, or where the difficulty only started in new form -even if it was an important field of distributive system of product or resources-, was not yet their revealed task because of the underdevelopment of their motivation and thereby no-consideration of the reforming direction was yet needed. This way, the resources distribution at the starting point was decided under the 'democratic' decision within the small leading stratum. Some of those who couldn't join this procedure spoke against this result and of land distribution among more broader stratas, but they remained minority and couldn't affect the distributive direction then⁹⁾.

But under the development of civil society, as the labour class movement, cheered by socialist thought of 19th century and their status strengthened by the result of effective demand policy aimed at full employment in twentieth century led by Keynes's theory, developed the content of democracy both in political and economic right, it has come to be agreed that the demand in the field of product could become demand in a reform in the distributive procedure of concerned resources if necessary and such reform in this direction can really happen¹⁰⁾.

9) cf. the movement of Winstanley, note (8).

10) For example, according to Weimar constitution of 1919, article 153, it is said that ownership is accompanied by obligation, and exercising that right must also serve to public welfare at the same time. Article 156, Reich can by law adopt public confiscation to private enterprise suited for socialization into social, communal ownership by compensation. In France in 1936, and in the United States in 1937, too, it was made clear that property ownership could be restricted for public purpose. (cf. Yozo, Watanabe. "Zaisankenron", ("On Property Ownership", Hitotsubu-sha book co., 1985, pp.73-81.) Also the high rate of inheritance tax would be included in this movement.

- ② causes of the change —Marx's theory and the development of productive power

As to what urged the change in recognition from product to resources, we can think of two factors: first, Marx's theory of original accumulation and the theory of surplus value and second, the weakening trend of the rule of distribution according to ownership accompanied by the development of productive power.

a) Marx's theory

Marx talks of inevitable change of capitalistic distributive structure both in product and resources in his theory. There seem to be two theories to urge people's understanding for institutional change; theory of original accumulation and theory of surplus value. They state the unduly capitalistic contract relationship both in its beginning and circulation process inside and also try to show the inevitability of the relationships, that is the inevitability of the change of distributive structure of both in product and resources as the result of labour class's hardship in their existence and their inevitable growth as an identical interest group. Here is discussed the problem of the recognition of unduly relationship above.

The theory of original accumulation points at government's interference with violence at the starting point of the institutions of civil society and thereby proposes a question to the righteousness of present inequal distributive structure. And as such, it forms an inner factor to an institutional reform. But it must be pointed at that this point at issue is countervailed by Marx's own understanding of social development.

According to it, the flow from feudal institutions to capitalistic ones and to socialistic ones is inevitable because of the corresponding development stage of productive power. That means what is necessary is not the consideration of the starting point but its direction, that is how the development of productive power makes the change of social structure inevitable. Understood like this, the theory of original accumulation is supposed to be ineffective as a reforming force.

The theory of surplus value argues the problem to be solved exists as far as employment relationship exists, and as such should be the main object to be considered today. Concerning the origin of value argued in surplus value theory, there is an contrasting utility value theory. Whether surplus value theory is proved right among other different theories is an issue of course, but this theory has another problem even if its propriety should be proved. That is the question of possibility of choice of exploitative system based upon surplus value by the majority people after enough, prudent consideration.

This is a question possibly brought about even in a society where the majority is labour class. At first sight, this argument seems contradictory to the interest of labour class itself, but it is not necessarily so. What is important in consideration of this question is the minimum standard of living and the possible mobility of people between the rich and the poor strata. When both are high enough, wouldn't there be born the possibility that the social constituents approve and choose such a society with its exploitative nature? To approve is meant here to choose such a structure on purpose. As can be seen, in such a society, the risk to go "down" exists but is small and the possibility to go "up" is big. Of course, as there still is admitted exploitation, those positioned in low strata wouldn't get "just" reward in the sense of being worth with one's

exercised labour. But if such expectation is satisfactory enough that he choose it as his own survival or life strategy, it would be very possible that such would be the social choice consciously. Of course it should be noted that such is a survival strategy under certain conditions, and would disappear faced by better alternatives. To probe this possibility of today in relation to the two conditions (=down and up) would be necessary in the consideration of the direction of modern distributive structure.

- b) the development of productive force: weakening of the rule of distribution to ownership

Another factor that enlarged the object of distribution to resources seems to be the division of labour brought about by the development of productive power. On the first stage of productive power in the beginning of civil society, almost all of the basic goods for living were secured by self-supporting. In such a condition, to secure resources like land was necessary for securing the minimum existence of oneself (including of course families and so forth unconsciously and customaly). Here, too, those two fundamental terms of survival and breeding of oneself regulate the minimum human acts as the purpose of human behaviours. To act to satisfy them was all and self-supporting was the rule then.

But under the high productive power developed afterwards, division of labour is what counts and it has become decisively important how to connect various necessary resources and exchange the products. There, to secure land and ability of self-supporting becomes insufficient for securing high standard of existence and breeding possible in that society. What's needed there is not an isolated self-supporting, isolated

private ownership or use of resources but a cooperative, social use of them based on division of labour outside the frame of private ownership or use. This provides better lives for individuals who own resources privately, too. What is necessary is not only fair distribution or fair exchange of products of participators according to private ownership, but also cooperative use of resources including land for enlarging the object of distribution, the products. This change becomes a power to bring about a direction of distributive change to add resources distribution to the object .

3) Modern distributive rules--main changing direction (direction "toward equality") and factors that regulate it

① changing direction--equality of "certain degree"

Whether the object of distribution is product or resource, it seems undeniable that distributive structure or rule is advancing toward strengthening equality in civil society generally. It is expressed in enacting the guarding laws for laborers and weak people in society accompanying the development of political democracy and also in enforcing progressive income tax rate. But what is not clear in spite of such real trend is why it happens and how far it goes.

② causes of the change

a) causes of the change to equality

The most general, fundamental reason for this change is the change in the strategy for securing survival according to the change in environment, that is change from securing that through individualistic means

to that through collective ones. The reason for that starts from the recognition that high living standard secured now has been made impossible to attain through isolated individual high ability because of the development of productive power. To keep high productive power of this collective cooperation, displaying each one's high ability is inevitable. And it is clear from the long experience of inefficiency of compulsory labour since classical ages that one can display his highest ability when he is placed in a voluntary position. Also it is clear that as humans have "Hobbesian equality"¹¹⁾, under compulsory labour there exists for the ruling ones the largest danger of survival, endless possibility of riot from the ruled. To evade it, realising peaceful cooperation, raising voluntary degree of each participator, strengthening the direction of distribution according to ability are necessary. Also certain strengthening the direction of distribution to the weak without labour

11) In the former half of 17th century, Hobbes emphasized the equality of humans' ability. This equality should be taken to regulate the content of social relationships, or support the original relationship of equal treatment of everyone in deciding rules. According to Hobbes, "Nature hath made men so equall, in the faculties of body, and mind; as that though there be found one man sometimes manifestly stronger in body, or of quicker mind then another; yet when all is reckoned together, the difference between man, and man, is not so considerable, as that one man can thereupon claim to himselfe any benefit, to which another may not pretend, as well as he. For as to the strength of body, the weakest has strength enough to kill the strongest, either by secret machination, or by confederacy with others. . . / And as to the faculties of the mind, . . . I find yet a greater equality amongst-men. . ." (Thomas Hobbes, "Leviathan", BPCC Hazell books Ltd., 1985, p.183.) There can occur struggles, but "The Passions that encline men to Peace, are Feare of Death; Desire of such things as are necessary to commodious living; and a Hope by their Industry to obtain them, And Reason suggesteth convenient Articles of Peace, upon which men may be drawn to agreement. These Articles, are they, which otherwise are called the Lawes of Nature. . ." (ibid., p.188)

ability will work for ameliorating future anxiety. In this way, the development of productive power and social production would affect the direction to be realized in distributive structure.

b) regulative factors for the degree of equality

Given the above as premises, to be studied is the degree of distributive equality to happen. If what we've reached at present stage is the direction of certain degree of equal distribution, clarifying the 'optimal' level of this "degree" on this stage should be our present task. But the problem of how to realize equality in this field has long been dealt with as one to be left to be decided by majority in political field and such a question as if there should be any law in the content of purpose and the direction of change, and to what direction, why, and how far does it proceed seem to have been paid little attention to so far¹²⁾.

As to the factors to decide the degree of equalization, we can think of the degree of growth of self-recognition, our view of justice and the recognition of mutual security at present.

α) subjective recognition--enlargement of self

In order to consider the changing recognition of present distributive rules, it is necessary to examine the fundamental factor of want for self-

12) But the reality keeps changing and pulls us ahead. Recent changes are characterized in such arguments of restricting welfare or self-help which seems to stand against the certain equalization tried so far. Such urge us to reconsider the founding reasons, direction and degree of the trend of equalization which seemed to be accepted tacitly and hereby demands us fundamental consideration of this problem.

survival as the fundamental purpose (referred to in 1 and 2,1),^①) and how the enlargement movement of "self" understanding born there develop under modern conditions.

As a species of animals or more fundamentally as lives, humans have in one hand selfish character of pursuing for the maximum existence and breeding of oneself. In such a procedure, "close" ones like families are usually included in the understanding of "self". This "concern for existence" for others never stopped growing within this circle. In the old days, for example, it was demanded in the religious teachings connected with the other world, as expressed in such words of Christianity or Buddhism as love for neighbors and mercy. As to each one's recognition of the reason for religious charity, we can think of two: one is that which is connected with one's wish for self existence to make better one's conditions for existence in the other world and the other is that which comes from one's satisfaction at present got from one's charitable acts. The former aims at one's own life and the latter at a broader existence, namely the prosperity or life of "species". Apart from these religious motives today, charitable acts are also carried out in strong shape of "social welfare" based not necessarily upon religious motives but on motives generally understood like "earthy sympathy".

But these motives of concern for others in such modern charitable acts (=social welfare) seem to be not necessarily very clear yet. How far and why does that concern we are paying now grow? This concern should be understood to consist of two parts: one, the general part, born from tacit compulsion rather than voluntarily and the other born voluntarily under tacit or apparent consent. The latter, being voluntary, can probably be viewed as "enlargement of oneself". And such trend of self-enlargement in the shape of enlargement of concern for others

seems to be a strong factor to regulate the equalizing direction of distributive rules. And naturally, the degree of the development of this trend seems to regulate the degree of development of equality in distribution.

Then, by what factors is the trend for enlargement of concern for others brought about? We can think of following three, from i) ~ iii), namely, the necessity of securing others by the development of division of labour in general, the enlargement of sympathetic feelings among species by enlargement of contact with others and the necessity of cooperation with others for recent urgent important problems.

- i) the necessity of securing others by the development of division of labour

As the first factor, we can point at that the change in strategy for survival from self-supporting to securing one's existence through development of division of labour (referred to in 2), ②, b)) causes a change in the self recognition at issue here. Namely, our argument in 3), ②, a) that in a society based upon division of labour, distribution considering equality for the purpose of letting every one exercise his productive power inevitably means that securing others' existence becomes the purpose and result of this procedure itself. To secure one's own existence, one must regard others' existence as strong a purpose as, or the second strongest purpose of, one's own. Such a change in self-recognition as purpose seems to be brought about under development of division of labour.

- ii) enlargement of contact with others by development of productive power

Division of labour develops productive power which increases chances of contact with others through the growth of spacial movement, like through changes of jobs and habitations and leisure. The growth of actual contact and chances of cooperation would inevitably enlarge concern for others. In its early stages, there would occur situations where understanding of possible cooperation is insufficient and resulting struggles or conflicts. But increased contact would lead to more recognition of possible mutual cooperation and an understanding that producing cooperative relationship is most advantageous for each other in the modern developed stage of productive power and division of labour¹³⁾.

- iii) the appearance of problems demanding cooperation by development of division of labour

Another factor to urge self-enlargement is the appearance of common problems that have to do with existence of many. In the developing process of civil society, nation states were formed which brought about wars among nations. In so-called total warfare social constituents couldn't help recognizing nationwide constituents as compatriots though under compulsory. Such a recognition would weaken after the war, but nevertheless it would continue to exist with some strength.

Another typical common problem to urge self-enlargement is the threat of nuclear war and environmental problems. That warfare refer-

13) If we could regard such direction as fundamental, the often talked of isolated individual-isoalted family like "nuclear family" can be included here, -has only such a significance to become a side current.

red to above was regional one and urged cooperation and enlargement of self-recognition within a country compulsively. Here we can point at the particular character of nuclear war that it enlarges people's recognition of being worldwide compatriots through common danger. Although this factor has drastically weakened under recent collapse of cold-war structure, its role that worked for urging for the direction of self-enlargement by making a great amount of people recognize human problems in the "cold-war" process made a great influence. Furthermore, environmental problems urge common measures as factors to threat everyone's existence in world-wide dimensions, and hereby have become great factors to urge self-enlargement, which needs little to be mentioned of.

β) change of the recognition of fairness: the strengthening of the rule of distribution to work

The second factor to decide the degree of equality is probably the change of the recognition of fairness, which is the strengthening the rule of distribution to work. In 2), ②, b), we've already argued that as productive power develops, the rule of distribution to ownership would be weakened by the need of this development itself. As already described, as what's recognized as fundamental forms of distribution, there are three, distribution to ownership, work and needs. In the process of weakening this direction of distribution to ownership, as the fundamental and fair distributive rule which social constituents could agree upon, the position of this distribution to work would become more and more important. And the strengthening of this direction would work for weakening the more the rule of distribution to owner-

ship as a reaction to its pulling people's sense of fairness to this direction.

But, although the consent for strengthening the distribution to work to a certain extent— including the degree of this strengthening— should be reached, in order to realise this strengthening, a new problem of how to know each one's contribution appears with new importance. One of the most persuasive arguments seems to be marginal productivity theory, but it is pointed out that to apply it to the reality, is not yet very easy¹⁴⁾.

γ) change to strengthening mutual security: the strengthening of the rule of distribution to needs

The development of division of labour, the development of productive activities and productive power through mutual cooperation will lead people to choose the direction of strengthening mutual security, mutual preparations for such cases as falling into conditions impossible to live without others' help by unforeseen happenings through enlargement of self and feelings for others. On this stage, as the weight of distribution to ownership has been weakened by other factors, they cannot depend mainly on it. Concrete level of mutual security will be decided comparing demerit of spending and merit of receiving. Here, the question is the concrete content of the two factors compared and the changing direction of realized level hereafter through such judgement. The main

14) cf. Yuzo Yamada ed, "Modern Principles of Economics", ("Gendaino-Keizaigenron"), Shunju-book co., 1962, p. 114. A question to be posed here would be how strict the present valuation based upon empirical judgement could be in order to measure marginal contribution of heterogeneous lands, capital equipments and labourers. What's more, we must answer the question of the rightness of given pattern of productive factors or resource distribution.

direction would be one to strengthen equality in which the content of mutual security based on enlargement of self enlarges security for existing socially weak people.

Conclusion

The theme of this paper was to propose modern changing direction of distributive structure or distributive rules and regulating factors of them with their content. From considerations above, we can conclude the followings:

- ① The subjective factors that need distributive rules are each individual's wants for survival and breeding. The realized forms are regulated by outer conditions.
- ② The deciding subject of distributive rules changes from individual to group, and to voluntary one.
- ③ The objects of distribution changes from what has products as main factor to what includes resources.
- ④ The changing direction of distributive rules of products and resources is strengthening equality of "certain degree".
- ⑤ What regulates the degree of this strengthening equality are the content of the change of subject recognition, the content of the change of sense of fairness and the degree of the strengthening of wants for mutual security.
- ⑥ These three are regulated by the content of development of productive power and production relation.

Questions to be answered next are the followings:

- 1 Closer examination of the correctness of propositions above, those regulating factors of distributive structure and rules.
- 2 Clarifying more the content of the effects of each item of described regulating factors and content of the problems of these items.
- 3 Finding the degree of equality suited for today on this solution above and finding necessary concrete distribution policies deducted from it.

(1991.10.18)