

# Sociology for Global Citizens : A Preliminary Approach

SHOJI, Kôkichi

**Abstract** To cope with the new age, it is necessary to deconstruct sociology from its condition as a traditional discipline and transform it into a new counter-discipline. First, we need to start from our bodily senses opening to our life world, grasp society as containing contradictions between community and stratification, and clarify the emergence of single-headed imperial systems based on accumulated contradictions. Single-headed imperial systems are created and maintained by obtaining people's worship of emperors as singularities, who are set up to mediate between the transcendental and the real world, through mitigating expanding contradictions by such apparatuses as religion, state, market and city. Attempts to break through the wall of these ancient or traditional empires to create an entirely new society were accomplished by citizens' revolutionary seizure of the power that the absolute king had concentrated for his own sake, in cooperation with productive forces, in areas where the imperial rule had been relatively weakened and the division of the sacred and the secular had been promoted,. This new social system (civil society), that was actually deconstructed by citizens, was an achievement-oriented system based on the labor theory of value and a multiple-headed world system where major nation states would struggle against each other for hegemony on world economy. Yet, this system became disorganized through class struggles between capitalists, who monopolized profit in order to dominate the whole social system, and workers who resisted them. The capitalists pushed this system into imperialism by utilizing or establishing colonies with support of their states. In the age of crises of imperialist wars, systems of one-party-dictated socialism and military fascism were established, and they failed in some areas, while a system of consumption-oriented civil society, that could expand economy and society self-excitingly by allowing workers and peoples of ex-colonies and ex-subordinates to become consumers who could constantly expand the market, was created and extended throughout the world. Globalization, emerging after the end of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union, has been further promoting this tendency. Critics of the US-led world system as a new "Empire" have been increasing because of the increasing influences of the US as the only superpower. However, since the number of citizens as sovereigns who have voting right in free elections has also been increasing all over the world, people have been calling for a new social and ecological system which is able to overcome such problems as not only wars and inequalities, but also environmental problems and bodily social problems such as

aging populations with low birth rate. Such a change may be possible if global citizens really exercise their sovereignty by putting into practice the principles expressed by the phrase “think globally, act locally”.

## I. Sociology as a Counter-Discipline

### 1.1 Sociology as a Discipline

It has been said that sociology is a discipline. Traditionally this means that sociology is a system of knowledge which is backed up by some theory and can be directly or indirectly tested by some empirical methods such as historical references, statistical analyses, social surveys, social psychological experiments and such. Even social policies can be considered as sorts of social experiments. A social policy is usually made on a supposition or a recognition that there is a social problem which has been caused by a more or less bad, or partly or totally dysfunctioning, state of society. Then, if the social policy succeeds in solving the problem, we can reach a conclusion that the supposition or recognition has been correct and/or right. The ultimate type of social policy is, in this sense, a social revolution.

In other words, when we say that sociology is a discipline, it usually means that sociology is an organized form of knowledge which can be argued and tested in some empirical or experimental settings to make sure if its statements or propositions are true or not. This usage of the term “discipline” seems to be somewhat different from its traditional meaning. According to Webster's dictionary, discipline is a strict training that corrects or strengthens, control gained through obedience or strict training, and a system of rules governing conduct. It is training, control, and rule imposed on our body.

But following the influence of the works of Michel Foucault, this word has come to be used in a literal sense, that is to say as meaning strict training, control or a system of rules imposed on our body. We now call some knowledge taken in this sense *savoir*. *Savoir* is knowledge imprinted or rather implanted on our body by structures of the settings where we are born and grow up, --- a society. Therefore, we already have some *savoir*. Rather, each of us is a *savoir* itself in the sense that we are products or fruits of our society which possesses structures to train and discipline its members to behave, conduct, think and discourse as it likes in order to maintain its own structures.

The fact that we already have or are some *savoir* has a twofold meaning. In a sense it means that we already know our own society to a considerable extent. In Zen Buddhism it is said that we are in the middle of the way when we start training. This means the same thing. But on the other hand, this fact also means that we are unconsciously very much bound by some knowledge we have been given so far. In this sense we even can say that we are slaves of the structures of our society --- that we look,

to some extent, like patients of mental diseases or prisoners of correctional institutions.

## 1.2 Need for Freedom

Therefore, if we don't like to be made to behave and discourse as our society likes, we have to free our body from its structures repeatedly and continuously. We know it is very difficult to do this, because it is much easier and much more comfortable to behave and discourse as the society likes. But at the same time we have a drive to free ourselves. We don't know why we have this drive; however, this has been the ultimate dynamo of all our history. Many social thinkers have thought that freedom should be the final goal or aim of human history. A typical example is that of G. W. F. Hegel. I also would like to make this belief in the need for freedom one of the basic assumptions in thinking about problems of human history and society.

How can we free ourselves from *savoir* as the given knowledge and gain *nouveau savoir* as a new knowledge that is fitted to our body? How can we deconstruct *savoir* to fit or refit it to our freed body? Deconstruction is a concept created by Jacques Derrida which means a conduct that performs both destruction and construction simultaneously, changing the context itself (Derrida, 1967a; 1967b).

At this point I think it is appropriate to introduce Bourdieu's ideas as well. Bourdieu believed it important that structures could not maintain themselves without making bodies behave as directed and this meant that structures should have to gain the bodies' *connaissance* (personalized knowledge) in order to keep working. So structures make in each body a *habitus*, which is a relatively stable *connaissance* or personalized *savoir* implanted in the body. Based on a habitus, a body responds to structures. It does this at each moment. However, the body has some chance to *connaître* the structures again and here it has another possibility to obtain freedom. Bourdieu made a distinction between a *pratique*, which is a habitual action, and a *praxis*, which is a conscious action, and here we find a moment when a *pratique* changes into a *praxis* (Bourdieu, 1980a; 1980b).

## 1.3 Possibilities of Misunderstanding

In most cases a body behaves by habit as the society wants. But, when it feels not free to an extent that it cannot bear, it begins to reexamine the *savoir*, the structure implanted in itself, to personalize it as much as it can bear, or, if possible, as much as it can be satisfied with --- it tries to *connaître* the structures. In other words, *connaître* is some form of *savoir* which is reflected by *agents* in the process of trying to examine it in order to get freed from the structures.

However, we may easily *méconnaître* (misunderstand) in this process. We may think that the God, instead of the weather, is hindering us producing from a good crop, or that another tribe is causing the infectious disease or an epidemic, or that the

machines, instead of the factory system, are exploiting us, or that an ill-defined disease is contagious or catching, without knowing that a factory has caused it by its liquid wastes, or that there are no suppressions by men of women, without realizing that there are many situations in which our language itself has latent power relations which make men, in most cases unconsciously, dominate women, and so on. Traditionally these have represented problems of false consciousness (*falsches Bewußtsein*) or ideology (*Ideologie*) to be explored by the sociology of knowledge.

#### **1.4 Sociology as a Counter-Discipline**

In light of the above problems, we need to *connaître* the *savoir* without getting into *méconnaître*. We need to personalize the structural knowledge without getting into some kind of false consciousness or ideological bias. We need to free our body from the already-gotten habitus, personalized structural knowledge, and to train it so that it can feel freer.

In order to do this, we may change the *savoir* or the structures by some movement of our body. I would like to refer to a method of this kind and a system of knowledge which can be got with it, as “sociology as a counter-discipline”. It should be a sort of methodological knowledge which is repeatedly renewed, while being accompanied by a sort of systemic knowledge which is repeatedly refreshed by this methodological knowledge. In other words, sociology as a counter-discipline is a remolded discipline or *savoir* which can be obtained through personalizing it with our body as much as possible in a right way.

#### **1.5 Five Components of the Counter-Discipline**

Sociology as a counter-discipline must have five components: *problématique*, theory, analysis or interpretation, solutions or policy proposals and movementology. *Problématique* is a hidden framework of *savoir* which can be made clear only after time has passed. But we can and we have to try to make it clear, now that we know that all *savoir* has its own *problématique*. This means that we must try to *connaître* our *savoir*. If we *méconnaître*, we help problematical structures to be reproduced.

*Problématique* looks like the definition of situation proposed by W. Thomas and F. Znaniecki. They insist that we live not in a direct or bare world but in a defined, and therefore more or less subjectively interpreted world, and that the group or society where we live is quite important in helping us to define our world. They pointed out our four basic wishes for, new experience, security, response and recognition, which might cause, anger, fear, love and desire for status, respectively (Thomas & Znaniecki, 1918-20).

This shows the importance of interpretation and interpretation requires some theory. This notion is connected with Chicago School's symbolic interactionism, yet it represents not only a unique problem but a universal one which must be considered in

any kind of theory.

A theory is a set of concepts, a conceptual framework and a way of stating things. In the Anglo-American tradition it has been popular to consider it as an instrument. John Dewey is famous as a philosopher of instrumentalism. Even Thomas and George Herbert Mead were not so far from him in their thinking. This is the limit of the Chicago School scholars who did not notice that their symbolic interactionism could not go beyond the sphere of behaviorism.

A theory is not only a set of instruments but also a series of statements and, as far as this is true, a theory is the essence of *savoir*, or if it is too much to claim this, I can say that is some important part of *savoir*. Actually a theory is not only a reflection but a part of the structures --- discourses. So, especially in the world of social sciences, there is no entirely abstract theory. Any theory cannot be other than a set of statements about movements of a society or of its history. Therefore a theory is already a sort of the interpretation of movements of a society or of its history. Later I will show that a theory necessarily comes to be a description of the history, especially it approaches the present state of affairs.

Analysis or interpretation should be performed with this sort of theory, and as its effects, solutions or policy proposals should be yielded. All these are movements of our body. Therefore, to analyze movements of a society or to interpret its history based on the *problematique*, using, and being led by, some theory in order to get some solutions or policies to cope with our predicaments, finally leads us to a *movementology*, that is to say a methodology to move our body to make it freer in the midst of the structures of our society, and this will imply finding a way of life.

### **1.6 Toward Sociology for Global Citizens**

Following this aim, I hereafter outline a theory of my sociology for global citizens. I have already explored the *problematique* in some of my books (Shoji, 1999). In them I have pointed out that, if we consider our contemporary society as the *problematique*, we find five major problems and, as we inquire into them, we can identify five sets of key concepts for theory building. In other words, if we explore the *problematique*, we will gain five sets of problems and key concepts.

Considering the problems of wars and nuclear weapons, we can gain key concepts regarding state and community; for socialism and global inequality, market and stratification; for environmental disruption, science, religion or symbolism and civilization; for population explosion and aging accompanied by low birthrate, morphology and ecology; and for organizations at various levels, movement and society. Now we need a theory with which we can connect these basic concepts along the lines stated above. A logical arrangement of five sets of key concepts will serve for establishing our sociology as a counter-discipline

## II. Community and Social Stratification: Dynamics of Social Expansion

### 2.1 Society as a Chain of Bodies: Community

We have to start from our own body and go in the direction of freeing it from the *savoir* --- the structural knowledge that has disciplined our body while we have been unconscious. So, we have to ask ourselves or our own body what a society is. As far as I ask myself or my own body, it answers that it is a chain of bodies.

Usually this is shown in a figure of lineage --- the infinite chain of generation alteration or heterogenesis. However, morphologically it is a circle-shaped chain. We all shake hands in a line of a circle to live together. In other words we enter into a circle of cooperation to live together. According to my feeling, this is the most primitive image of our society that I would like to call a community. At first glance a society looks like a circle and it is a community. Let's examine the meaning of this bodily perception or intuition.

It is very important to make a distinction between the inner or the inside and the outer or the outside, because this is the first behavior that our body undertakes in order to organize the world where we live. Before we do this, our world is a chaos melting into the nature or the ecological system. This recognition is very important to understand the essential character of the Oriental thought. Suzuki Daisetsu, the noted Zen Buddhist philosopher repeatedly emphasized this point (Suzuki, 1997).

However, I do not entirely agree with him because he only emphasizes the difference between the East and the West. More important is the fact that there is a difference of dimension between the Western dichotomy or dualism (of subject and object, and such) and the Eastern fundamental monism (of *kū* or Oneness) and, I believe, the latter is more fundamental than the former.

In any case, we make this distinction in order to guard the inner against the outer. The extreme and tragic result of this distinction is *cannibalism*; the condition in which we eat other human bodies, thinking that they belong to the outer. We do this in order to survive although some anthropologists insist that this act has rather symbolic meanings. I agree with this, but it is also a fact that instrumentally the inner should represent the ends while the outer the means.

### 2.2 Family and Band Society

Here we consider the family. Primitive families were not large ones. The large family represents rather a model of a cone type of society which we will mention later. A primitive society was a so-called band society which used to be a chain of several families each of which used to consist of a couple (parents) and several children. It is also referred to as a "horde," which Emile Durkheim considered the simplest society; one consisting of just a single segment.

A prototype of the incest taboo is supposed to have emerged in the family to guard itself from the outer --- the other families and the outside of the society. In turn, the rule of marriage based on this taboo became a principle to organize a larger society; one which was no longer a simple band (Lévi-Strauss, 1949).

A primitive community was a set of primitive families. However, if we consider a primitive community consisting of only adults taken out of primitive families, leaving their dependents, this seems to represent an “egalitarian” community in which there are very few differences of physical strength and ability that form bases of division of labor and differentiation in general. This was supposed to be the origin or the starting state of social expansion. And especially when this was idealized in the tradition of Christianity, it was considered an ideal community from which humankind had degraded (Rousseau, 1754; 1762).

Even Marx and Engels, who were much more realistic about social development, supposed that a primitive form of communism existed at the starting state of human social development (Marx & Engels, 1848). These examples show the power of community or the strength of the people who gather together to make a community. However, we should recognize there are already some possibilities for differentiation and stratification existing within primitive communities.

A society starts or emerges through the very history of biological evolution, taking and receiving a lot of actions from it. Basic actions are inter-affection or love and reproduction, work or labor or the use of tools for consumption and economic production and reproduction, exchange of goods, communication or even the use of signs and even rules or organization and leadership.

### **2.3 Centralization and Demarcation**

If a society is something like a circle, it must have a center. Geometrically, a circle is a set of points which are located at the same distance from the center. And mechanically it is a sort of equilibrium of centripetal and centrifugal forces. All points or bodies are equal in this sense.

Then, what is the center? It may be a campfire, where we make a circle to commemorate the last day of our summer school in some tableland. In a primitive society it might be a totem pole around which all the members of a tribe would gather to hold a festival in order to strengthen their unity before going hunting or warring. In our contemporary society it may be a president of a nation who is making, in front of a national flag, a speech announcing that the people are going to “war against terrorism”.

Japan's *Tenno* (Emperor) has a subtle, ambiguous existence in this sense. According to the Constitution, he is a symbol of the national integration of the Japanese people, but should not be the center of state power. He is a remaining vestige of an ancient empire --- which we will discuss later as a type of single-headed

imperial system ---, but at the same time he may serve as a political force if some people choose him as a head of some movement whatever his intention is.

So, the center is something or somebody upon which all the members concentrate themselves. It must have been a thing, first, with some person such as a priest or a shaman who mediated between it and the people, and then it must have been replaced by him or her in most cases. The body of a king is, in this sense, an effect of personalization of the center.

It must be remarked, however, that sociologically, for a society to keep going, the centripetal forces should be more or less larger or stronger than the centrifugal ones. This is because in a society there are always some people who want to deviate or to go out of the circle so that a society is almost permanently in a critical situation, risking disorganization. In other words, a society cannot be kept going without concentrating the forces of the people.

The *omikosi*, a portable shrine or a sacred palanquin, is a good example. In carrying an *omikoshi*, people concentrate their forces to the center, the *omikoshi*, so that it is constantly lifted up. This is the same dynamic that exists in a society. Unless we concentrate our forces --- our attention and intention to do some work if necessary --- on the center, our society may be diffused and disorganized.

Strictly speaking, a society is not simply a circle, but something like a plate with a mounded center --- a cone if we take a geometrical example. This is quite important when we consider the transformation of society from a circle or community to a pyramid or stratification.

#### **2.4 Hare and Ke: Existing structure of community**

To keep a community existing, bodies must support it with their conscious actions. The *Omikoshi* is a good example again. This is also a symbol of a state where all the members of a community gather to cooperate in order to ascertain their unity. This is called *hare* in Yanagita's folklore and *communitas* in Victor Turner's anthropology (Yanagita, 1931, Turner, 1969).

However, as a matter of fact, bodies cannot keep themselves lifted up high continuously, because we get so tired that we have to relax ourselves and take some rest. So, the community should be sustained by habitual actions or *pratiques* of its members --- by routinized bodily actions of its members. *Ke* is something like this in Yanagita's folklore and it is called *structure* in Turner's anthropology.

These actions, however, tend to be slackened continuously because our body is a part of nature and it tends to be relaxed into it. Even taboos against cannibalism, homicide and/or incest tend to be continuously broken so that the community is exposed to a disorganizing crisis. This can be said to be an application of the principle of the increase of entropy or the second law of thermodynamics, which states that energy disperses evenly. Therefore, to keep a community existing, we have to tighten

it periodically and, to do this, we participate a feast or a festival. This is *hare* in Yanagita's folklore and here we can find an origin of religion.

This is related to the problem of the division of labor and leadership that yields some latent stratification. In a community there is already some differentiation of roles, and therefore some division of labor that causes division of leaders and followers. Some of them are inherited and others become customs. But all of these depend on some forms of consensus so that they do not establish any relationship of rulers and the ruled. Stratification is still latent.

However, when communities encounter each other, their latent stratifications encounter opportunities to become manifest. At this point there appears a sort of geometry or mechanics of tribal conflicts (Shoji, 1989, 213-219). If there are wars among three communities A, B, C whose strongest is A followed by B and C, A's leaders A' will eliminate B' and C', the leaders of B and C, and include their followers as the outer and lower groups with respect to A's original followers. Thus, the community will enlarge and a pyramid or a hierarchy will become visible based on this change.

If the followers of the original B and C tribes are discontent and try to resist, there will emerge class conflicts in the enlarged community A. Tribal conflicts will continue as class struggles in enlarging communities. This is a law of development from tribal conflicts to class struggles through which latent stratifications become manifest. We can see examples of this manifestation of stratification in the history of ancient India, ancient Japan, and modern America among others.

## **2.5 Existing Structure of Stratification or Stratified Society**

If a state is established, most people come to think that it is natural for A or A' to rule B and C, then it is also natural for A' to rule A. The confirmation of consensus leads to procurement or obtainment of the legitimacy. Thus the stratification becomes manifest at the level of people's consciousness.

Slaves often rebel and mostly are suppressed. Then, some of them or gradually all of them are internalized. We can see many examples in ancient Rome, medieval Japan, modern America and so on. In some cases these lead to movements for a more egalitarian society. In this sense, manifestation of stratification sometimes leads to a movement for a more egalitarian or less stratified society. This can be called a sort of dialectic of social development or social expansion.

Through these processes, society grows as a cone type or a stratified society. This causes a problem of contradictory relations between community and stratification. We can see these contradictions between slave communities and ancient empires, serf communities and feudal kingdoms, civic communities and class societies, and so forth.

It is military powers that are working behind tribal conflicts and they are the externalized expression of productive forces as wars are originally work and labor against other communities. Therefore, military powers are limited by productive

forces. And here, we should not forget that productive forces include our mental forces. Military powers are sums of arms, skills, technology, organization and morale. But, however enhanced the morale is, the military power of an early agricultural society is limited in its range. Therefore they move from conflicts to coexistence and to habitat segregation, especially when there are sufficient conditions for doing so. But, when there is no such condition and when we have to fight to survive, we do our best to expand productive forces and exercise our mental power fully. This leads to the creation of civilization.

## **2.6 Religion and State: Toward single-headed imperial systems**

An ethnos is a community which has gained culture, or a primitive form of discourse community, and it shows some primitiveness of society. A class is a stratified group which has gained means of contention, therefore it constitutes a discourse group which shows some fundamentality of social division. An ethnos is an expanded A (=A+B+C). Classes are A', A, B and C, when they have obtained their own means of contention. An ethnos is, in this sense, a complex cultural community which includes confrontations between classes or class conflicts. A civilization is created through these processes in order to maintain a complex society --- a cultural society with class divisions or class confrontations.

An apparatus to maintain this kind of complex society is, first, myth and religion. Religion is an integration of actions, and physical and social settings, done to maintain the myth or to integrate a complex society with the myth. Religion is mainly practiced by means of language, although some tools are needed and indispensable. Main functions of religion are world formation and social control to maintain a totality (Durkheim, 1912). World formation is later developed into science, while social control, if it becomes independent, transforms into a state.

However, because this is very difficult, theocracy lasted or endured in ancient empires. Although unable to become independent from theocracy, the state regulates markets, builds cities and systematizes the whole society both structurally and morphologically.

A society as a system is thus built by a religion on a basis enlarged and enriched by revolutionary growth of productive forces due to agricultural revolution. Agricultural revolution is called, in this sense, the first wave. In connection with this, there have been lots of discussions about the Asiatic mode of production. Even though the hypothesis of universal, lineal and staged development is now unpopular, there are some points we should still consider.

Why does the ruler (the king) become prominent? In most cases it is due to integration of productive forces, such as an irrigation project of a large scale (Wittfogel, 1957). But this is not enough. The power of the state must be reinforced by religion in order to regulate markets, build cities and systematize a society. However, to

maintain such a large systematized society, an empire, the power or the state needs lots of armed forces backed up by productive forces, while it is basically impossible to extract them continuously from agriculture. Therefore, the empire falls and another king or state tries to build another empire. Thus, similar processes are repeated again and again, and this has come to be called “Asiatic stagnation”.

### III. Mitigating Contradictions: Single-Headed Imperial Systems

#### **3.1 Concentration and Imagination: Impulses to leap**

Community means equality, while stratification means inequality. Therefore, establishing dynamics between these conditions implies mitigating their contradictions. A cone type of society, the existing structure of a stratified society, is a result of each instance when contradictions are mitigated or there has been an effort to *aufheben* (sublate) them. Early agricultural societies, however, have their limits to expansion due to their limited ability to mitigate or sublimate these contradictions, which are in turn due to their agricultural productivity and therefore their military capacity.

Early agricultural societies are given chances to overcome these limits when they gather in vantage regions, for example in the vicinities of big rivers, and get drawn into conflicts to survive. When we cannot get resolutions in conflicts or struggles for major things such as irrigation, thereby leading us to fall down together, we frantically seek something that transcends us. We seek something to control floods and supply water, something to control the weather and make it rain and, on the contrary, something to give the sunshine when necessary.

Something like magic and technology is sought, and there is no difference between them at this time. And imagination to explain and persuade all of these leads to a religion. Development of our language ability is one of the preconditions as well as one of the fruits of these strivings. Invention and amelioration of letters is also achieved in this process. All of these lead to the creation of a civilization.

This can be considered as carrying an *omikoshi* at a higher level. This is the creation of a new community and the erection of new stratified structures on it. Using sophisticated symbolism for this complex process creates a civilization. A civilized stratified society needs more and more mitigation and/or sublation of contradictions. A civilized stratified society becomes a *social system* with the development of mitigating or sublating apparatuses of complicated contradictions. I would like to define a social system like this.

#### **3.2 Dreams of Imperium: Generation of religions**

To overcome the limits of early agricultural societies we have to leap not physically but imaginatively. To leap in this sense, we carry out something to pray for salvation.

This something transcends our all experiences so far and therefore constitutes what is transcendental and sacred.

It should be, however, something that appeals to, and can be felt by, our body at the same time. This is not a thing itself but a thing as a medium between our body and the transcendental. Usually this requires some person as a medium --- a medium between that thing and us on the one hand and that thing and the transcendental on the other. Something as a medium carried by somebody as a medium is transformed into somebody as a medium backed up by something as a medium. This can be called the “personalization of the sacred”.

Kings are thus produced as personalized media, mediators, between us and the transcendental or the sacred. And, as our society expands through stratification of stratifications, kings are also stratified so that the king of kings is produced. The king of kings, then, becomes the subject who issues the imperium over the social system that is brought about through mitigation or sublation of contradictions emerging in the expanding cone-typed society. This king of kings can be called an emperor.

The emperor is a personalized form of *omikoshi*, that is carried out by the kings of smaller stratified societies, so that the emperor comes to look like the transcendental itself for the people. Through all these processes we make a story to explain them. The world should be a generated and organized one in which everything is positioned with some meaning. We can call this kind of world a “cosmos” (Berger, 1967; Ueno, 1985).

A story about the genesis and reproduction of a cosmos is a myth. A set of *pratiques* to maintain the myth and through it to integrate a society is a religion. The emperor issues the imperium based on the religion, and the imperium itself is the highest religious *pratique*.

Most myths or religions start from the sun as a god. Then, they produce various gods who help the sun-god as the division of labor develops. This is the process from fetishism to polytheism of Auguste Comte's law of three states (Comte, 1830-42). We can see varieties of polytheism in Egypt, India, China, Greece, Rome, Japan and so on.

However, Comte was bound to the Western Christian tradition in that he thought monotheism be the ultimate and highest form of development of polytheism. If we observe world religious history free from the Western tradition, we will find plural ways of development not only from polytheism to monotheism, but also from polytheism to, say, *detheism*.

According to the Western tradition, there are three forms in theism --- monotheism, polytheism and pantheism, and its negation is atheism of which the modern and rational form is deism. But if we look at the history of the Orient or the East, we will find religious forms in which gods, including the only and absolute God, are not so important, especially in Buddhism, Confucianism and Taoism. I would like to call

these forms detheism.

We leap or jump from polytheism to monotheism when we need something absolute for salvation to get out of enduring struggles, to secure crops and livestock in severe nature and to preserve more safety. In Mesopotamia, Zoroastrianism emerged from Assyria (2000bc-612bc) to Achaemenian Persia (550bc-330bc). Under its influence emerged Judaism. Then, Christianity mediated humans and God with a special human body, Jesus Christ.

However, different conditions have led from polytheism to detheism, reflecting the fury and misery of struggles, various results of stratification and especially the vanity of human birth, aging, disease and death. In India Buddhism was created through recognizing the vanity of this world, people's persistence in life and the never-ending cycle of reincarnation, metempsychosis, leading to the seeking of emancipation from all these worldly desires and worries.

Under the influences of Upanishad philosophy that preaches the separation and unity of principles of cosmos and ego, *brahman* and *âtman*, Buddhism has opened a way to reach *nirvâna* through practices of self-effacement, involving special trainings of our own body not depending on the transcendental. Buddhism is a type of detheism in this sense, while deism is modern and rational in terms of its negation of monotheism and theism in general.

On the contrary, we open a way to change the world starting from disciplining our body, through settling our family and governing our state and finally by pacifying our empire, when we do not alienate ourselves from but commit ourselves to the world. In China, Confucianism was born from cautious and continuous trials of this kind.

Although the concept of Heaven in Confucianism looks like that of God in Christianity, the former is basically spacial, non-personal and unlimitedly close to the Nature itself, while the latter is fundamentally personal and transcending time and space. Taoism is a philosophy of the pacifist wing of this thought, as well as a mass religion generated from the mixture of this philosophy, Buddhism and some other folk beliefs. This is another type of detheism.

We bring monotheism to the core when we live a moving life like, such as that necessitated by using caravans to carry out trades with various regions --- cities and villages. In this case we ourselves are mediators of various regions and ethnoses with various goods and ideas. Through various types of mediation we become the mediators of mediators and finally the mediator between the God and various peoples. In this way monotheism comes to be pursued thoroughly.

Idolatry or idol worship is prohibited strictly and iconoclasm has occurred wherever idolatry has been found, in whatever forms --- Buddhist, Christian or any other. This is the strength of monotheism without idolatry. Believers are by themselves mediators. A typical example is Islâm, which was born in the seventh century and expanded rapidly to all directions. Islam demands the absolute faith or obedience in

Allah, and Islamic struggles or wars are *jihād*, the sacred war. Many Muslims live in the desert and they believe that if they should die they will be revived in the Heaven where, according to the Qur'an, there is a lot of water, green places and women.

So, we get a rough image of religious development. From primitive pantheism through polytheism, monotheistic religions emerge, such as Islam and Christianity, as well as matured polytheism such as Hinduism, and detheism such as Confucianism and Buddhism.

To remark briefly on Japan's religion, it has moved from polytheism to detheism. It is an unstable hybrid of Shintoism, Buddhism and Confucianism. But this is quite significant when we see consider the process of modernization. The breakthrough from a single-headed imperial system to the multiple-headed world system was done neither in a system of extreme monotheism nor extreme detheism but in one of humanized monotheism and another of humanized detheism.

### **3.3 Materialization of Imperium: From state to empire**

Religion has two basic functions --- world formation and integration. If it is materialized especially focusing on the integration function, a state is generated. In this case, the state becomes a very important apparatus which directly and societally mitigates or sometimes sublates contradictions between community and stratification or between equality and inequality and all kinds of other contradictions. However, as we have seen in chapter II, it is very difficult for a state to become independent from the religion.

If discourses and *pratiques* of the imperium are materialized, a state grows into an empire. The empire has its own shrine as the center and this is also the emperor's house. Later this house, the palace, gets separated from the shrine. The empire has its emperor, its organization of priests to issue the imperium on its territory, another organization of warriors which gradually differentiates from the former and its stratified people who support them by supplying not only their surplus but even necessities.

To maintain this structure, the empire builds the emperor's shrines and statues here and there throughout the territory and carries out its rule with people's worship of these symbols. According to Plutarch, in Ancient Egypt kings built statues of Isis and Osiris or of themselves everywhere throughout the territory and made the people engrave them, thus observing them as their rulers and protectors.

We also can see similar examples in ancient and modern Japan. The emperor Shomu Tenno gave the imperium to the heads of all provinces to build a state-established temple for having people realize that Japan was to be governed by Buddhism, in which he believed. The emperor Meiji Tenno not only distributed his pictures to public places such as government offices, schools and such but also traveled around Japan by himself to show his figure as the Emperor (*junkō*) in order to

consolidate his imperium, the Great Japanese Empire.

Other examples were seen in the former Soviet Union and other socialist countries. In these countries, especially in their European satellites, they built numerous statues of Lenin and Stalin in order to have people realize that the Revolution had happened and that the leader or ruler had changed. Most of them, supposing that they were still ruled by the Tsar, did not understand the meaning of the Revolution and thought that a new Tsar had usurped the throne.

To keep the unity of the empire the emperor must be in one body, but to carry out his rule he must be in as many places as possible. To be in one body through being in many bodies is the secret of being the emperor. The empire is single-headed in this sense, so it can be called a “single-headed imperial system”.

### **3.4 From Inter-affection to Exchange: the market and its regulation**

On the way to expanding like this, the empire comes across serious obstacles --- exchanges. As seen in 3.3, imperial rule is carried out vertically from the top to the bottom. People, however, engage in exchange and exchanges are done horizontally among them. Moreover, exchanges are done between or among communities and, if developed, even between the inner and the outer parts of the empire.

The horizontality of exchange comes from the fact that it originally is made up of various types of mediations of differences between and among the people. Inter-affection is done between men and women, parents and children and among brothers and sisters. Inter-affection begins to develop into exchange between and among families. Eventually, exchange becomes predominant between and among communities.

Communities even inter-affect through exchanges like *kula* (Malinowski, 1922). Referring back to the concept of community, centrifugal forces are still working of course and, we may even say, obscenely so, although centripetal forces are always larger than they. These forces shake the basis of the empire. The empire must include and regulate these prevailing exchanges --- markets of love, products, goods, words or discourses and sometimes even arms.

### **3.5 Internalization of Exchange by Theocracy: city and imperial system**

One type of city is created by the empire to control and regulate an area around the shrine while another type is created by the people to gather, concentrate and cohabit surrounding a market. Cathedral towns and castle towns develop from the former, while market towns and post towns are variations of the latter.

As spontaneously generated towns threaten the rule of the empire, market towns should be brought into and included in the center city of the imperial rule and otherwise they are regulated and controlled strictly. Thus theocracy, that is to say religion=politics, by suppressing and exploiting economy, systematizes the society in

an *urban and rural configuration* or in a *center-periphery structure*. This internalization of exchanges by theocracy is morphologically the formation of the imperial system centering to major cities.

The single-headed imperial system thus formed (1) promulgates its imperium through the people's worship of shrines and statues allocated all over the territory while giving them the security, (2) institutionalizes a tax system by materializing the worship, (3) extracts more taxes from controlled markets which continuously try to expand if getting chances, and (4) exists structurally by maintaining the religion=politics formula and by strengthening its own property and organization --- patrimonialism.

Max Weber conceived of the development of traditional rule as evolving from gerontocracy, the rule of patriarchs, through patriarchal rule, to patrimonialism. In patrimonialism, the state comes to have a sort of objectivity backed up by some more or less universalized religion, and not only are the armed forces more highly hierarchalized but also most of state affairs are more and more performed by bureaucrats. Some form of patrimonial bureaucracy emerges.

### **3.6 Moving Range of Military Forces: Limits of single-headed imperial systems**

The emperor, a single head, becomes more and more strongly divinized as the imperial territory expands because the empire must exert stronger and stronger centripetal forces to overcome increasing centrifugal ones. The ultimate security of the emperor or the empire depends on its military power. Therefore it is ultimately limited by its basis of productive forces. How large, how far and how long can the emperor send his army?

In Egypt military power was limited by its productive forces depending on periodical floods of the Nile. In Mesopotamia many empires fought each other in melee to repeat rises and falls. In India, after the fall of the Indus Civilization, the Aryans, the invaders, formed a typically stratified society with the caste system. This invoked some new religions such as Jainism and Buddhism and even after the diffusion of Hinduism in the Gupta monarchy of the 4th to 7th centuries many empires rose and fell. In China after the Qin dynasty a number of huge and strong dynasties rose and fell until the conquest of the Yuan dynasty.

## **IV. Breakthrough to Unlimited Expansion: the Multiple-Headed World System**

### **4.1 Movable Productive-Military Forces: Significance of the nomadic imperial system**

Single-headed imperial systems have the limits to expansion due to their productive-military forces which are basically agricultural and therefore slowly-growing and fixedly settled. Productive forces, in this sense, limit social

expansion rather than drive and accelerate it especially before the Industrial Revolution. Some Marxists and some proponents of economic growth stress the role of productive forces somewhat misleadingly, saying that the development of productive forces totally changes a society, that the driving force of the history is growing productive forces, and so on. They have been mistaken in thinking as if the tendency after the Industrial Revolution could be extended to the whole range of social history.

The productive-military forces which are based on trading or commercial abilities are semi-movable and so they can partly overcome these limits. The Islamic productive-military forces were examples in this sense because they were based on commercial towns and caravans. This was one of the major reasons why they could build such huge empires. The Islamic empire expanded to its largest territory during the Abbasid dynasty at the end of the 8th century.

Moreover, if we have more movable productive-military forces such as those in nomadism of high productivity, we can expand more the range of a single-headed imperial system. The Mongolian empire overwhelmed even the Islamic empires by its more thorough-going movable productive-military forces.

According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, the Mongol "political and military organization was matched to the family-clan-tribe pattern. Every man who could ride and bear arms was both a herdsman and a soldier according to the need of the moment. Raiding other tribes to capture cattle, women, and prisoners was a recognized method of property accumulation. When, however, a tribe rose to notable power, as in the time of Genghis (Chinggis) Khan in the 13th century, a decimal form of military organization was adopted, with units of 10, 100, 1,000, and 10,000. Commanders of large units were assigned territories from which they drew the tribute to the supreme khan and mustered their quotas of troops. Mongol history fluctuates between such periods of feudal concentration and those of tribal dispersion."

The units were families. They moved with all of their means of production, horses, other cattle, movable houses called *gel* or *pao* and such as productive-military forces. Their religion was quite simple. The Great Khan was the Son of Heaven and as such the Absolute Ruler. As "raiding other tribes to capture cattle, women, and prisoners was a recognized method of property accumulation," wars were extensions of hunting. As mentioned above, wars were originally work or labor carried out in other communities as parts of the environment.

The Mongols committed terrible massacres if necessary according to their strategic perspective. Thus they built a huge empire covering major parts of the Eurasian continent and this stimulated single-headed imperial systems located in its West, East and South. In the West it menaced fragile empires like the Holy Roman Empire by building the Kipchak Khan (1243-1502) and the Il Khan (1258-1353) empires while in the East it conquered China to build the Yuan dynasty (1271-1368). In turn, the Yuan Empire stimulated Japan's small single-headed empire by its attempts to conquer.

#### **4.2 Failure and Compromise of Absolutism Formation: Japan's feudalism and the *Bakuhan* system**

One example of attempts for breakthrough (out of a single-headed imperial system) is the failure and compromise of absolutism formation in Japan. Japan's single-headed imperial system consisted of major clans, the *uji* society, built on rice-crop agriculture and Shintoism in the 7th century. It accepted the introduction of Buddhism before and after its establishment. Early mythical and historical documents like the *Kojiki* (the Ancient Chronicle, 712), *Nihonshoki* (the Chronicles of Japan, 720) and *Fudoki* (the Local Chronicles, 712-925) were written through these processes.

Later, power was gradually passed to the warriors as the people surrounding the imperial court, the top elite of major clans were aristocratized. The Kamakura shogunate was actually the beginning of the warriors' government, the *ie* society, and the dual rule of it and the imperial court (Murakami, Kumon & Sato, 1979). The Mongolian Invasion in 1274 (War of *Bun'ei*) and 1282 (War of *Koan*) weakened the productive-military basis, although it temporarily raised the morale, of the Kamakura shogunate.

The imperial court tried to take back power by utilizing some warlords' help, but this pushed Japan's feudalism as a whole get into a long turmoil --- an age of internal wars or strife. The new imperial government of Kenmu was built in 1334, but this quickly brought about the period of the Northern and Southern Dynasties that lasted from 1336 to 1392. On the other hand, the Muromachi shogunate was built in 1336 and it kept some political stability enough to create a unique culture for a while. Then, with the internal strife of Onin, 1467-1477, as a start, the whole country of Japan got into another long age of internal wars.

About one hundred years later, Oda Nobunaga, after expelling the Shogun Yoshiaki from Kyoto, overthrew the Muromachi shogunate in 1573. Being tolerant of Christianity, Nobunaga tried to learn the state of affairs in the world from the priests and approached the status of an absolute king by divinizing himself. Under this system the unification of the country almost reached the perfection. Japan moved closest to becoming an absolutist regime, in which he might have abolished the single-headed imperial system in order to institute the warrior class's military rule (*Tenka Fubu*) to an extreme. However, he was killed in the uprising at *Honnoji*, Mitsuhide's rebellion, in 1582, which may have been the result of the court's conspiracy.

Toyotomi Hideyoshi took over power and unified the whole of Japan in 1590, employing means of land surveying (*Kenchi*) and disarmament (*Katanagari*) --- separation of soldiers and peasants. Before that, in 1587, he had issued the order to expel missionaries. He tried to invade Korea twice in the wars of *Bunroku*, 1592, and *Keicho*, 1597. After Hideyoshi's death, Tokugawa Ieyasu opened the *Tokugawa*

*Shogunate* in 1603 and, using the orders of “one province, one castle” (*Ikkoku Ichijo*) and the ordinances for warriors (*Buke Shohatto*), established the *Bakuhan* system in 1615.

Being worried by Christians’ revolts, the peak of which occurred at Shimabara in 1637, Tokugawa Iemitsu almost completely closed the country, gathering foreigners in Hirado and Nagasaki in 1616, and only in Hirado in 1641. Hideyoshi, Ieyasu and Iemitsu were afraid of the Western invasion with the Christianity as an advance party and thus decided on the complete closure of the country. The check and balance of the western powers such as Portugal, Spain, Holland and Britain at the East end of Eurasia or the Far East, made it possible for Japan to take this negative policy. In China, they were busy in the transition period from the Ming Dynasty to the Qing Dynasty.

The Tokugawa shogunate threatened Korea and made Ryukyu a tributary state in 1609. After the closure, Japan developed internally to some extent with the growth of productive forces, but generally was stagnated in its isolation in the drastically developing world of the 17th to 19th century.

#### **4.3 Confrontation of Religious Conceptions: Struggles between monotheist powers toward the age of great voyages**

Nomadic imperialism, although it has sometimes overwhelmed other agricultural and commercial imperial powers, has its own limits to expansion, since its productive-military basis is still basically agricultural. We cannot expand productive-military forces only with the range and speed of the state power or policies (as with Keynesianism in the later capitalist context) as long as they are not freed from the very limits of agriculture. Although it established the largest empire just in the center of the Eurasian continent, nomadic imperialism could not break through the limits of its agricultural productive-military forces.

The real breakthrough came from a monotheism, that would not go to the very end or core, like Islam. In Europe, after the establishment of the Roman Catholic Authority with the penance of Heinrich IV at Canossa, the Crusades were sent seven times from 1096 to 1270. The results of some of these were extremely miserable. As a result, the Pope’s power was weakened and the money economy was expanded.

Due to the population decrease caused by the spread of the plague (pestilence), peasants developed their own power and they started repeated revolts against the feudal lords such as in Jacqueries' rebellion in 1358 and Wat Tyler's in 1381. John Ball’s words were quite symbolic when he said, "When Adam dalf [dug] and Eve span [spun], Who was then a gentleman?" However, England and France were involved in long-term wars such as the One Hundred Years' War (1339-1453) and the War of the Roses(1455-85). Meanwhile, Spain and Portugal developed the *Reconquista* movements and opened the age of Great Voyages.

Behind all these were the confronting and competing attitudes of Christianity and Islam. As mentioned before, Islam carried its monotheism to the end and drove their believers to wars and conquests with the images of the paradise and the concept of *jihād*. Christianity could not cope at all with this strength for long so that it tried to find a route to the East by getting in touch with the Mongolian empire which had been threatening the Islam from the other side.

This attempt failed as the western part of the Mongolian empire was converted to the Islam, with the result that European countries could only go to the West or the South by ship to find a way to the East. Christianity was not so strong as a religion to consolidate and expand its empires because it was influenced by humane elements such as the image of St. Mary and the dogma of the Holy Trinity (the unity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit). However, this humane aspect of Christianity was developed into humanism, which would in turn nourish subjectivity and provide for an unlimited expansion.

#### **4.4 Dialectics of Sacred-Secular Dualism: West-European feudalism and absolutism**

To be liberated from theocracy, it is important that a dualism between the sacred and the secular emerges because it develops into another dualism between authority and power which leads to the independence of the latter from the former. As we have seen, this happened in Japan from the 12th to 17th century, although it led to the closure of the country and a stagnant equilibrium amidst the dynamically developing modern world.

The European feudalism was also a result of the separation and conflicts between the sacred Pope's authority and the secular landlords' power. Moreover, the European feudalism had another internal dualism between the contracts among landlords or knights and those between them and serfs or peasants. Forms of property or ownership were also various and unstable as the lands were owned at the same time by the lords, priests, and peasants, according to the *Gewere* in German laws. This unstableness was increased by the threats of the Islamic and Mongolian empires, the spreads of the plague, the peasant revolts and others.

Gaining chances, cities grew to acquire autonomy from the landlords. Bourgeois or citizens also continued to engage in more and more exchanges to get richer and richer. And there was no strong imperial power to regulate them or to collect taxes and such. Instead, major landlords and especially kings tried to expand their power on the basis of these growing forces.

The kings tried to shoulder a new *omikoshi* in search of a new empire. The theory of divine right of kings was invented for that sake. It was shouldered most eagerly and strongly by James I and his political theorist Robert Filmer in England and by Louis XIV and his theologian Jacques Bénigne Bossuet in France in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. These two and the other major kings also made use of the Reformation and the

Counter Reformation to establish and consolidate their power.

Thus absolutism was brought about. The institution of absolutism was itself a trial to create a new empire on the basis of the divine right theory of kings, a sort of theory of theocracy. However, it made it possible for the secular forces, the bourgeoisie, to overthrow the absolute powers because they had concentrated all their power among themselves. The secular forces, brought about by the dualism, took over all the power concentrated by the forces that had tried to overcome the dualism itself. This kind of process should be called dialectical in its literal sense.

Absolutism was overthrown in the 17<sup>th</sup> century in England and in the 18<sup>th</sup> century in France, but it survived until the 20<sup>th</sup> century in Germany and Russia. In England and France, where the bourgeois revolutions succeeded, religion was gradually taken over by each form of nationalism, which would develop stronger and stronger ideologies by internalizing growing economic forces and developing science and technology. In Germany, running behind in this direction, under these impacts, the Christianity itself was radically criticized, generating an atheism which would lead to the perfection of modern humanism. We can see this development of ideas especially in the development from Ludwig Feuerbach to Karl Marx.

#### **4.5 Ambivalent Community and Global Stratification: Conquest, plunder, and early market formation**

The formation of civil society and nationalism is at the same time the stratification of the world by means of conquest, plunder, and early market formation. The community formation on the inside is simultaneously the building of a huge stratified society on the outside.

In the 15<sup>th</sup> century and after, various types of conquest and plunder of the "new" and "old" continents were forced through or steamrolled. It was with the plundered wealth that the primitive accumulation of capital could be accomplished in Holland, England, and later France, thereby creating the "regional market sphere". The absolute monarchies were formed on the basis of all these processes, strengthening their state mechanisms.

While in Spain and Portugal they failed to build new productive forces by utilizing acquired wealth, new types of capital, influenced by the sects of Protestantism, were successfully accumulated to create a new mode of production, which was later called "early capitalism", in Holland, and then in England. In Otsuka Hisao's history of European economy these processes were described as though they had been brought about spontaneously, while it should be said in Immanuel Wallerstein's historiography of the modern world system they were all components of the formation of the world system (Otsuka, 1969a; 1969b; Wallerstein, 1974; 1980; 1989).

In this sense, the modern European societies were Januses with two faces, one of which was that of the avant-gardes of the Christian civilization and the other that of

the humans who would do whatever they wished to satisfy their material desires. Reformed and counter-reformed Christianity served as ideologies of this sort of world system formation and later modern science and technology, created and developed out of the same Christianity, would try to rationalize all these processes.

#### **4.6 Formation of the Multiple-Headed World System: The capitalist world economy and the inter-state system**

The social system thus formed is a world system because it is based on an economic system which has developed from the European world economy to a capitalist world economy where in principle everything should be made commodities including human labor and human bodies themselves. This system is multiple-headed on the other hand because it has been directed by a conflicting system of major nation states who continuously compete each other for the hegemony to lead and orient the capitalist world economy. This system is called “the modern world system” by Imanuel Wallerstein (Wallerstein, 1974).

This system is formed from the beginning as a center-periphery structure or more exactly as a centre-semiperiphery-periphery structure. At the center are the hegemonic states, in the periphery are many underdeveloped and exploited nations or peoples before nation-building, and in the semiperipheral area some developing nations who are trying to catch up with the hegemonic nations after overcoming their formerly underdeveloped conditions. And at the center a new community, called a citizenship community, is raised up and shouldered up highly to the inside, while making no disguise of its invasive intentions to the outside with which a world-wide stratification structure is formed rudely. This is the modern world system.

### **V. Citizenship and Class Confrontation: The First Existing Structure of Modern Society**

#### **5.1 Citizenship as a Higher Community: The labor theory of value as a consensus**

At the center of the multiple-headed world system, we can trace back to the inside from exchange to labor, as the origin of exchange, so as to build a new community based on the concept of right property caused by labor itself (Locke, 1690). Labor in this case is an individual labor and the property is also an individual property because peasants and citizens have been moving toward their autonomy as the old feudal community is disorganized in Western Europe (Hirata, 1969). The idea and consciousness of individual property suggests the last form of property which started from a tribal form and has passed through various stages of state, imperial, aristocratic, and warriors' or knights' property (Marx & Engels, 1845-46).

In other words, individual property is conceptualized as the ultimate form of

property as far as it presupposes a formula of "labor=property" that nobody can doubt. We also come to share simultaneously in this process the consciousness that the origin of all value is in labor itself. This especially implies that the origin of values is not in the property of land represented by the feudal landlords but in labor itself and as such this is the universal consciousness not only of peasants but also of all citizens who have not yet been divided into bourgeois and proletarians.

Later, as the capitalist economy develops, capital owners begin to contend that values are generated from not only labor but also capital and technology, while labor theoreticians oppose this by maintaining that the ultimate origin of values is always in labor and that capital represents the accumulation of the past labor while technology should be considered the universalization of labor. Comparing direct labor forces, capital is accumulated labor forces and science and technology are universalized labor forces

If we stand on the consciousness that values originate in labor, we have to recognize that they should be measured by the hours of labor we throw or put into them --- that we spend for them. Actually labor is of almost unlimited variety. Accordingly, values should be measured by an average of the various labor hours which are necessary to produce a variety of commodities, because they are exchanged among each other, so that their values can be mutually referred to. Moreover, naturally they change according to the conditions of each time.

This is the historical significance of the labor theory of value. If we agree on this, a new community is raised and shouldered up on this consensus. We find a new *omikoshi* to shoulder. This community comes to be defined by citizenship and the society which is formed on it comes to be called a civil society. In this stage there is no clear distinction between a civil society and a bourgeois society, among *la société civile*, *la société citoyenne* and *la société bourgeoise* while there is only one word *die bürgerliche Gesellschaft* in German although some have begun to use the word, *die Zivilgesellschaft*. (Shoji, 1999)

## **5.2 Separation of Religion and State, Night-Watch State (Nachtwächterstaat) and Free Trade: liberalism as a hegemony**

From Locke to Adam Smith, the idea of individual property is reconfirmed and on this basis religious tolerance is accepted to promote the separation of religion and state. A state is considered to be based on a minimum function which Ferdinand Lassalle called a "night-watch state (*Nachtwächterstaat*)". Smith finds a surprising power of the division of labor and this means that he actually confirms the effectiveness of a unity between technological and organizational processes of labor as the economic basis of civil society.

He also recognizes conflicting interests among capital owners, workers and land owners, but he expects the market will regulate them as the "invisible hands" of God

(Smith, 1776). The market is considered to be self-regulating in this sense. Smith considers this possible because we all have sympathy --- mutual sympathy (Smith, 1759). Sympathy is, in this sense, the emotional basis for the citizenship as a higher community --- a civil society. In other words sympathy is a bodily comprehension of society

Therefore, Smith asserts, economy should be based on free trade. Thus, the separation of religion and state, the night-watch state and the free trade make liberalism a hegemonic ideology. Liberalism consolidates the citizenship on the inside while it asks for universality on the outside, on the semiperipheral and peripheral areas of the modern world system. Liberalism, in this sense, essentially has a contradiction between its inward and outward movements.

### **5.3 Nationalism, Centralized State and Protective Trade: Nationalism as the counter-hegemony**

The modern world system is, as we have seen, multiple-headed. It is not directed by the only one hegemony. The other hegemony is formed by nationalism.

First, the great French revolution stirs up nationalism against England. An economic theory of nationalism has already been prepared by François Quesnay. His physiocracy considers agriculture and the whole process of production and distribution more important than the market and free trade, creating the *Tableau économique* which influences Marx and later Wassily Leontief, and its analysis is similar to that of J. M. Keynes. The modern French state is formed as a centralized state based on this political economy by Napoleon Bonaparte's strong leadership.

Then, the French nationalism in turn stirs up another explosion of nationalism in Germany. And on the basis of this nationalism is formed the German historical school, the first leader of which is Friedrich List. His political economy is built as that of a national economy and it employs a theory of productive forces against the British political economy as that of a people's economy and a theory of exchange values (List, 1841). After the national integration in 1870, Germany moves strongly toward protective trade --- protectionism.

Other nations who come late have to adopt a more or less protectionist way of trade. All these open ways to an age of imperialism.

### **5.4 Dissolution of Citizenship and Class Confrontation: civil society as a capitalist society**

Civil society exists through labor and exchange processes (A --- W – G – W --- A; A is *Arbeit*, labor, W *Ware*, commodity, and G *Geld*, money, while --- means production process and – exchange process) and as such it is considered just as far as the exchange of equivalents is carried out on the basis of individual property. Commerce (G – W – G) has been widely done for a long time and its inherent injustice has been sanctioned.

As labor forces are merchandised for the capital to get profits by selling goods produced in the process (G – W[Pm, A] --- P --- W' – G'; Pm is *Produktionsmittel*, means of production while W' increased commodity and such), this also comes to be considered just as long as exchange processes are those of equivalents. Moreover, this becomes recognized as the most desirable way to develop a society on the basis of the citizenship.

Thus, commercial capitals developed through agricultural ones into industrial ones, while mercantilism developed through physiocratism develops into industrial capitalism. However, as this mode of production develops, the rich becomes richer and richer while the poor become poorer and poorer. The whole society is divided drastically into the capitalist and working classes --- the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The class bipolarization of a society proceeds. Citizenship as a higher community is threatened to be dissolved by the newly emerging class division and class confrontation. The structure of reproduction as the economic basis of society, which I will discuss below, is a really risky mediation of the citizenship and class confrontation.

Why does this happen? The theory of surplus value, *der Mehrwert, la plus-value*, formulated by Karl Marx, provided an attempt to answer this question. Marx combined the concept of surplus value with that of exploitation. He thought that capital would exploit the surplus value behind seemingly equitable exchanges of labor forces. Owners of capital do not pay for all the value that the worker produces, to take as much of it as possible as their own rewards, insisting that the means of production, which makes it possible for the whole production process to run, are their private property. In order to unmask this secret process, Marx developed a theory of dualism of values --- values-in-use, *Gebrauchswerte, valeurs d'usage* and exchange-values, *Tauschwerte, valeurs d'échange*.

According to Marx, values are exchanged because they can be used, but as soon as they are thrown into exchange processes, they begin to circulate independently. Exchange-values become independent from values-in-use to a considerable extent. Consequently, owners of capital can buy labor forces (as exchange-values) at the cheapest rate and can exploit them (as values-in-use) as much as they want. The modern law of property ensures this by not regulating the production process itself because of the formality.

The modern law of property also legalizes the right of property as a right of single and exclusive ownership of something valuable, including land, by a person, natural or juridical, while, as stated in chap. IV, it can be multiply owned by priests, lords, peasants and such in the medieval German custom of *Gewere*. Thus, the process (G – W[Pm, A] --- P --- W' – G'), is made possible to sustain a reproduction process of the economic basis of the society.

The reproduction process consists of the sector I producing means of production (*Produktionszweig der Produktionsmittel*, the first sector) and the sector II producing

materials of consumption (*Produktionszweig der Konsumtionsmittel*, the second sector). Each sector consists of constant capital, *konstantes Kapital*, variable capital, *variables Kapital* and surplus values, *Mehrwerte* ( $I = I_c + I_v + I_m$ ,  $II = II_c + II_v + II_m$ ).

The first sector cannot produce materials of consumption, nor can the second sector produce means of production. Therefore, if  $I_m$  and  $II_m$  are all consumed by the capital owners (in a case of simple reproduction),  $I_v + I_m$  must be adequately exchanged with  $II_c$  while  $I_c$  and  $II_v + II_m$  are exchanged within each sector. Especially the exchange  $I_v + I_m = II_c$  is symbolic of a good rotation or turnover of the reproduction process. This formula of the reproduction process symbolizes a cone structure of civil society as a capitalist society. From the viewpoint of values-in-use, the civil society is communal. Means of production and materials of consumption are exchanged on the basis of equivalent exchange reflecting individual property produced by individual labor.

However, if these processes presuppose the merchandization of labor forces, the owners of capital exploit labor in the production process in terms of appropriation, *Aneignung*, of surplus values which are the unpaid portion of what the labor produces. Therefore, from the viewpoint of exchange-values, the civil society is divided into capitalist and working classes who get into confrontation and conflicts. The civil society is class-divisive as a capitalist society in this sense. It inevitably falls into the class struggles.

### **5.5 Workship as a Higher Community: Workers' internationalism and socialism**

According to the labor theory of value, 'labor = production = property' realized in a process ( $A \cdots P \cdots W - G - W \cdots P \cdots A$ ) was the consensus. However, as the process ( $A = W - G - W$ ), merchandisation of labor, becomes inevitable, some people buy this  $A = W$  and engage in the process ( $G - W[P_m, A] \cdots P \cdots W' - G'$ ) in order to get profits.

According to the theory of surplus value, exploitation is done behind the exchange of equivalents. And, as owners of capital try desperately in a severe competition, the expanded or progressive reproduction process repeatedly falls into overproduction and/or underproduction, and panics or depressions are brought about periodically. This is the existing structure of the modern class society, the modern stratification built on the higher community based on citizenship.

Therefore, if we operate from the workers' position to try to overcome or sublimate this contradictory structure, we have to replace the citizens' community with a class community of workers. One way to do so is to restore the principle that labor equals production and that production equals property in order to revive the process ( $A \cdots P \cdots W - G - W \cdots P \cdots A$ ), as Pierre Joseph Proudhon, William Morris, and many others have tried.

If we think this is too romantic and retrospective, the other way is to radically change the process ( $G - W[P_m, A] \cdots P \cdots W' - G'$ ) into another process ( $A = G - W[P_m,$

A] --- P --- W' - G' = A). This process presupposes the existence of money, but not the merchandisation of labor forces. The meaning of money changes in that it becomes or returns to a means of exchange instead of a means of capital accumulation.

Then the problem arises of who realizes  $A = G$ , and how. The history of the 20<sup>th</sup> century has been an arena for experiments about this question. Jacobin-Blanquism, having its origin in the Great French Revolution, would seize state power by means of direct actions which are sometimes violent such as street fighting, in order to change the political form and then, rapidly rather than gradually, the whole society from the top. These strategy and tactics are rationalized by the idea that the leaders are the avant-gardes representing the general will of the people in a society in which most of the members are uneducated peasants.

Leninism was a sort of variation on this Jacobin-Blanquism and it succeeded in seizing the state power directly because Russia of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century was still an agricultural society though some major cities like St. Petersburg and Moscow were being industrialized and urbanized to a considerable extent. Leninism realized  $A = G$  by creating soviets all over the society that were the state headquarters or their branches as well as the leading factions of the Communist Party. This was the starting form of a huge bureaucracy of the party state.

Maoism is another variation of the Jacobin-Blanquism, and was sometimes called "agrarian populism" in the much more peasant society in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Maoism also realized  $A = G$  by building a huge bureaucracy based on a party state following the Soviet experiences although it trembled and was disturbed by the Chairman Mao's will for the "Great Leap Forward" and the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution".

Various types of Western European Social Democracy have been tried in attempts to implement various forms of socialist reforms by such democratic means as taking the majority or forming the majority by coalition in the Assemblies. They have succeeded in realizing  $A = G$  to the extent that some major industries have been nationalized and that many welfare policies have been implemented. Most of them, however, have abandoned the Marxist theory of exploitation and also, in most cases, the labor theory of value itself.

The Social Democratic Party of Germany did this by adopting the Godesberger Program in 1959. Britain's Fabianism has been trying to build a new society based on the workers' community without making use of the Marxist theory that stresses the exploitation of surplus values on the basis of the labor theory of value. They once tried to use a sort of Ricardian theory of rent to explain and accuse the exploitation of surpluses in big cities. Fabianism has also succeeded in realizing  $A = G$  to the extent that some major industries have been nationalized and that many welfare policies have been implemented.

### **5.6 Escape to the World System: Bringing workers into imperialism**

Facing the offensives of labor, capital, having already abandoned the labor theory of value and depending on a new theory of marginal utility or modern economics, begins to struggle against and gradually compromises with the labor. Then, utilizing sufficiently the fact that a multiple-headed world system could exist from the beginning by transferring the contradictions in the core countries to the people in the peripheral area, capitalism approaches the form of modern imperialism.

There was a famous controversy regarding the meaning of imperialism. Karl Johann Kautsky contended in his theory of ultra-imperialism that imperialism would be the foreign policy which monopoly capital would make the state take, and therefore those forces might compromise each other (Kautsky, 1913-14). Rosa Luxemburg contended in her theory of imperialism being the inevitable result of capital accumulation that imperialism should be the result of monopoly capital coming to seek customers "out of the territory" as they themselves would narrow the internal market by pauperizing workers (Luxemburg, 1913).

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin tried to sublate the controversy by advancing his theory of imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism (Lenin, 1917). Capital accumulation could be accomplished logically within the territory, but as the capitalism entered into the stage of monopoly under the effects of competition and depressions, monopoly capital would invade all over the world using the states as the advance guards. Therefore, as a territorial re-division of the world was being sought, wars would become inevitable because late-comers would be trying to wedge themselves into forerunners.

Lenin's theory was most successful in explaining the processes leading to World War I, and this increased the popularity of Leninism before and after World War II. However, if we frankly consider the changes in the situation after World War II, we find many aspects which can be effectively analyzed and interpreted by Kautsky's and Luxemburg's theories.

The multiple-headed world system has several facets of interest in this respect. Some people insist that Kautsky's theory is useful for analyzing the basic alliance of postwar imperialist powers urged by the existence of the Soviet Union and/or the nuclear armed forces and that the latter is still urging them to do so. Some others find that Luxemburg's theory is quite effective in analyzing the "structure of dependence" of the developing countries in relation to the advanced and hegemonic nations and to various types of "exchanges of non-equivalents" in the contemporary world system.

In any case, it seems true that large amounts of capital from the central nations have escaped to the outside, to the capitalist world economy, while compromising their workers and making more and more labor aristocrats in the inside of their territories.

## VI. Self-Exciting Social System: The Second Existing Structure of the Modern Social System

### 1. Empire Building by the Name of Workers' Community: From early-born socialism to social imperialism

Reacting against monopoly capital or major capitalist countries who were escaping or running away from internal conflicts into arbitrary exploitation in the world system, some activists tried to build socialist regimes in the name of the workers' community. Some activists thought they should do this because workers could not develop the consciousness to do this by themselves due to the late development of capitalism and the ideological hegemony of the bourgeoisie. This represents a variation of Jacobin-Blanquism.

Some activists also chose to do this because they thought workers were too few and weak and so they should make alliances with peasants. In order to start an uprising, they selected a country which was the weakest link in the world-wide chain of imperialist powers because all of them were involved in a world war due to their conflicting interests about territorial re-division of the world (theory of imperialism). They also took over the state power first because they thought the state was a means for the ruling class to oppress the people or the ruled classes arbitrarily (theory of class state, Lenin, 1917). The Russian Revolution was launched along this line and, intentionally or not, this led to empire building in the name of the workers' community.

They tried to change the process ( $G - W[Pm, A] \dashrightarrow P \dashrightarrow W' - G'$ ) to another process ( $A = G \rightarrow W[Pm, A] \dashrightarrow P \dashrightarrow W' \rightarrow G' = A$ ). However, actually this process became a different process ( $S = G \rightarrow W[Pm, A] \dashrightarrow P \dashrightarrow W' \rightarrow G' = S$ ; S is *Staat*, State). In this process the state (S) first appropriates all the money to allocate it to Pm (factories, farms and offices) and A (workers, peasants and intellectuals) in order to make them produce necessary goods (*norma*) and distributes them to Pm and A again to run the next cycle.

If  $S = A$  were actually true (the state was really a workers' state) and if the state plan (*Gosplan*) really functioned instead of the market system, this might be a form of socialism --- a state socialism. However, as a matter of fact, the Party intermediated between workers and the state, first to coordinate allocations and distributions, but gradually to take special margins or interests for their own sake. The state plan was distorted and a privileged class (*nomenklatura*) was formed. Leon Trotsky attacked this, calling it "the revolution betrayed" (Trotsky, 1937), Herbert Marcuse criticized Soviet Marxism as "oppressive" (Marcuse, 1958) and Tony Cliff accused Soviet Union of being a form of "state capitalism".

In short, the Soviet Union built a huge empire on the basis of the alleged workers' community and yet stratification actually emerged --- a *de facto* cone structure --- due

to the establishment of "Marxism-Leninism", especially by the dictator Stalin, as a form of religion on Marxism which sanctified Lenin. The Soviet state, as I have previously mentioned, procured peoples' loyalty by encouraging worship of statues of Lenin and Stalin and by using some shrine-like buildings such as cultural palaces which were built everywhere in the Soviet Union and other subordinate socialist countries.

The Cultural Palace, built at the center of Warsaw, was especially well-known or notorious among the Polish people. It was built by Stalin following the main building of the Lomonosov (Moscow) university as the model. I saw another of the same kind in Bucharest, Romania. What were these, if not the techniques implemented by a single-headed imperial system?

In the 1970s China began to criticize the Soviet Union as being a system of "social imperialism". Social imperialism was originally a word used by Lenin himself when attacking British Fabians because they were actually supporting the British Empire's colonialist policies. This word was thrown back on the Soviet Union itself. The social empire must have also been single-headed. Therefore, the Soviet Union created its puppet governments in Eastern Europe and tried to make even China subordinate. However, this caused the Sino-Soviet (Soviet-Chinese) controversies to escalate quickly, eventually reaching the stage of direct confrontation including military collisions.

## **6.2 Mass Production and Discovery of Consumers' Community: From civil society to mass consumption society**

On the other hand, in the United States, Taylor's ideas of "scientific management" began to be introduced into major corporations and the bases of Fordism were established (Taylor, 1911; Aglietta, 1976). Especially Fordism developed a managers' perspective on the management of labor process and on the whole process of workers' life, including its aspect of consumption. Later the "regulation school" would call this system a "regulation system".

The fact was found afresh that a worker could be at the same time a consumer. Workers as consumers would consume more than necessities. Thorstein Veblen had shown that the leisure class would engage in conspicuous consumption (Veblen, 1899). It was found that even working class people would do the same thing if given some leeway or margin of money. They gradually found that consumption need not only result in satisfaction but that it could be a symbolic action or symbolism itself.

The success of Ford's T-type cars proved this (Mita, 1996). The popularization of private cars opened a door to an age of mass consumption. Later Walt Whitman Rostow would reconfirm this in his book *The Stages of Economic Growth* (Rostow, 1960).

At about the same time, industrialism was rediscovered. The notion of industrialism as an ideology was formed in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries by

Henri de Saint-Simon and Auguste Comte, the founders of socialism and sociology, and was made one of its major bases. In the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, sociology was made an ideology of capitalism or the bourgeoisie, while Marxism or the theory of class struggles was made the ideology of socialism or the proletariat.

In the 1930s George Soule suggested that industrialism could be seen the common basis for both capitalism and socialism (Soule, 1933). In the depression, capitalism was struggling for a more planned society and the basis for it was industrialism. Had not Soviet socialism been trying to build a planned society on the basis of industrialism? Had not either capitalism or socialism been moving forward to the same or at least a similar direction? Later this idea (a convergence theory) would be used as an ideology for the peaceful coexistence of capitalism and socialism.

Thus we can say that the industrial community was rediscovered. However, as we are already in an age of mass production and mass consumption, our conception of industrialism should be something to fit the age. The industrial community has been a community dominated by industrialists, *les industriels*, most of whom are industrial capitalists or managers working for them, if we use the words of the founders of industrialism. But now should we not think of a new idea of industrialism for consumers because we all, including workers, managers and even capitalists, are consumers in the age of mass consumption and the mass consumption society? All of these would become the basis for theories of a consumption society (Baudrillard, 1970).

### **6.3 Empire Building under the Name of National Community: Totalitarianism and the "myth of the 20th century"**

When nations were unable to use the names of either the workers' or consumers' community, they tried to build an empire under the name of their own national community in order to survive in the age of imperialism and social imperialism. Italy attempted this first, providing the idea *fascio*, bundle or unity, of the whole nation. Germany followed by advancing the more thorough-going idea of *Volk* or *Blut und Boden* backed up by the idea of the "myth of the 20th century", by learning techniques of revolution from Russia. Japan was urged to undertake expansionist policies in order to join the struggles for territorial re-division of East and Southeast Asia, imitating the German model.

The myth of the 20th century was first of all racist in terms of insisting on maintaining the purity of blood of the Aryan people so as to exclude Jews, who were supposed to dirty it (Rosenberg, A, 1930, *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts*). It also pretended to be a form of national socialism. The word "Nazi" came from *Nationalsozialisten*. However, the Nazis did not abolish private property or ownership of major means of production but set aside great monopoly capital for their use. The owners of monopoly capital also made use of it for their own sake (Neumann, 1944).

Nazis adopted parliamentarianism on the surface in order to take over the state power through elections, while using all kinds of dirty and violent means on the back side or underground. They made quite effective use of mass media such as mass meeting, radio, movies and such. After the takeover, they implemented *die Gleichschaltung* as a revolution from the top, learning from the experiences of Soviet socialism. They enforced a planned production and distribution system, which should be considered a wartime economy rather than socialism.

In sum, German Nazism was an attempt to build a contemporary single-headed imperial system on the basis of modern monopoly capitalism by means of a new racist religion symbolized by the idea of the "myth of the 20th century".

In Japan, leaders had already made full use of the existence of the Emperor to overcome all kinds of confusions and conflicts at the end of the Tokugawa period and in the early Meiji era they used it to build up a new community for "modernization". Japan's modern Tennoist system was a sort of single-headed imperial system intended for modernization, although it had a dual structure of modern social institutions and traditional Shintoist and Confucian ideologies (including ideological apparatuses of the state such as families, schools, mass media and such.).

Osamu Kuno has called this dual structure of the Tennoist ideology a dual system of esoteric and exoteric doctrines like that of Buddhism (Kuno & Tsurumi, 1956). This single-headed imperial system later became one of the heads of the multiple-headed modern world system, as Japan's capitalist economy developed by utilizing so-called feudal residues. Therefore, facing serious difficulties after World War I, Japan tried to leap to another contemporary single-headed imperial system following the German model.

For that purpose, it developed the Japanese nationalism into a new ideology which it called the Great Asian Co-Prosperity Zone (*Dai Toa Kyoiei Ken*). The National Mobilization Regime (*Kokka Sodojin Taisei*) backed up by the Imperial Rule Assistance Association (*Taisei Yokusan Kai*) was an imitation of Germany's *Gleichschaltung*. Japan's Tennoist system was also a modern single-headed imperial system oriented toward continuous and unlimited expansion.

#### **6.4 Mass Consumption and Self-Exciting System: Self-rotationization of consumption society by an intervening state**

Through the experiences of the Great Depression and World War II, the implementation of a consumers' community came to be connected with another finding of state (government) intervention. Keynesian economics had already provided a theory to rationalize government intervention to stimulate and activate depressed economies (Keynes, 1936).

According to Keynes, income is the sum of consumption and savings on the one hand and the sum of consumption and investment on the other, therefore savings should

equal investment. If savings is kept un-invested for interests or interest earners, the size of economy does not expand to produce more business activities and opportunities for employment. Therefore, the government or state should do something to encourage or even urge investment when the economy is depressed or stagnated.

After World War II it was realized that consumption could also be expanded operationally. John K. Galbraith proposed the “dependence effect”, which argued that consumption would not be necessarily independent but rather would expand depending on the whole production and distribution process including market research, public relations, commercial advertisement and such (Galbraith, 1958). According to him, there are two kinds of needs --- absolute and relative --- and the necessities of life are absolute.

However, we have relative needs which do not follow the law of diminishing marginal utility. Rather they increase or expand almost unlimitedly as forms of conspicuous consumption, as we have already noted in regard to Veblen’s book. They depend, we can say, on the process of their fulfillment itself and therefore they depend quite a lot on advertising, sales and finally production itself. This theory is, as a matter of fact, a reconfirmation and a new formulation of the ideas of consumers' community.

A variety of myths about consumption and consumers have been produced as ideologies of this self exciting system --- a self-rotationized, or we might even say a self revolutionized, consumption society controlled by an intervening state. Consumers are kings. If you consume as much as you want, you will eventually make an ideal society and so on. And this process goes on continually.

### **6.5 Increasing Self-Excitement in the Name of the Information Community: Informational consumption society and dispersion of power**

Propaganda for mass consumption gradually extends into the area of mass leisure and mass education. People come to consume time in pursuing recreation, travel and all kinds of hobbies and then become interested in sending children to schools of higher education to allow them upward mobility in the social stratification. Students sent on to higher education, however, come to consider their college and university life as a time for indulging in leisure activities.

Thus, a mass consumption society develops into a mass leisure society which, in a sense, has aspects of a mass education society. Along with the diffusion of durable consumers' goods such as private cars and electric cleaners, washers, refrigerators and such, mass media such as newspapers, radio, movies, television and telephones are spread throughout the society. All these create the basis for an information community based on the consumers' community.

Computers began to be used extensively in the 1960s. Based on this development, sociology developed theories of industrial society into theories of knowledge society and

information society (Shoji, 1977). At this stage, American sociologists preferred the term “knowledge society” to “information society”, stressing changes in production structures of the society, while Japanese sociologists preferred “information society”, stressing changes in consumption activities of the society. Japan had at last achieved the status of a consumption society as the results of its postwar high-speed economic growth.

In the 1970s and 1980s, computers rapidly became personalized (small-sized in terms of independent machines as well as terminals of networks). Operation and application software was developed and improved more rapidly than imagined. As the intellectual technology developed, more and more media were connected with each other to make a system of multimedia. And as the Internet was opened to non-military, business and general public use, all of these were connected into world-wide or global networks.

Virtual realities expanded and came to be considered as parts of our general realities and all of these developed and increased the level of the self-exciting system on the basis of the information community. Due to this expansion and complication of our realities, the power structure has been dispersed so that it has been getting more and more difficult to comprehend its existence and function.

This situation of power exercise is very close to the one that Michel Foucault developed in all his books exploring the structure of modern society (Foucault, 1966; 1972; 1976-86). This is one of the reasons why his works have been so ardently welcomed, especially by younger people who are becoming more and more sensitive to invisible power exercises due to all kinds of media which are being accepted as parts of their bodies.

#### **6.6 The Quasi Single-Headed World System and Its Complex Stratification: External and internal colonialism of American imperialism**

America's intervening state is also intervening to the outside, the rest of the world. The American state tried to become a welfare state when it faced the Great Depression of 1929 and after. However it actually moved to find a way out of the Depression in expanding its economic basis in order to prepare for the War. Through World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War and others, the American state became a Warfare-Welfare State (Marcuse, 1964).

The United States has also been criticized for being a new type of imperialism which, although not having many colonies of the 19th century sense, spread the structure of dependence over the Central and South American countries as well as produced a higher level of dependence structure among the ex-imperialist countries, now the advanced capitalist ones, including both the victorious and the defeated in World War II (Baran & Sweezy, 1966; Magdoff, 1969).

On the other hand, it has been holding on to an "Inner Third World" since the

colonial age and has been criticized for its "internal colonialism" especially after the civil rights movements of the 1960s.

Thus, America developed a consumers' community, upgraded it into an information community which could be self-excitedly rotated through interventions of the Warfare-Welfare State, and built on these communal bases a huge stratification of class and ethnicity to the inside and at the same time another huger stratification of advanced, developing and underdeveloped countries to the outside in the contemporary world society. The ideology for this whole process has been an Americanism that starts from consumerism, through people's capitalism and new industrialism up to informationalism, based on the latest fruits of science and technology and humanism. For this it has been often criticized for its self-righteousness.

In short, the modern social system itself seems to have acquired a second existing structure that we can call a "quasi single-headed world system", the top of which is the self-exciting society, having around it a higher dependence structure existing among advanced societies. And, of course, there are developing and underdeveloped societies in the semiperipheral and peripheral zones of this world system and it makes a larger structure of dependence with these and the advanced societies. It was this self-exciting society that confronted the socialist world, especially the social imperialist system, mobilizing other advanced, developing and even underdeveloped countries.

## VII. Globalizing Society: A Quasi Single-Headed World System or a Social and Ecological System?

### **1. Social Imperialist System and Nuclear Imperialist System: The "two worlds" and consequences of the "cold war"**

The social imperialist system created its own center-periphery structure. First it established several puppet governments in the East Europe. Then it tried to make Asian and Latin American socialist governments subordinate. However, in the course of these attempts it faced China's resistance and finally came to confront it.

Carrying out this empire building, social imperialism confronted the head of a quasi single-headed world system that turned out to be a superpower armed with nuclear weapons. An ultra-modern imperialist state based on the self-exciting social system, incorporating a self-revolutionized information and consumption society, had been expanding as a nuclear imperialist state which had the nuclear military-industrial complex at the top and center of its structure. It went on to stretch out its arms and legs all over the world.

To counter this, the social imperialist state, having succeeded in developing nuclear weapons by itself, became another nuclear power by continuously expanding its nuclear armed forces. The social imperialist state also developed into a nuclear

imperialist state.

In 1962 the Cuban crisis happened. The United States blockaded the sea around Cuba in order to stop the Soviet Union from building missile sites in Cuba. The nuclear imperialist and social imperialist states were about to begin a war. Humankind faced a crisis of a possible World War III. On the other hand, in 1968, during "Prague Spring", Czechoslovakia's democratization movement was crushed by the Warsaw Pact Army. Social imperialism exposed its internal crisis.

In 1975 The Vietnam War ended. The United States was defeated by and withdrew from Vietnam. America's first defeat shocked all the people and Americanism was thrown into serious doubts. The basis of nuclear imperialism trembled. However, in 1979 the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan and began its own "Vietnam War". In 1981 Ronald Reagan was inaugurated as the president of the United States. He set forth the Strategic Defense Initiative, and invoked anti-nuclear movements all over the world. Nuclear imperialism tried to regain its power desperately.

In 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev took over as secretary-general of the Soviet Communist Party and began Perestroika. There emerged possibilities of democratizing the social empire. However, in 1989 the socialist regimes of East-European countries collapsed and the social empire began to be disorganized from its satellite countries. The United States and the Soviet Union issued a joint statement to end the "cold war" at Malta. The nuclear capitalist and social imperialist states realized and confirmed the unreality of committing a nuclear war.

In 1991 Iraq invaded Kuwait and the Gulf War started. The US-led multi-national army attacked Iraq in order to liberate Kuwait successfully. In the same year a coup d'état was tried by conservative leaders of the Soviet Union and, in failing to manage its repercussions, this nuclear social imperialist state disappeared.

Thus, the American nuclear empire won this confrontation and the quasi single-headed world system under its hegemony actually has covered the whole world. The world changed from a bi-polar system to a mono-polar system. However, as the European Union has become stronger and stronger, the quasi single-headed world system has been being pulled back toward the original multiple-headed world system. Of course, the powers of Japan, Russia, China and others cannot be ignored.

I have already mentioned the major cause of the Soviet failure or, more definitely, of the failure of Perestroika. Gorbachev was one of the best democrats born in the Soviet Union, but at the same time he was one of the last Leninists who rather simply believed political reforms from the top could change the social system.

If we compare this Soviet experience with that of China, we can see the latter's realism in recognizing that the economic reform should be accomplished first because this is all the people have to live on. We can also see that China's way is more congruent with the basic idea of Marxism that the economy is the basis of social formation. It is natural, therefore, that Vietnam decided to follow the Chinese way.

Cuba and North Korea, however, have been facing too many of their own difficulties to achieve substantial political change and economic growth.

## **7.2 Negative Formation of Human Community: Nuclear arms expansion race showing the limits of wars**

Through the period of the cold war, huge amounts of nuclear arms were accumulated mainly in the United States and the Soviet Union. By 1983 the United States, the Soviet Union and the other nuclear-armed countries altogether had stored nuclear weapons of 150 million times more explosive power than that of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima, which had the explosive power of 12.5 kiloton TNT (trinitrotoluene). By 1997 the United States and Russia reached a stability ratio of two thirds the number of nuclear warheads and one half the number of platforms that had been in existence at the peak of the late 1980s (SIPRI, 1997). Britain, France and China each maintain about one tenth of nuclear weapons in terms of explosive power.

Therefore the amount of nuclear arms stored has obviously been decreased, but it is still more than enough to annihilate the whole of humankind. Moreover the decisive power to use them is exclusively held by actually only 5 nuclear big powers, especially just one or two superpowers. Some nations like India have been protesting against this state of oligopoly of nuclear weapons and thus the NPT-CTBT system has been becoming quite unstable.

Considering these facts, we can at least say that this world has been totally covered by the range of nuclear arms so that for most of nations it has become impossible to have any ambition to build an empire of a considerable size. There have been, even after the Cold War, not a few limited wars or military conflicts in various regions in the world, with the result that military expenses of some areas or countries have been rather increasing. However, we can say that wars have stopped existing as the *ultima ratio* or the last means to solve serious problems which may emerge among human groups, not only nations.

Of course, the United States has the power to intervene in all kinds of conflicts with its nuclear armed forces in order to settle them for its own interests, but its intention can be checked from the inside by the American people's will and from the outside by the world's public opinion channeled through international and global media including the United Nations. Considering all of these factors, we can say that we are now, even though negatively or unconsciously, shouldering a community of a global scale whatever we may call it. This community, although still shrinking, may provide a basis for a newly emerging society which we will call a "global society as a social and ecological system".

## **7.3 Expanding Global Stratification: From East-West and North-South problems to the "Summit" regime**

In an expanding global community, formed negatively by the nuclear armament expansion race, global stratifications have emerged and have been expanding (Shoji, 1999, 51). According to Samir Amin, in 1975, of the economically active people of the world, 27% living in the center earned 83% of the world's total income while 73% living in the periphery earned only 17%. The capitalist and middle class people of the center who comprise only 7% of the world's total population received 40% of the world's total income.

Since the last quarter of the 20th century, the North-South gap has widened. According to UNDP, the income distribution of the world was bipolarized between the period 1965-80 and that of 1980-93. If we take one dollar per day as the poverty line, 1.3 billion people, or 33% of the total population of developing countries, are still under this line.

These data show that there is a huge pyramid of stratification in the world, the top of which is occupied by the diamond-types or hour-glass types of stratification seen in the developed or advanced nations. Most diamond-type structures of stratification have been changed into more or less hour-glass type structures in the advanced countries during their information-oriented economic development in the 1980s and after. After the collapse of socialist regimes, the ex-Soviet and East-European countries have been pulled down into semi-developing ones.

Why has this huge stratification occurred? It is because the human community has been formed by the nuclear-armed superpower that has within itself its own stratified center-periphery structures (Shoji, 1999). At its top and center there is a nuclear military-industrial complex which is a complex of the military, industry, government, university, unions and such, formed for, first, nuclear armaments, second, general armaments to support them and, third, major industries which support all of these.

Multinational corporations take part in this complex as they perform their major activities and, taking advantage of them, develop all kinds of economic activities all over the world. They make "triple alliances" with local capitals and states of developing countries in various regions of the world in order to extend their activities into the corners of the peripheries (Evans, 1979). Thus the huge stratified center-periphery structures have been formed in a global scale.

The superpower, the United States, has tried to make use of the United Nations in maintaining this stratified center-periphery structures, but, facing strong resistances from the Soviet Union, China and more and more developing countries, has shifted the major stage to make and implement its world and global policies gradually by means of the Summit Conference. The Summit began as a meeting of the heads of super and big powers to coordinate economic policies to overcome rather depressive situations after the Oil Crises in the 1970s.

However, especially after the end of the Cold War, it has been becoming a more and more comprehensive meeting, used to discuss and coordinate not only economic but

political and military policies of each time. Moreover, it has accepted Russia since 1997. It has been becoming more and more the stage for these super and big powers to bring about coordination constantly about the world economy, regional conflicts and national and global policies in general. Is this a government which has been established over the United Nations? Do we have to discuss the Summit Regime as a quasi world government?

In 2000 the Japanese government tried to invite China to the Okinawa summit, but they did not accept the invitation. India and many others, not only developing but even developed, countries would not recognize the summit as a world government in any sense. Since a financial and economic crisis began to cover all over the world in 2008, the summit states have tried to organize meetings including major newly emerging nations such as China and India in order to cope with the expanding crises. The new US government that started in 2009 has been promoting this tendency toward a more world government-type meeting.

#### **4. Visualization of Ecological Restrictions: Expansion of environmental problems into the crisis of global ecology**

In the globally stratified center-periphery structures not only super and big powers but also developing nations have tried to further development with all their powers. They have said anonymously that they would carry out not only economic but also social and cultural development, but, as a matter of fact, not only developing but even developed countries have done very little in social and cultural development. All nations, developed and developing, and therefore the globally stratified center-periphery structures themselves, have transferred their contradictions to their outer environment, that is to say to the global ecological system.

In 1972 the Stockholm UN Conference for Human Environment instituted the phrase "Only One Earth", but most of the participants were from advanced nations. In 1980 the Carter Administration of the US issued a comprehensive report "The Global 2000 Report to the President: entering the 21st century" (US Government, 1980), but the Reagan Administration which followed stressed "reindustrialization", "Reaganomics", "Strategic Defense Initiative (Star Wars)" and such policies for building a "strong America".

In 1992 the Rio de Janeiro Global Summit, also known as the UN Conference for Environment and Development, declared "Sustainable Development" as a goal under strong pressures from developing countries and even from the United States. The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development proposed the Agenda 21. In February 1993 the Committee for Sustainable Development was organized under the UN Economic and Social Council. In May 1997 the 19th Special Session of the UN General Assembly was held on Environment and Development. In December 1997 the 3<sup>rd</sup> Conference of Parties of the Framework Convention on Climate Change issued

the Kyoto Protocol.

Through all these developments the ecological restrictions of our society --- especially of our global society --- have been gradually or rapidly visualized to more and more people who are becoming, whether they like it or not, global citizens. As long as we continue to regard ourselves just as local or national citizens, we can escape from noticing the ecological restrictions and implications of our own society because we can export pollution problems outside of the border into the sea or more or less lowly-regulated countries. This was the state of developed countries of more than ten years ago, but now we all have to be aware of the ecological restrictions we share mutually.

However, advanced and developing nations have been severely confronting each other and even among advanced nations there are sharp confrontations between ecology-conscious nations such as the EU and economy-conscious nations such as the US and China. The global environmental problem will continue to be the major issue of the globalizing society in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### **7.5 The Body as a New Focus: New social problems in stratified center-periphery structures**

The global society has been newly “subjectifying” our body in Foucault's sense. In affluent societies which have appeared at the top and center of the globally stratified center-periphery structures, we have come at first to face a problem such that some people have too much food to keep our body slim. Dieting has become a boom and some younger people, such as Karen of the Carpenters, even died of anorexia nervosa. Our lifespan has also been prolonged so we have to face problems of aging in fear of senile dementia.

We have decreased the number of our children for various reasons, especially because we have been liberated from pressures that force us to have more children to survive, and decreased children have come to face problems of too much care or over-managed life spaces, such as in families, schools and such. These social problems have begun to spread into developing countries as they try to “modernize” themselves while still having a lot of “classical” social problems caused by mass poverty.

Thus bodily social problems are problems raised by the way our global society “subjectifies” our body. Starting from our body, we have explored major problems of social expansion such as (1) community and stratification, (2) state, religion, market and city, (3) single-headed imperial systems, (4) intermediate empires with movable productive-military units, (5) the multiple-headed world system with a capitalist world economy and nation states, (6) civil societies as capitalist societies with reproduction mechanisms intermediating citizenship and class confrontation, and (7) a self-revolutionized information-consumption society stretching its arms and legs all

over the world as a quasi single-headed world system.

At present we are facing a globalizing society with a shrinking human community as the basis, huge stratified center-periphery structures on it, environmental problems of the largest scale as parts of the global ecological crisis, and bodily social problems shaking the very framework of our existence. Is this simply another expansion of the quasi single-headed world system based on the self-revolutionized information-consumption society, or is it the germ of a new social system?

#### **7.6 Globalizing Society as a Social and Ecological System: The appearing of a new social system?**

The currently globalizing society is at first an expansion of the quasi single-headed world system which has been criticized as a form of American imperialism. Now that the Soviet Union has disappeared, this system can be said to be actually the only empire controlling the whole world.

However, as we all know well, this is neither an imperial system in the classical sense, nor a contemporary instance of a fascist empire like Nazi Germany or a social empire like Soviet Union. The polity of the US is a democracy and its behavior on the international stage is checked by the EU, Russia, China, India, Japan and so on. The American Imperialism is, in this sense, a functional imperialism. Especially after the 1980s, it has been attacked as a form of media-imperialism or as cultural imperialism (Tomlinson, 1991; 1999). Therefore we should not overlook possibilities to change it.

American citizens can change their own government and giant corporations in various ways. Citizens in other countries can change their own governments so that they can influence the US via the UN, the Summit, and other such systems. Moreover, international NGOs and NPOs have been increasing their influence not only on the United Nations but also on the US government, governments of other major nations and multi-national corporations. Thus global citizens' movements have emerged and developed as the global functional imperialism has been strengthened.

Developing global networks will help these movements as well as functional imperial activities. Therefore we are now at a crossroads of the quasi single-headed world system that is functionally an ultramodern form of imperialism and a new global social system which I would like to call a "global society as a social and ecological system".

If we make use of the shrinking human community as a positive framework for a global society, and if we disorganize the contemporary stratified center-periphery structures to become more equal as much as we can, and if we include the environment as much as possible into our formation of the social system so that we do not exploit but live together with it, and if we "re-subjectify" our own body as real sovereigns of the global society through overcoming bodily social problems, the currently globalizing society will lean towards a new social and ecological system.

**Notes and Acknowledgment:** This paper is based on the notes for a series of lectures that I gave at the University of Tokyo during 2000 and 2003. For an example of recent development, see Shoji (2009). Professor Bruce Allen, Seisen University, Tokyo, kindly checked my English, raising many interesting questions and useful suggestions. I thank him from the heart, although the final responsibility is mine.

## References

Aglietta, M., 1976, *Régulation et crises du capitalisme: l'expérience des Etats-Unis*, Calmann-Lévy.

Baran, P. A. and Sweezy, P. M., 1966, *Monopoly Capital*, Monthly Review Press.

Baudrillard, J., 1970, *La société de consommation, ses mythes, ses structures*.

Berger, P., 1967, *The Sacred Canopy: elements of a sociological theory of religion*, Doubleday.

Blumer, H., 1969, *Symbolic Interactionism: perspective and method*, Prentice-Hall.

Bourdieu, P., 1980a, *Le sens pratique*, Éditions de Minuit

Bourdieu, P., 1980b, *Questions de Sociologie*, Éditions de Minuit.

Bourdieu, P., 1987, *Choses dites*, Éditions de Minuit.

Cliff, T., 1974, *State Capitalism in Russia*, London : Pluto Press.

Comte, A., 1830-42, *Cours de philosophie positive*, 6 tomes, 5<sup>e</sup> éd., 1892., Éditions Anthropos, 1968.

Derrida, J., 1967a, *L'écriture et la différence*, Le Seuil.

Derrida, J., 1967b, *De la grammatologie*, Édition de Minuit.

Dewey, J., 1910, *How to think*.

Dewey, J., 1922, *Human Nature and Conduct : an introduction to social psychology*.

Durkheim, E., 1895, *Les règles de la méthode sociologique*, Presse Universitaire de France, 1968.

Durkheim, E., 1912, *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse: le système totémique en Australie*, P.U.F., 1960.

Evans, P., 1979, *Dependent Development: the alliance of multinational, state and local capital in Brazil*, Princeton University Press.

Foucault, M., 1966, *Les mots et les choses: une archéologie des sciences humaines*, Gallimard.

Foucault, M., 1972, *L'histoire de la folie*, Gallimard.

Foucault, M., 1975, *Surveiller et punir: naissance de la prison*, Gallimard.

Foucault, M., 1976-86, *Histoire de la sexualité: 1 Le volonté de savoir, 1976, 2 L'usage des plaisirs, 1984, 3 Le souci de soi, 1986*, Gallimard.

Galbraith, J. M., 1958, *The Affluent Society*, Houghton Mifflin, 4<sup>th</sup> rev. ed., 1984.

- Hechter, M., 1975, *Internal Colonialism: the Celtic fringe in british national development*, University of California Press.
- Hegel, G. W. F., 1821, *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*.
- Hegel, G. W. F., 1830, *Encyclopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften in Grundrisse*.
- Hegel, G. W. F., 1837, *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte*, Reclam, 1924.
- Hirata, K., 1969, *Civil society and Socialism*, Iwanami Publishers.
- Kautsky, K. J., 1913-14, „Der Imperialismus“, *Neue Zeit*, Jg.32, Bd.II.
- Keynes, J. M., 1936, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, Macmillan.
- Kuno, O. & Tsurumi, S., 1956, *Thoughts of Contemporary Japan*, Iwanami Publishers.
- Ленин, В.И., 1917, *Империализм, как высшая стадия капитализма, Полное собрание сочинений*, 5 из., том 27, 1962.
- Ленин, В.И., 1917, *Государство и революция, Полное собрание сочинений*, 5 из., том 33, 1964.
- Lévi-Strauss, C., 1949, *Les structures élémentaires de la parenté*, P.U.F., nouvelle éd. La Haye.
- Lévi-Strauss, C., 1955, *Tristes tropiques*, Plon.
- Lévi-Strauss, C., 1958, *Anthropologie structurale*, Plon.
- List, F., 1841, *Das nationale System der politischen Ökonomie*, 1982, Akademie Verlag.
- Locke, J., 1690, *Two Treatises of Government*, a critical edition with an introduction and apparatus criticus by Peter Laslett, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., reprinted with amendments, 1970, Cambridge University Press.
- Luxemburg, R., 1913, *Akkumulation des Kapitals : ein Beitrage zur ökonomischen Erklärung des Imperialismus*, 4. Aufl. 1970, Verlag Neue Kritik.
- McCormick, John S, 1992, *The Global Environmental Movement: reclaiming paradise*, Belhaven Pr., 2nd ed., 1995.
- Magdoff, H., 1969, *The Age of Imperialism*, Monthly Review Press.
- Malinowski, B. K., 1922, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, G. Routledge.
- Mannheim, K., 1929, *Ideologie und Utopie*, Friedrich Cohen, *Ideology and Utopia : an introduction to the sociology of Knowledge*, Routledge, 1936 by L.Wirth & E.Shils.
- Marcuse, H., 1958, *Soviet Marxism*, Columbia University Press.
- Marcuse, H., 1964, *One-Dimensional Man*, Beacon Press.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F., 1845-46, *Die deutsche Ideologie*, MEW 3, Dietz, 1958.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F., 1848, *Manifest der kommunistischen Partei*, MEW 4, Dietz, 1959.
- Mead, G. H., ed. by C. W. Morris, 1934, *Mind, Self and Society: from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*.

- Mita, M., 1996, *Theory of Contemporary Society: Present and Future of Our Information-oriented Consumption Society*, Iwanami Publishers.
- Murakami, Kumon & Sato, 1979, *"Ie" Society as a Civilization*, Chuo-koron Publishers,
- Neumann, F., 1944, *Behemoth: the structure and practice of national socialism, 1933-44*, Oxford University Press, 2nd ed.
- Otsuka, H., 1969a, *Introduction to the History of European Economy*, Iwanami Publishers.
- Otsuka, H., 1969b, *Genealogy of Modern Capitalism*, Iwanami Publishers.
- Quesnay, F., 1758, *Tableau économique*.
- Rostow, W. W., 1960, *The Stages of Economic Growth*, Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed., 1971.
- Rousseau, J. J., 1754, *Discours sur L'origine et les fondements de l'égalité parmi les hommes*.
- Rousseau, J. J., 1762, *Du contrat social: ou principes du droit politique*.
- Shoji, K., 1977, *Theory of Contemporarization and Contemporary Society*, University of Tokyo Press.
- Shoji, K., 1989, *A New Perspective to Social Development*, University of Tokyo Press.
- Shoji, K., 1999, *Global Society and Citizens' Linkage*, Yuhikaku Publishers.
- Shoji, K., 2009, "Citizens' Sociology in the Age of Crises and Changes", *Bulletin of Seisen University*, 2009, Seisen University, Tokyo.
- SIPRI, 1997, *Yearbook: Armament, Disarmament and International Security*, Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Soule, G., 1933, *A Planned Society*, New York: Macmillan.
- Suzuki, D., 1997, *Oriental Way of Thinking, new ed.*, Iwanami Publishers.
- Taylor, F. W., 1911, *The Principles of Scientific Management*, Harper.
- Thomas, W. I. & Znaniecki, F.W., 1918-20, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, 5 vols., 2nd ed. 2 vols., 1929.
- Tomlinson, J., 1991, *Cultural Imperialism: a critical introduction*, France Pinter.
- Tomlinson, J., 1999, *Globalization and Culture*, Polity Press.
- Trotsky, L., 1937, *The Revolution Betrayed: what is the Soviet Union and where is it going?*, Doubleday, Doran & Co.
- Turner, V., 1969, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure*, Aldine Publishing.
- Ueno, C., 1985, *Adventures of Structuralism*, Keiso Publishers.
- UNDP, 1996, *Human Development Report 1996*, Oxford University Press.
- US Government, 1980, *The Global 2000 Report to the President: entering the*

*twenty-first century*, 3 vols.

Veblen, Th. B., 1899, *The Theory of Leisure Class: an economic study in the evolution of institution*, Macmillan.

Wallerstein, I., 1974, *The Modern World System: capitalist agriculture and the European world economy in the sixteenth century*, The Academic Press.

Wallerstein, I., 1980, *The Modern World System II: mercantilism and the consolidation of the European world-economy, 1600-1750*, The Academic Press.

Wallerstein, I., 1989, *The Modern World System III: the second era of great expansion of capitalist world-economy, 1730-1840s*, The Academic Press.

Wittfogel, K. A., 1957, *Oriental Despotism: a comparative study of total power*, Yale University Press.

Yanagita, K., 1931, *History of Meiji and Taisho: Phases of Life*, 1993, Kodansha Publishers.