

THE
KYOTO UNIVERSITY
ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMOIRS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS
KYOTO UNIVERSITY

VOLUME LXIII NUMBER 2 (OCTOBER 1993) WHOLE NUMBER 135

**THE THEORY OF BOURGEOIS LANDOWNERSHIP
TRANSFORMATION (2)**

by Yoshiharu OZAKI*

II Transition from Feudal Structure of Agriculture to Capitalist One

So far we have seen the moments of landownership transformation just in the context of the capitalist development in general. Now, let's see them in a more concrete context of the transition from feudal structure of agriculture to capitalist one. How, then, will these moments appear?

1. The Feudal Structure of Agriculture and the Bourgeois Evolution of Agriculture

— The conversion of contradictions within feudal structure into those of transitional period —

[1] The transition starts within the feudal structure of agriculture itself. In the feudal structure of agriculture, whatever stage it may be at, i.e., whether it is at the stage where the rent takes a form of labour rent, rent in kind, or money-rent, a peasant who is a direct producer appears as a possessor of land, which is 'the necessary material labour conditions required for the realization of his labour and the production of his means of subsistence', that is, as 'an actual ruler (or a ruler in reality)', and as long as he is so, appears as a 'self-sustaining' independent peasant. The small economy of peasant, who 'conducts his agricultural activity and the rural home industries connected with it independently' based upon this form of direct linkage between the means of production and the

* Professor, Faculty of Economics, Kyoto University.

labour force, makes the very basis of feudal agricultural production (the independent small peasant economy, *selbstständige kleine Bauernwirtschaft*,¹⁾ as the condition of feudal production of agriculture).

Corresponding to this production condition, the feudal landownership comes to be made in a multi-layer structure, in which the basis is the actual rule over land by peasant (peasant land holding), though an inferior right to land—in the feudal law, it was admitted to him as a right to real estate that is so-called ‘beneficial dominion’, *diminium utile*, or *Untereigentum*, then upon it, overlaps the feudal lord’s nominal ownership (landownership of feudal lord)—the feudal law gave it a fictitious title of ‘direct domination’, *dominium directum*, or *Obereigentum*.²⁾ Moreover at the same time, this structure makes the formation of estate-hierarchy which represents the direct relation of personal dependence, i.e., that of lordship and servitude.

Thus, it is true that the form of feudal landownership is itself a structure of the rights to the real estate, and that in this sense it makes a relation between material beings, but that this relation does never complete itself within material world basing itself upon the personal relation. And as such, this form is what makes possible for these two conditions, that is, the actual rule of peasant over the land and the direct relation of personal dependence, to come into existence at the same time. In short, the relationship of feudal landownership is an unification of these two conditions and a material relation based upon a personal relation.³⁾

This very form of feudal landownership, its very multi-layer and estate-hierarchical formation of landownership, makes an essentially independent peasant to be a villain (*Hörige*) who is bound to land and has no personal freedom on the one hand. On the other hand, it ensures a feudal lord, who is actually a mere nominal owner of the land, the direct or indirect command over labour, especially

1) Marx, *Das Kapital*, Bd.III, SS.798-9.

2) *Ebenda*, Bd.III, SS.798-9. From the viewpoint of law, both ‘beneficial dominion’ and ‘direct dominion’ are so-called ‘*Gewere*’ in Germanic law. It represents the right to real property not separated from the actual rule or domination over it, and thus not able to be exercised absolutely, as independent of actual relations concerning to it, which is a character peculiar to the medieval real property right, and presents a sharp contrast to the absolute and idealistic character of the modern real property right. In the medieval Germanic way of thinking about the real property, anyone that benefits from a certain land (whether through himself cultivating it, or taking rent from others) has his own *Gewere* on that land. Thus, there as many rights as permitted by the circumstances are piled up, and make themselves into a multi-layer structure, on one same real property. Remember, that *Gewere* is not the private ownership in the modern sense, but, in spite of that, that it is the real property right (e.g., here, the peasant’s right to possess the land is quite different from the right of those who hold the land only through lease). (cf. Takenori Kawashima, *Theory of Property Right*, Iwanami Publishers, 1949, ch.3, 2.)

3) In this respect, the relationship between a feudal lord and a peasant forms a striking contrast to the relationship between a capitalist and a labourer on the surface of capitalist economy, that is, in the sphere of circulation where both of them come in with an appearance of personal freedom based upon objective dependency relations. But it is wrong to see this appearance as basic reality and not to see the capitalist relations as ‘objective dependency, which,—turns into certain definite relations of personal dependency, but stripped of all the illusions’. At the same time, it is an ‘illusion’ to see only ‘pure personal relations’ in the ‘feudal age’. Vgl. Marx, *Grundrisse*, SS.81-2.

over surplus labour, of an independent peasant, and also the title to force his surplus-labour, that is, the pressure other than economic one — whether it assumes a direct form (a whip) or an indirect one as a power of social relations (the provisions of law). To sum up, the multi-layer and estate-hierarchical structure of landownership makes the condition of the feudal exploitation through restricting the rule of peasant over the land to the mere possession.⁴⁾

On the one hand, besides a tendency for a ground-rent to be fixed by the usage and tradition original for the feudal rent, the independent peasant production, as far as basing de fact rule over the land, has a subjective moment of enhancing of the productive power of his own labour, and also has a moment of 'independent development of property and wealth' within his hands, as growing of productivity, — an excess over and above the ground-rent and the portion necessary for reproducing his labour force, that is, so-called embryonic profit —.⁵⁾ This moment means a tendency to advance the independent nature of peasant production and his actual rule over the land — a tendency for the independent economy of peasant to strengthen his land-holding and at the same time to weaken and disintegrate constantly the multi-layer and estate-hierarchical structure of landownership.

On the other hand, the multi-layer and estate-hierarchical structure of landownership is not solely based upon the independent peasant production, but also appears as a force to oppress the advancement of this independent nature. The landownership of feudal lord as a nominal landownership constantly strives to realise itself economically into the ground-rent 'as the normal and dominant form of surplus value' through exercising the power embodied in this multi-layer and estate-hierarchical structure of landownership. The feudal ground-rent is a normal limit set upon the embryonic profit.⁶⁾

Therefore, the feudal structure of agriculture is a unification of two factors opposing to each other, i.e., the essentially independent peasant production and the multi-layer and estate-hierarchical structure of landownership. This contradiction appears as the following conflicts, that is, the conflict between the landownership of feudal lord and the peasant land holding in the feudal landownership relation, the conflict between the autonomy of the labour of peasantry in the agricultural production and the restraint set upon it by the feudal lord through exercising the direct or indirect command over their labour, especially over their surplus labour, and putting the title and right into action to enforce it, and finally, the conflict between the feudal ground-rent and the share of peasant, particularly the embryonic profit in the distribution of products (especially of surplus products). This is the basic contradiction of the feudal society, which makes the objective basis of the class-struggle between the feudal lords and the peasantry. By the way, the transition starts within the feudal structure of

4) Marx, *Das Kapital*, Bd.III, SS.799-800. The low productivity of labour inherent in the small peasant production makes it more or less inevitable that the collective or communal ownership comes into existence. This ownership and the compulsions of rural community combined with it are on the one hand the basis of certain independence of peasantry, but at the same time, on the other hand, they operate on that independence as another restraining power. For example, such forms as the open-field system, mixed and scattered field system (Gemengelage), and so on.

5) *Ebenda*, Bd.III, SS.801-802.

6) *Ebenda*, Bd.III, SS.801,804,806.

agriculture. In this score, the creation and development of capitalist agricultural structure can proceed on only through this contradiction.

[2] We have already seen that the starting point of the creation and development of capitalist agricultural structure is the transformation of peasant economy from natural one into commodity one, and that the commodity production by peasantry is conditioned by their private occupation and use of the means of labour to some extent and by the development of social division of labour among them based upon the above occupation. Also we have seen that the transition of peasant economy to the commodity production and the advancement of the private character of their land possession which appears as the progress of division of labour and the gradual separation from the communal and estate-hierarchical forms of ownership proceed on interdependently.

As soon as the division of labour penetrates into the feudal structure of agriculture and captures the peasant economies, they appear as a subject who has some aspect of simple commodity production, because of their independency based upon their actual rule over the means of labour, especially over the land, and the multi-layer and estate-hierarchical structure of landownership begins to operate as a restraint of this aspect.

On the one hand, the peasant commodity production starts its development with converting the part of surplus products as the embryonic profit into commodities. With the development of its productive power and with the development of social division of labour, the small peasant economy becomes to be more independent, its embryonic profit increases, and the sphere of commodity economy expands. These conditions, vice versa, also strengthen the independence of peasant — strengthen the private nature of his actual rule over the land. It is the gradual creation of the 'de facto peasant landownership'. And this development at last reaches 'its adequate classical form' in which the peasant commodity production 'lets loose its whole energy', only when a peasant buys up the formal ownership of land and his land possession becomes the free peasant landownership.

On the other hand, however, the advancement of peasant's private occupation and use of the land, in connection with the development of commodity economy which starts with the creation of embryonic profit, is a tendency to disintegrate the multi-layer and estate-hierarchical structure of landownership, and against that disintegration there emerges a counter-tendency on the part of the landownership of feudal lord to reconstruct its landownership. The feudal lord attempts to absorb the embryonic profit by increasing the level of ground-rent, restrict the de facto peasant landownership within the mere peasant land possession and so inhibit the peasant from producing commodities at all, or at least he attempts to deny the free development of peasant commodity production by exploiting thoroughly the fruit of peasant commodity production as a ground-rent.

Here, thus, the feudal contradiction between the multi-layer and estate-hierarchical landownership and the essentially independent small peasant production converts itself into the contradiction between the landownership of feudal lord which still adamantly seeks to maintain and realise itself in feudal landownership relations and the peasant commodity production which seeks to develop freely by removing the landownership of feudal lord.

Note please. As long as this is a response of the landownership of feudal lord to the peasant commodity production, the feudalistic basis of agricultural production remains thoroughly unchanged.⁷⁾ It remains the small economy carried on by the peasant who is merely possessing the

land. Therefore, even if a feudal lord remains to consume directly ground-rents (whether the fruits of labour rent or the rent in kind), or he, selling out the ground-rents as commodities more or less, makes himself to be a commodity seller in counter-response to the peasant commodity economy with the so-called landlord commodity economy, or he appears as a direct exploiter of money from peasants, by these changes in form the economic and historical essence of his response to the peasant commodity production does not change at all. As long as the response of feudal lord pursues to realise a feudal rent without changing the historical character of the direct production process of agriculture, in other words, without changing of the social form of existence of the direct producer or the labour force, it is a thoroughly feudal response.⁸⁾

* The transition and three forms of feudal ground-rent.

There are three successive forms in the category of feudal ground-rent.

-
- 7) Therefore, the feudal response can never be the transition of feudal system into capitalist one, to whatever extent it proceeds on. We have to keep this in our minds. Because it is one of the causes which have given and are still giving rise to the serious misunderstanding of 'two paths' theory in Japan that the feudal response (so-called feudal reaction) has been confused with the landlord's path of the 'two paths' of bourgeois agricultural evolution, or that, to say more exactly, the landlord's path in the bourgeois evolution has been dissolved virtually into the feudal response. This point becomes particularly important in the later discussions.
- 8) More or less, the feudal response corresponds to and is combined with the independent development of circulation of commodities and money in general, and therefore with the independent development of the capital of merchants and usurers — the development of circulation which does not capture the production but only relate to the production as a base given for it. A feudal lord is the main occupier of feudal surplus products. Therefore, for the merchants, he appears as their good customer and as one of the main sources for the independent development of their wealth, and for the usurers, the money lending to him as a wasteful landowner, as well as to the independent small producers, is the most characteristic form of their activities. These 'capitals' make the feudal lord anxious for money, therefore for surplus products, so that they give a depriving character and appearances of commodity economy to the feudal exploitation by him, but they make no change in the mode of exploitation as long as their movement remains to be independent. The degree of the independent development of feudal response and of the independent development of the capital of merchants and usurers (these two developments are, by the nature of things, two sides of one coin) is in inverse proportion to the degree of the development of capitalist production. Both of them stand in the way of the class-differentiation of peasantry. Thus, the development of two forms of 'capital' is not the transition from feudal into capitalist. On the contrary, the process in which they come to be deprived of the basis for their independent development by the class-differentiation of peasantry, so that they come to be compelled to convert themselves into those which are based upon the capitalist mode of production due to the loss of the basis for their independent development, is the very transformation we are discussing. This is the bourgeois agricultural evolution attained through the transformation of feudal lord's economy. It is true that the feudal response and the landlord's path of bourgeois agricultural evolution resemble each other in their outlooks. That is, the former can acquire the outlook of commodity economy through the activities of capital of merchants and usurers which develop independently, and the latter can never bring commodity economy into existence without the vestiges of feudal response which must have been once exercised by a feudal lord. However, it is a mistake to understand the feudal response and the landlord's path in the same dimension. Only when the feudal response has gone out of existence, the landlord's path of bourgeois agricultural evolution starts.

That is, labour rent, rent in kind and money-rent. Here, we will make clear what relevance each of them has in the course of the transition of agrarian society from the feudal structure into the capitalist structure.

First, whatever change in the form of ground-rent may occur within these three, it has nothing to do with the essence of ground-rent we are considering here. Each of them is the only normal form of surplus labour, and intends inherently to realise itself as such. Whatever form the ground-rent may take, the basis of it remains the same small economy carried on by the peasant who merely possesses the land.

Second, these three forms of ground-rent suggest different possibilities in the aspects of the autonomy of peasant in his labour, thus the independency of his farming, the embryonic profit gotten by him, the commodity production and at last the class-differentiation of peasantry.

Even under the condition of labour rent, it is already 'possible ... to acquire any independent ... wealth' on the part of the peasant.

Under the next condition of rent in kind, the peasant acquires the whole products which are produced on the land he himself cultivates. The feudal lord's despotic command over the surplus labour becomes, so to speak, indirect. That is, it retreats from the direct command under the labour rent — under the labour rent, the surplus labour appears directly in a clear and exact form of corvee, and in this form the feudal lord has his immediate grip upon the surplus labour of peasant. The producer becomes more independent and more likely to acquire the embryonic profit. '... this form will give rise to greater differences in the economic position of the individual direct producers', and some direct producers will 'have ... acquired the means to exploit other labourers directly'. The class-differentiation begins as a result of the expansion of autonomy.

However, this germination of class-differentiation never develops fully under the condition of rent in kind. It occurs only under the next form of money-rent. In this case, the peasant gives over the money which represents the price of those products produced by surplus-labour. The basis of the rent remains same — the peasant is still in the mere possession of the land —, but tools and other movable properties come into his ownership both nominally and actually. 'The basis ... of rent ... is approaching its dissolution'. Money rent 'presupposes a considerable development of commerce, of urban industry, of commodity production in general ...' and that products 'be sold at prices roughly approximating their values'. That is, it takes place only when the social division of labour has reached a certain extent. Here, 'the custom' of 'exploiting agricultural wage-labourers' 'develops among the more prosperous peasants subject to rent payments' and 'they gradually acquire the possibility of ... themselves becoming transformed into future capitalists'. Thus, it is given the biggest possibility for the class-differentiation of peasantry within the womb of feudal system — the start of transition of agricultural production into capitalist one — (Marx, *Das Kapital*, Bd.III, Kapit.46, SS.804,805,806,807; Lenin, 'Development', *op.cit.*, pp.174–176.)

What we can deduce from the above two points of discussion is as follows. First, the

transformation of the ground-rent from labour rent through rent in kind into money-rent is conditioned by the advance of productive power and the independency of peasant. At the same times, it is a series of stages at which the fruits of that advancement are wholly absorbed by the feudal rent in a successively new form. That is, it is a series of stages of the feudal response to the peasant's private occupation and use of the land, therefore to the peasant commodity production, on the part of the feudal landownership.

Second, however, these three forms, the feudal rent takes successively, are those which result successively in the more strengthened independency of the peasant and the more highly developed commodity economy, and thus result successively in enlarged possibility of dissolution of the feudal rent. Only when the rent comes into the form of money (*Auflösungsform der Grundrente!*), the possibility of this dissolution (the disintegration of the small economy carried on by the peasant subject to rent payment, that is, the class-differentiation of peasantry) comes near causing actual one.

Therefore, if the things are allowed to go spontaneously, the transition as a structural one can start only from the feudal system at the money-rent stage. Certainly in our history, there are some cases in which the transition was given such an impact that it was forced to start at the lower stages of the development of feudal rent, but even in such cases, along with, or preceding, the actual transformation, more or less there can be seen a change in the form of ground-rent, that is, the conversion into money-rent. The reason why things go in such a way is clear, if we don't forget such circumstances that we have just seen. — for example, the conversion of peasantry who were subject to corvee into those subject to rent, *Zinsbauer*, since the second half of the eighteenth century in the eastern Prussen (cf. Kohji Hujise, *The Creation of Modern Agriculture in Germany*, 1967, Ochanomizu Press, P.1, ch.2), and the fact that in Russia since 1861 the dominant form of rent-payment under the system of tenant farming based on servitude and bondage was a money-rent directly. (cf. Lenin, 'The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905–1907' [in the following, abbreviated in 'Agrarian Programme'], *Collected Works*, Vol.13, p.317)

[3] As long as peasants remain within the conditions of simple commodity production and continue to carry on their independent small farming, feudal lords can make the feudal response to any change that happens on the part of peasants and actually do so. However, as soon as the development of peasant commodity production begins to result in the class-differentiation of peasantry, i.e., to transform into the capitalist agricultural production, thus as soon as the small peasant economy starts its bourgeois evolution, the situation changes fundamentally.⁹⁾ The crucial point of this change is that while the feudal response is based on the independent small economy of peasantry who is bound to pay a ground-rent, the class-differentiation of peasantry destroys it.

With the start of class-differentiation of peasantry who bear a rent, it begins to be impossible for a feudal lord to make a purely feudal response — to maintain the feudal landownership itself, and it

9) Vgl. *ebenda*, Bd.III, Kapit.20 u.36.

becomes more and more impossible as the class-differentiation proceeds further. Thus on the one hand, he continues to do his best to maintain his feudal exploitation of the small peasant economy and all of his rights necessary for it. But on the other hand, as long as the class-differentiation proceeds, he must accept the change of actual production process into capitalist one. His landownership has to give up the dependence upon the peasant land possession and the small peasant economy as a right of feudal lord, and has to move its footing onto the emerging capitalist agricultural production. In this way, he must go through with the gradual bourgeois reconstruction of the historical character of his feudal landownership itself, and must transform it into the modern landownership. Without this, he can never maintain his own landownership. Exactly at this moment, the landlord economy also starts its bourgeois evolution. This is the bourgeois response by a feudal lord, the historical character of which is decisively different from the feudal response.

2. The Structural Contradiction in the Bourgeois Agricultural Evolution

— The 'two paths' —

Now, both the peasant economy and the landlord economy have begun the bourgeois evolution. As a result, there comes (1) a new structure of agriculture which has (2) its own contradictions within itself, and (3) these contradictions are to be sublated in several ways, then (4) each of these ways in which the sublation is to be achieved will determine how the bourgeois evolution will proceed. We have to make clear these four points as possible as permitted by theory.

[1] The transformation of commodity economy into capitalist agricultural production can never take place overnight in the nature of itself. So the social structure of agriculture, determined by the conditions given by the preceding structure, cannot appear but as the combination of several economic relations as follows.

What consists the peasant economy, first, is the economic relation of the independent small economy which is still based upon the mere land possession. There are no longer the homogenous peasant economies, so that the strength of this economic relation, as the determinant of the conditions in which peasants are situated, is no longer the same among them. From the viewpoint of the class-differentiation, the small independent peasants who make the main force of the feudal agricultural production, are middle peasants who are the starting point for the differentiation. The economic relation of the independent small economy based upon the mere land possession operates most strongly in middle peasant economies as the determinant of economic conditions. Thus, middle peasants are under the most severe feudal exploitation. The more the peasant becomes apart from this middling category in two directions, rising and falling, of class-differentiation, the weaker this determination becomes, and at two extremes, it is virtually null.

However, as long as the peasant remains a peasant and thus still cannot thoroughly sublimate this determination, he more or less cannot escape the feudal exploitation, whether he is a well-to-do peasant whose labour force is mainly his family labour and supplemented by wage labour, or a mid-

10) See what I have mentioned in 1 (1) in this section as to the conditions for feudal exploitation. They are made up of both those of feudal agricultural production and those necessary to execute the exploitation. There is a 'necessity of small-scale production and of a tie between the peasant and the land (allotting of

dle peasant, or a poor peasant clinging to his small land parcel.¹⁰⁾ The estate-hierarchical limitation of landownership of feudal lord to the land possession still operates as an obstacle to the free¹¹⁾ development of their commodity production, its transformation into capitalist agricultural production and so the class-differentiation of peasantry. As long as the peasant is under this condition, it inevitably becomes his concern, especially in the case of well-to-do peasant who has the possibility of bourgeois evolution, to abolish the landownership of feudal lord and to convert his land possession into the free peasant landownership. Though not indispensable, it is the most favourable condition for the bourgeois evolution of his economy. And for the free development of that evolution, it becomes the necessary precondition. Thus, it makes sense to acquire 'the complete landownership on the land they cultivate' for those peasants who are able to afford it, and in fact, it occurs individually and scatteredly.¹²⁾

Second, another one which consists the peasant economy is the economic relation of commodity production and capitalist production. The determination by commodity production is the weakest in the middle peasant's economy. There, the commodity production remains within the sphere of simple commodity production. At the two extremes of the class-differentiation, the determination by commodity production becomes the strongest, and the commodity production itself is transforming into the capitalist commodity production.

Therefore, as long as the class-differentiation can proceed on practically as a process of differentiation of simple commodity producing peasants who owe the rent, it is proceeding with making the peasants free from the feudal exploitation and expanding the sphere of capitalist exploitation not by converting them into the free peasant landowners but only by dissolving the precondition of the feudal exploitation, that is, the relation of small economy based upon the mere land possession.¹³⁾ The nearer the peasant comes to either extremes of class-differentiation, to the more extent he becomes other than peasant, therefore, to the more extent he gets out of the conditions for the old exploitation, the relative importance of this old exploitation in his whole economic life diminishes, so that all

land to the dependent peasant) in the case of both labour-rent, rent in kind and money rent' (Lenin, 'Development', *op.cit.*, p.211.).

Adding to this, the rich peasant and the poor peasant are both the most highly developed bourgeois elements within the class of peasantry, i.e., within the small economy where wage labour plays only a supplementary role. There the rich peasant is bourgeois and the poor peasant is proletaria. There is of course the bourgeois agricultural entrepreneur who has come beyond the category of small economy. For the sake of convenience, we call him 'peasant' bourgeoisie to express the womb from which he has just come out, and to express both the rich peasant and the 'peasant' bourgeoisie, we use the term of bourgeois peasant. In the opposite extreme to them stand the poor peasant and the agricultural labourer. We call both of them proletaria peasant. Either in a group of bourgeois peasant or of proletaria peasant, it is nonsense to draw an absolute and eternal boundary between two elements within it. For we are considering the transformation process from one to the other of them.

- 11) Here, the word 'free' means 'free from the feudal exploitation' as long as no qualification is made. For example, 'free evolution' is the evolution which proceeds under the condition that no feudal exploitation exists.
- 12) This phenomenon itself is still not the peasant revolution. Cf. note (20) for 2 of this section.
- 13) Cf. Lenin, 'Agrarian Programme', *op.cit.*, p.225 et seq.

in all, he becomes free from the constraint of the existing old land relations (the multi-layer and estate-hierarchical structure of landownership and the traditional and communal-compulsory land system). On the one hand, the proletarian peasant becomes free through losing his land possession itself. On the other hand, the bourgeois peasant becomes also free through gathering pieces of land which were once possessed by others and organising an enterprise of new type (the capitalist production). And the peasant who has become bourgeois is subordinating the proletarian peasant, who has become free from the old exploitation, to the new capitalist exploitation. The capitalist ground-rent has already come into existence as a matter of fact, and started its maturation in the land which is occupied and used by the bourgeois peasant.

Now, let's turn our eyes to the feudal lord economy. What consists it, first, is the economic relation of feudal exploitation of the small peasant whose economy is based upon the mere land possession.

The second is the economic relation of landownership which develops to depend on the capitalist exploitation, compelled by the class-differentiation of peasantry. This conversion of feudal lord economy from the feudal exploitation into the capitalist exploitation, although it cannot go but through a series of transitional forms, starts from the transformation of feudal lord economy into the form of landlord's direct farming, which represents the lower stage of the capitalist agricultural production. Then, follows the transformation from direct farming into the capitalist land lease, which represents the separation between landownership and actual occupation and use of the land — here, it of course doesn't matter whether the whole land owned by landlord is leased out or one part of it leased out and the other is farmed by him directly¹⁴⁾ (the capitalist lease by bourgeois 'peasant' corresponds to it).

Whether it takes a form of direct farming or of leasing the land out, the bourgeois evolution of feudal lord economy or the bourgeois reconstruction of landownership of feudal lord cannot be achieved, unless feudal lords secure their landownership, that is, they succeed in preventing the land possession by peasantry from its universal conversion into the free landownership. And also as long as the land owned by a feudal lord is used capitalistically, it is inevitably transformed to be free from the old relations over it (on the one hand, the landlord's private landownership free from the multi-layer and estate-hierarchical structure, and on the other hand, the large-scale farm land free from the old land system).

14) Here, I never mean that all the capitalist land lease by landlord take place solely as converted from landlord's direct farming. Conditions for the transformation of the landlord economy from feudal exploitation into capitalist land lease have their root in changes in the peasant economy, so that the transformation into capitalist land lease may come into existence as a direct result of the gradual maturation of conditions for capitalist agricultural production within the land possessed by peasants. What I want to say here is that the capitalist agriculture upon which the landlord economy can base itself in the course of its transformation cannot take other than two forms of landlord's capitalist direct farming and of capitalist leasing out of the land, because it is an indispensable condition for it to maintain its large landownership, and that from the viewpoint of development which we have made clear in the former section, these two forms must be in the order mentioned here both historically and logically so that the capitalist leasing out of the land cannot but be a form which that of landlord's direct farming has converted into.

To sum up, the first economic relation in the peasant economy corresponds to the first one in the landlord economy, and the second one in the former corresponds to the second one in the latter. Hence, neither the peasant economy nor the landlord economy is a self-contained independent structure. They are closely interdependent and interacting between themselves and thus make up one whole social structure of agriculture. This whole structure is composed of three economic relations, that is, the feudal economic relation, the economic relation of simple commodity production, and the capitalist economic relation, and the proportion of these three relations is different according to the period. What comes to realise itself within this structure as a trend—neither more nor less than a trend—is a development. This development is that the feudal economic relation and the economic relation of simple commodity production retreat and diminish their relative shares, and the capitalist economic relation, taking the places of them, becomes dominant step by step in the course of time, and that as a result, the entire structure of agriculture changes its historical nature gradually. This is the structure of agriculture where the bourgeois agricultural evolution proceeds spontaneously when it starts in the feudal structure of agriculture and the feudal structure of agriculture transforms itself into the capitalist one.

[2] Thus first, in this structure of agriculture, the more the feudal exploitation prevails, the weaker the bourgeois evolution is, and vice versa.¹⁵⁾

Second, the more the class-differentiation goes forward, therefore the more the bourgeois evolution of peasant economy proceeds, the further the bourgeois evolution of feudal lord economy also advances, and the weaker the former is, the weaker the latter is¹⁶⁾ (they have been often regarded as in inverse proportion to each other, but this is misunderstanding caused by confusing the latter with the feudal response). If the things go according to the conditions given in this structure and reach a certain level of their development, the 'peasant' bourgeoisie come to have common interests with the landownership of those feudal lords who use their ownlands or have them used capitalistically—whatever transitional form it may take, it makes no matter here—, and the more the class-differentiation goes forward and the landlord economy advances in its bourgeois evolution, the more so becomes the situation.

But third, the conditions necessary for the bourgeois evolution of feudal lord economy are in

15)16)17) It is of crucial importance to understand that these three propositions are interrelated and consistent with each other when we make a research into the transitional structure of agriculture and the contradictions within it,—therefore when we consider about the 'two paths'. The first one is drawn from the proposition that the feudal mode of production and the capitalist mode of production are not compatible with each other, which apparently Lenin's 'Agrarian Programme', by the nature of its object, premises in its discussion. So we need not discuss any more about it. However, the second one is quite different. This proposition was put forth by Lenin in his 'Development' through making clear both theoretically and empirically that the peasant economy and the landlord economy evolve into bourgeois economy side by side—he analysed the peasant economies in the second chapter of 'Development', and the landlord economies in the third chapter of the work, showing that both of them are making their bourgeois evolution, that is, the former are in the course of their class-differentiation, and the latter are coming into the dependence upon the wage labour in proportion to this differentiation of peasantry.

However, in Japan, because it has been generally admitted that the bourgeois development of the peasant economy is in itself the peasant path, this second proposition has come to be considered as an

argument about the co-existence of 'two paths' incompatible with the 'two paths' theory. From this viewpoint, it has been argued why Lenin did 'fall into such an inconsistency' is caused by the reason that in the second chapter of 'Development' he excluded the element of feudal exploitation from his analysis theoretically and over-estimated the bourgeois development of peasant economies positively. And then it has been argued that Lenin, by bringing the element of feudal landownership into his logic in 'Agrarian Programme' and making self-criticism about that 'over-estimation', came to be able to conclude that the bourgeois evolution of landlord economy and that of peasant economy are incompatible with each other. This has been understood as the 'two paths'. In short, it has been argued that the essence of the 'two paths' theory lies in denying the second proposition. But this argument is a complete misunderstanding. First, what the second proposition points out is the recognition of principle not of the co-proceeding of the peasant path and the landlord path, but of the co-proceeding of the bourgeois evolution of peasant economies and that of landlord economies. Though it is true that the methodology adopted in 'Development' is considerably abstract, its abstract nature is quite different from what has been argued in Japan. It arises from the limit of the study conducted in 'Development', namely Lenin had to stop his research at the point where he put forth this second proposition (it is clear that theoretically there is only a 'development' so that there is no space for the 'two paths' theory in 'Development'). And to speak about this proposition itself, the 'two paths' theory cannot deprive it of its validity. This second proposition comes at last to the relationship between the feudal exploitation and the destruction of it, i.e., the class-differentiation of peasantry, and if we deny this relationship, we can neither discuss the bourgeois evolution of the landlord economy nor, therefore, the 'two paths'. The conclusion drawn from taking into account the feudal exploitation, which inevitably appears as long as the landlord economy is concerned and makes an obstacle standing in the way of the class-differentiation, is not that the bourgeois evolution of landlord economy and that of peasant economy is incompatible with each other, but that the conditions for the former are incompatible with those for the free progress of the latter (the essence of the peasant path lies in this freedom). In short, the conclusion is our third proposition. Thus, this third proposition has made one step more toward the total reality than the second one. However, it has done so not by denying but premising the second proposition (about the interrelationship and consistency between these three propositions, see how and in what order they are discussed in Lenin, 'Agrarian Question', *op.cit.*)

Second, though it is true that Lenin made the self-criticism, it was not cast upon 'Development' (it can never be cast upon 'Development', for in the nature of the methodology of it, Lenin could not show his total recognition about whole reality in it). His self-criticism was upon the 1903 agrarian programme of Russian Social-Democracy, the cut-off-lands programme, which distinguished the lands cut off from the peasantry in 1861 from the rest, the peasant allotments and the landlords' estates, and regarded the feudal exploitation survived only in the former. The cut-off-lands programme put forth the question in terms of the struggle between the interests of landlords and of the peasants, which is more concrete than those in which 'Development' dealt with the bourgeois agricultural evolution (in this respect, the cut-off-lands programme and 'Agrarian Programme' are at the same level in the concreteness of their discussions), but it failed to give a correct answer because of its misunderstanding about what were the realities. Thus, Lenin's self-criticism was not only about the over-estimation of the bourgeois evolution of peasant economy but also about the over-estimation of the bourgeois evolution of landlord economy proceeding together with that of peasant economy. He wrote that 'The survivals of serfdom appeared to us then to be a minor detail, whereas capitalist agriculture on the peasant allotments and on the landlords' estates seemed to be quite mature and well-established.'; for at that time, there had not been any precise data otherwise upon which the programme could have said 'in advance with certainty' the extent to which the class-differentiation had separated 'a strong peasant bourgeoisie' and 'the stratum of agricultural labourers' from the rest of peasants, the extent to which the landlords had transited, in proportion to that separation, from the labour-service system to wage labour', and therefore the extent to which the peasantry had a capacity 'of bringing about a "peasant agrarian revolution"', before the peasant mass

contradiction with those for the free development of bourgeois evolution of peasant economy.¹⁷⁾

This is the very contradiction that is newly created. Therefore, it is not the contradiction between the bourgeois evolution of feudal lord economy and that of peasant economy. It is the contradiction between the bourgeois evolution of feudal lord economy and the conditions for the free development of bourgeois evolution of peasant economy, therefore, the contradiction between two kinds of interests concerning to the disintegration of feudal landownership which now becomes inevitable. That is, it is the contradiction between the interests of feudal lords, who are maintaining their feudal exploitation of the peasantry and only when this exploitation becomes impossible in its existing forms, modify their feudal landownership and advance in the course of bourgeois evolution of their economies, and the interests of peasants, who are being differentiated into several economic agricultural classes and proceeding in the bourgeois evolution of their economies, but at the same time, as long as this evolution is prevented from its free progress by the feudal exploitation, need the immediate and total disintegration of feudal landownership — by the nature of things, those who are taking the lead among them are the wealthy peasants who are outcomes of class-differentiation and can have a prospect to evolve themselves into agricultural capitalists by getting rid of the obstacle of feudal landownership.

The speciality of this contradiction lies in its transitional nature. It cannot come into existence at all without the proceeding of class-differentiation of peasantry, and thus in other words, it is actualized inevitably at certain stage in the course of the transition. However, when the class-differentiation comes to the point at which it separates the powerful 'peasant' bourgeoisie from the rest (the bourgeois evolution of landownership corresponds to it), and also it destroys the common interest of peasantry as to the disintegration of feudal landownership (only this gives the peasantry the ability to fight for the disintegration of feudal landownership),¹⁸⁾ this contradiction disappears altogether as a fundamental contradiction which can decide the situation.¹⁹⁾

[3] What we are looking at is the structure of agriculture at the stage where the bourgeois reconstruction of old land relations (that is, the old landownership and the old land system) has become inevitable. Both the peasant land possession and the feudal lord's nominal landownership are fit for the feudal exploitation as long as they remain in the form which they have taken in the old land relations, and both of them do not fit for the production which is to develop freely into capitalist one. As

struggle occurred. Thus, his self-criticism was related to the misjudgement made in the cut-off-lands programme upon the probability that the contradiction, pointed out in the third proposition which premises the first and the second propositions, would come into the reality of conflict (i.e., Lenin's 'the moment of that development'). Therefore, it was not the self-criticism about the second proposition at all, much less the denial of it. (Cf. Lenin, 'Agrarian Programme', *op.cit.*, pp.267,291-292. About this discussion as a whole, cf. my article 'Studying the classics: Lenin's "The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907"', *Economics*, no.118.)

- 18) See how Lenin said about the relationship between the capacity 'of bringing about a "peasant agrarian revolution"' and the extent of class-differentiation. 'Agrarian Programme', *op.cit.*, pp.291-292.
- 19) Unless the peasants come into a struggle with the landlords pressing for demands based upon their own interests at this moment of the development and gain a victory in this struggle, the development cannot but go on upon the given basis.

we have seen before, as far as the development of capitalist agricultural production creates the landownership in the form of modern landownership and the large-scale farm land as a result of itself and at the same time premises them for itself, the development of capitalism, whether in the case of feudal lord economy or in the case of peasant economy, does accomplish that reconstruction 'certainly and inevitably'. In this respect, there can be only the path of bourgeois development. However, the bourgeois development inevitably puts forth the contradiction between the interests of the landlord and of the peasant over that reconstruction, because of its very nature that it begins within the feudal agricultural structure.

Here, let the peasants appear in the battlefield and press for the free peasant landownership, and so, let the contradiction come out into the actual struggle. The crucial issue in this struggle is the feudal landownership as the main prop of the old exploitation, in particular, the large landownership of feudal lord which is exploiting peasants through the peasant land possession. There may be two different possible forms for the disintegration of feudal landownership, according to the outcome of this struggle. The feudal landownership can be disintegrated not only in the peasant's way, which is to abolish and do away with the large landownership of feudals lord at once through converting universally the peasant land possession into the free peasant landownership,²⁰⁾ but also in the landlord's way, which is to reconstruct the large landownership of feudal lords gradually into the modern landownership, maintaining the former as long as it can survive. In short, it can be disintegrated either through the peasant land revolution or through the gradual landlord land reform.

The peasant land revolution is what realises the first and prerequisite moment of the bourgeois

20) Keep in mind that the free peasant landownership cannot be created unless all the farm lands are converted at once into those under the peasant landownership. For example, the year 1861 in Russia put only a part of the lands under the peasant landownership, and it was this partial nature that, when we see them as a whole, made the peasant economies dependent upon the landlords' estates and kept what was formally given to them as landownership in a state of mere land possession in reality (Cf. Lenin, 'Development', *op.cit.*, p.194; Do, 'Agrarian Programme', *op.cit.*, p.225; Do, 'Agrarian Question', *op.cit.*, p.140, and so on.).

To take one more step in our discussion, the creation of free peasant landownership, i.e., the abolition of the large landownership of the feudal lord, can be achieved in two forms; first, the peasant private landownership: it is that in which peasants come to have interests in the ordinary course of the bourgeois development we have already seen; second, the peasant nationalisation of land which becomes possible under certain special conditions. Though both of these forms make the peasant land possession free from the feudal exploitation, the latter is the most thoroughgoing, for it makes the peasant land possession also free from the private landownership. Yet, we should not confuse this peasant nationalisation of land, which is no more than the dissolution of feudal landownership in the interests of peasants, with the nationalisation of land which takes place as the capitalist dissolution of the capitalist landownership based upon the capitalist accumulation. As you know, capitalist agricultural production makes the private landownership dependent upon it and comes to have this landownership as its necessary premise at a certain moment in the course of its development. Thus the former nationalisation occurs before this point and the latter occurs after it. From this point of view, we can understand what was implied in Lenin's anticipation that 'The fanaticism of the private property owner can and should assert itself, in due time, as a demand of the newly-hatched free farmer for the assured possession of his farm' after nationalisation of the land is achieved (Lenin, 'Agrarian Programme', *op.cit.*, p.291.).

landownership transformation in the fullest form. By establishing the peasant landownership, though still not the modern landownership in itself, this revolution roots out the feudal landownership at once and gets the bourgeois evolution out of the existing spontaneous structure based upon the remaining feudal exploitation by feudal lords into the new structure based upon the peasants' predominance. In this sense, it deserves to be called a revolution. On the other hand, the landlord land reform prevents this land revolution from taking place. It is true that the landlord land reform disintegrates the feudal landownership, but it does so only slowly, only in proportion to the transformation of the landownership of feudal lord into the modern landownership. So it is the reform with no change in the existing basis.

[4] Thus, whether the peasant revolution gains a victory or not in the course of the disintegration of feudal landownership does determine the historical conditions for the succeeding process of the bourgeois evolution of agricultural structure — landownership and agricultural production —. If the revolution gains a victory, the large landownership of feudal lord will be abolished, and if the former doesn't, the latter will be maintained and reformed. The difference between these two each-other opposing conditions are so crucial that the result of the struggle on this issue should decide the type of the succeeding evolution process.

If it comes destined that the large landownership of feudal lord is maintained and reformed, there will be no change in the existing spontaneous structure of agricultural evolution.²¹⁾ The persistence of the feudal exploitation of the peasant small economy is unavoidable. The peasantry will be dissolved without bringing the lands they cultivate under their free ownership. The feudal exploitation will disappear only slowly, and only in proportion to the differentiation of small peasants subject to the feudal rent, therefore to the transition of landownership onto the base of capitalist exploitation compelled by the differentiation of peasantry. As the feudal exploitation is an obstacle to the development, the persistence of it makes the class-differentiation of peasantry retarded, and it slows down the interdependent development of the capitalist agricultural production and the modern landownership. Therefore, this process, that is, the process of primitive accumulation, is a process of 'the most suffering expropriation' for the peasantry, worsened by the addition of the feudal exploitation for a long time. In this case, the essential contents of the evolution are these; the first and prerequisite moment of landownership transformation is prevented from taking place to the full,²²⁾ the

21) As we have seen before, the spontaneous structure of agricultural evolution is made up not only of the peasant economies but also of the landlord economies, both of which are in the course of bourgeois evolution. To put forth the conclusion in advance, whole this spontaneous structure consisted of both of the bourgeois evolution of peasant economies and that of landlord economies proceeding side by side as well as contradicting with each other is the very structure of evolution in the case of landlord path.

22) It is obvious that unless the peasant agricultural production has the character of simple commodity production to some extent and so the private character of land occupation by peasantry advances to some extent, there can be neither class-differentiation of peasantry at all nor the landlord-type transition. In this sense, here too, we can see the spontaneous progress of the first moment *de facto*. (in this sense, the principle of development, we have seen in the former section, operates in all moments of the bourgeois landownership transformation wherever the agriculture is actually in its capitalist evolution. Thus, it is a series of characterisations which can be given, though in the most abstract terms, to any bourgeois evolutions).

second moment realises itself only through the reform of the landownership of feudal lord into the modern landownership,²³⁾ and so the agricultural production on this land owned by feudal lords or landlords grows and changes gradually from the feudal one (the small peasant economy based on mere land possession, or, under particular historical conditions, the demesne management by feudal lord on the base of serfdom, which is constructed through gathering units of petty-mode production under the direct supervision of feudal lord)²⁴⁾ into the capitalist one (first, the capitalist farming carried on by the 'peasant' bourgeoisie, second, the landlord's capitalist farming on his own land, third, the large capitalist farming carried on upon the land taken on lease). This is a process in which the agricultural structure changes from the feudal exploitation to the capitalist one spontaneously, and it is this process that can be called the landlord path for the bourgeois evolution of agricultural structure.

On the contrary, if the feudal exploitation is broken up all at once together with the large landownership of feudal lord, the spontaneous structure of agricultural evolution will be changed radically.²⁵⁾ Having got rid of this obstacle to the development, the peasantry will be assured of free land more certainly, and thus the class-differentiation will be accelerated, and the development of capitalist agricultural structure will be more rapid and smooth. In this case, the first moment of landownership transformation has been realised to the full, so the second moment will come into existence as the transformation of landownership from the peasant landownership into the modern

23) To concentrate our attention on an aspect of ground-rent, in this case, the feudal rent gradually grows into the capitalist rent through several transitional forms (the small peasant rent, the metayer system or the share-cropping, and the landlord's direct farming, though the peasant proprietorship of land parcels is excluded being as a rule) (Vgl. Marx, *Das Kapital*, Bd.III, SS.806,811,826.). Moreover, what appears simply as the strength of landownership at the transitional stages of the maturation process of capitalist ground-rent here appears as the strength of the old landownership which is transforming itself into the modern landownership. Thus, the ground-rent more or less keeps some feudal exploitation within its substance or at least remains restrained by this exploitation, which can be sublated only along with the maturation of the conditions of capitalist ground-rent.

24) Even the demesne of feudal lord is under the same land system which divides the farm land into a lot of small strips as the land possessed by the peasant. So the labour on demesne cannot be performed any way other than in the petty mode of labour. Thus, the demesne management is but a mere arithmetic sum of small economies. Cf. note (27) seq. for this part.

25) The bourgeois evolution of peasant economies as a part of the spontaneous structure of evolution is the historical basis for the peasant path. However, we must not confuse this bourgeois evolution of peasant economy with the peasant path. The peasant path is such that in which the peasant economies make their bourgeois evolution freely, i.e., in a state free from the landownership of feudal lord. Therefore, it cannot make its start without converting the evolution structure itself radically by getting the landownership of feudal lord out of the spontaneous evolution structure. Consider the implication carried by the following Lenin's comment upon Russia at the beginning of 20th century. 'whether the bourgeois agrarian system has taken root in Russia to such an extent as to make a sharp transition from the "Prussian" development of agrarian capitalism to the "American" development of agrarian capitalism objectively impossible. If it has, the "classical" presentation (peasant land revolution) of the basic question of tactics falls to the ground' ('Letter to I.I.Skvortsov-Stepanov', *Collected Works*, vol.16, p.117).

landownership,²⁶⁾ and the agricultural production will grow and change from the peasant small production into the capitalist one on the land which has come to be held by peasants who are now free from the feudal exploitation. The upstart capitalist agricultural entrepreneur risen from the rank of peasant will monopolise the large-scale farm land as the object of use, centralizing pieces of land into his hand, and at the same time, the agricultural labourers who lost the land will be organised under the despotic command of capitalist entrepreneur, thus the capitalist exploitation will develop in the social circumstances in which now no feudal exploitation can be found.

It is this process that can be called the peasant path.²⁷⁾

-
- 26) In this case, different from the case of landlord-type evolution, the feudal rent has already been gotten out of existence with the realisation of transitional rent (here, the typical one is the peasant proprietorship of land parcels), and the latter grows and transforms itself into the capitalist rent. Two ways of creating the capitalist rent and the modern landownership here mentioned are reflected in the following Marx's comment which makes a part of discussions on the ground-rent in *Das Kapital*. 'The form of landed property which we shall consider here is a specifically historical one, a form transformed through the influence of capital and of the capitalist mode of production, either of feudal landownership, or of small-peasant agriculture as a means of livelihood, in which the possession of the land and the soil constitutes one of the prerequisites of production for the direct producer, and in which his ownership of land appears as the most advantageous condition for the prosperity of his mode of production' (*Ebenda*, Bd.III, S.627). However, we can see through this comment the abstract nature of *Das Kapital*, in which Marx is interested only in the result, i.e., only in the modern landownership itself, and in which whether it has come about from the former or the latter is beyond his concern.
- 27) So far we have made our effort to make clear the characteristics and differences of and between respective 'two paths' with such general categories as the landlord path and the peasant path, by combining the conditions for the development of capitalist agricultural structure with the conditions of feudal structure of agriculture. Thus, our discussion has been within the most abstract terms of those which can be used in considering the 'two paths'. Therefore, it is natural that how and in what manner the 'two paths' come into the realities of our history differs from case to case, though in any case the characteristics so far mentioned are being retained. For example, taking up the extent of pervasion of the landlord's direct farming in the course of landlord-type evolution, there should be some difference in accordance with the conditions of the feudal system within which it had started, i.e., in the case where the premise is the direct estate management based upon the serf system or the labour service system like in Russia and Prussia (even in this form of landlord's direct estate management, there were forces working to make the rent transform into necessary forms, which we have already seen. Cf. * note 'The transformation and three forms of feudal ground-rent' for II, 1 [2]), or in the case of other forms of premise. In the peasant-type evolution, too, it is obvious that there should be difference between conditions provided in the evolution based upon the free land not only from the feudal landownership but also from the private landownership in general, which was seen in America and was aimed at by the Russian peasant land revolution, and those in the evolution based upon the peasant proprietorship of land parcels. So if we only take into account these one or two resemblances between Russia, Prussia, and America, we can realise that Lenin was right when he characterised, in Russia, the landlord path as the Prussian-type path, and the peasant path as the American-type path, judging from the concrete conditions under which the Russian agriculture was situated and from the characteristic features of events which were taking place then. The notion which takes Lenin's these characterisations made upon what was actually taking place to be in itself the 'two paths' theory and the notion which denies the applicability of this theory to the realities because of the deference of it from Lenin's characterisations are both mistakes owing to lacking of understanding the economical implications of those theoretical premises which were set in Lenin's

* 'the landlord path' and the class-differentiation of peasantry

In Japan, there is a deep-rooted notion as to the landlord path of bourgeois agricultural evolution. In this view, the slowness of the evolution in the landlord path is overestimated, and the landlord path is virtually reduced to be what never achieves the bourgeois agricultural evolution. One of the points characteristic to this view is that the organisation of landlord economy in the course of landlord path is not a capitalist one, even though it looks so in appearance, and that it is in its essence feudal, determined by the 'norm' of feudal landownership, and ever reproduces its original character. In this sense, this notion sees the organisation of landlord economy as a fixed structure and in this regard, it forms a contrast to Lenin's method. In Lenin's view, the organisation of landlord economy during its transformation from the labour-service system to the capitalist system is made of a combination of two basic systems of feudal agriculture and capitalist agriculture, and the proportion each of them forms varying according to the level of development. Only according to his view, we can see the landlord economy as what, containing contradictions, has to make its bourgeois evolution through changing its base from the former, that is, the feudal agriculture to the latter, that is, the capitalist one, along with the class-differentiation of peasantry. (Cf. Lenin, 'Development' *op.cit.*, pp.194-195.; Do, 'The Agrarian Question in Russia towards the Close of the Nineteenth Century' [in the following, we will abbreviate this title 'Agrarian Question'], *Collected Works*, vol.15, p.90).

There is another misunderstanding in the same line as the viewpoint mentioned above. In this notion, the landlord path can never be compatible with the class-differentiation of peasantry or cannot but restrict it at a low level, because of the feudal exploitation remaining within itself. Why this notion is wrong has already been basically made clear, but it is necessary to make some additional comments. It is true that the feudal exploitation 'suppresses constantly' 'the moment of the rise of productive power within the peasant economy' and therefore the class-differentiation of peasantry (that notion stops at this point). However, by contraries, the advance of commodity production and class-differentiation undermines 'constantly' the basis of feudal exploitation—natural economy, unchanging technique, inseparable ties between the landlord and the peasant, and so on—. If we could let the former aspect overshadow all, it would be correct to say that the landlord path is unchanging, feudal in its essence, or what never achieves the bourgeois agricultural evolution. But such 'path' is no longer any bourgeois evolution and the landlord path of it, but is anything other than it. Only where the two each other opposing trends of the feudal exploitation and the commodity production and class-differentiation have got themselves into the actual contradiction, that is, only when the class-differentiation of peasantry is 'advancing' step by step and the peasant economy is making its advance into the bourgeois economy in spite of the existence of feudal exploitation, we can discuss the

characterisations in concrete terms. However, we won't say that the 'two paths' theory can be applied to whatever cases at any time, or it does not make sense how and in what manner it comes into being. Rather, what we want to say here is opposite.

bourgeois evolution of landlord economy. The landlord evolution is the transition of the whole structure of agrarian society composed of both landlord economies and peasant economies from the feudal exploitation to the capitalist exploitation. We have already made it clear that it is the principle of development that the class-differentiation of peasantry (the dissolution of small peasant economies) is the basic economical aspect and the driving force of the development of capitalist agricultural structure. This principle never fails to take place so long as the process is that of bourgeois evolution, whether it is advancing through the landlord path or through the peasant path (Cf. Lenin, 'Agrarian Programme', *op.cit.*, p.225; Do, 'Agrarian Question', *op.cit.*, pp.90,92.; Do, 'Development', *op.cit.*, pp.205–210.).

(As a concrete notion of this kind, there is a well-known view that, basing inevitably upon the landownership accompanied by the personal dependence of rural folks, the Junker economy doesn't permit the class-differentiation of peasantry to advance beyond a certain limit and so its bourgeois evolution is also restricted within what is determined by this limit. However, the former part of this notion is nothing but pointing out the condition necessary for the Junker economy to survive without changing its original character. This proves no more that the bourgeois evolution of Junker economy never advance beyond that limit than to say that Gutsherrschaft can be never compatible with the class-differentiation of peasantry because of its crucial dependence upon the serf labour is a proof that it never transforms into the Junker economy. In short, this notion comes to the meaningless tautology that 'the Junker economy remains to be the Junker economy as long as it remains so'.)

Therefore, Lenin was right when he characterised the peasant path as that in which the peasants (and only the peasants) grew into the capitalist agricultural entrepreneurs upon the land free from the feudal exploitation, but did not characterise the landlord path either as that in which the class-differentiation stopped at a certain level, or as that in which the peasants did not grow into the capitalist agricultural entrepreneurs (not likely in Japan where it is generally thought so). To tell as to the class-differentiation, first, Lenin's criteria in distinguishing 'two paths' from each other is not that whether peasants grow and change into the capitalist agricultural entrepreneur or not, but whether for the peasants the way of their growing and changing into the capitalist entrepreneur (on the other hand their transformation into the proletariat) becomes 'the least rapid' and 'infinitely greater misery and suffering' process because of the remain of feudal exploitation, or becomes a rapid one which can 'secure for the peasants the greatest degree of prosperity possible' under the condition of commodity economy as a result of rooting out the feudal exploitation. It clearly represents the peasants' interests, and they correspond in this case to the interests of national economy because the rapid growth of peasant into the capitalist agricultural entrepreneur also makes the development of social productive power rapid. This interests of national economy in the development of productive power made Lenin's second criterion (Cf. Lenin, 'Agrarian Programme', *op.cit.*, pp.240,243.).

The notion, predominant in Japan, understands that the feudal lord's (landowner's)

management of his own land as one form of the capitalist exploitation (capitalist agricultural production), upon which the landlord transformation is based, is the landlord path, and that, at the same time, another form of the transformation, that is, the leasing out the land to the 'peasant' bourgeoisie by a feudal lord (landowner) is the peasant path, because it 'permits' a peasant to grow and change into the capitalist agricultural entrepreneur. Thus the notion opposes these two forms to each other. But this also comes to the same view that so far we have criticised. Generally speaking, the creation of capitalist land lease, therefore, of conditions of capitalist ground-rent does not in itself represent the peasant path, as well as the farming on one's own land is only a form of the bourgeois agricultural enterprise which appears at the beginning of the bourgeois agricultural evolution whether it is going in the landlord path or in the peasant path (though in the former, it belongs to a feudal lord (landowner) proprietor, in the latter, to a peasant proprietor). Here also, what is of critical importance in distinguishing the two paths from each other is whether it is created upon the feudal lord's (landowner's) land as the gradual transformation of conditions for the feudal rent, or newly created upon the free peasant landownership. If the following Lenin's statement is read carefully, it will be quite easy to understand what we are discussing here. 'Undoubtedly, tenant farming based on servitude and bondage is extremely widespread in Russia, and, according to Marx's theory, the payment which the peasant makes under such a system of tenancy is largely money rent. What power makes it possible to extort that rent from the peasantry? ... It is the power of the feudal latifundia. Since the latter will be broken up — and that is the starting-point and fundamental condition of the peasant revolution — there is no reason to speak of "money rent" in the pre-capitalist sense.' 'In my *Development of Capitalism* I showed that ... about one-fifth of the peasant households account for up to half of peasant agricultural production and a much larger share of rental land; ... that ... these peasants cannot exist without a vast army of farmhands and day-labourers. Among these peasants the elements of capitalist rent are taken for granted.' 'Money rent is the moribund yesterday ... Capitalist rent is the nascent tomorrow, which cannot but develop under the Stolypin expropriation of the poor peasants ("under Article 87"), as well as under the peasant expropriation of the ... landlords.' (Lenin, 'Agrarian Programme', *op.cit.*, pp.317–318.)

Here we can see the Lenin's view clearly. It is that the capitalist tenant farming system, that is, the capitalist ground-rent is to be created either in the case of peasant path or of landlord path, that is, either in the case that the peasantry destroys the power of the large landownership of feudal lord, the main prop for the exploitation of money rent, by expropriation of the landlords (this is 'the starting point and fundamental condition of the peasant land revolution' as Lenin said), or in the case that the feudal power of landownership gradually transforms into the capitalist power through the expropriation of poor peasants by landlords and wealth peasants of Stolypin-type supported by a backbone of great landownership. Only after taking this point into account, we can understand how Lenin characterised the specific form taken by the 'clearance' of the old land relations, as regulated by the landlord conditions as to the relation of ownership, that is, the landlord-type 'land clear-

ance', although the 'clearance' is inevitable in either path and there the landownership plays an active role.

The characteristic of the landlord-type 'land clearnace' is that the feudal lords (landowners), securing 'the interests of the landlords', make 'the rich peasants' 'pay ... an exorbitant price' for the land, and in return 'give them freedom to plunder the village communes, to forcibly expropriate the masses, to round off their plots, ... to set up ... the basis of new capitalist agriculture', in short, it is the appropriation of the common land and the allotments (the land possessed by the peasants) by the landowners and the rich peasants. (Please keep in mind the difference from the peasant-type 'land clearnace', that is, rich peasant-type appropriation of land by 'rich farmers' according to 'the division ... based on a new sorting process among the peasant cultivators' which has come possible owing to the clearing up of the large landownership of feudal lord and the creation of free peasant or nationalised ownership of the land) (Cf. Lenin, 'Agrarian Programme', *op.cit.*, pp.277-279.).

Moreover, it is the necessary condition for promoting the landlord land reform and the practical process inevitable in the course of landlord-type evolution, to break up the condition necessary for realising the peasant land revolution by promoting consciously the process in which the rich peasants at the top of the class-differentiation connect themselves with the land utilised capitalistically by landlords and integrate their interests with those of landlords and by separating them politically from the rest of peasantry on the above economic base. (Cf. Lenin, 'Development', *op.cit.*, Preface to the Second Edition; Do, 'Agrarian Question', *op.cit.*, p.139). From the notions dominant in Japan which understand the landlord path only in opposition to the class-differentiation of peasantry, it can never be possible to understand these Lenin's discussions consistently.

[5] We have already considered the development of agricultural structure from the simple commodity production economy to the capitalist economy. Here we are able to re-characterise this single process of development as the 'two paths' opposing to each other in the course of transition of agricultural structure from the feudalistic to the capitalist. Four moments of the landownership transformation, which appeared succeedingly one after another in a series, are now also reordered into the two series which are opposing to each other. One starts with the full realisation of the first moment through rooting out the feudal exploitation (the peasant land revolution), and the other starts without it (the landlord land reform). According to whether is the starting point of the process, the manner in which the second moment will be realised differs, and then the third moment also will be realised differently as long as it appears overlapping the second.

To sum up, the 'two paths' are the manners in which the basic conditions for the development of capitalist agricultural structure realise themselves in the course of transition. What makes distinction between them is whether the process of transition is free from the feudal exploitation or restrained by it, and what decides which path of the two is taken is the two forms of 'landownership transformation', that is, whether the feudal landownership is abolished all at once or it is maintained and given the conditions for its gradual accommodation to the capitalism. Now we can say that the 'landownership transformation' in this narrow sense is the very decisive moment which determines how and in

what manner the capital (capitalist agricultural production) creates such landownership that is necessary for itself through the contradiction between the landownership of feudal lord and the peasant land possession within the feudal landownership.

3. Bourgeois Revolution and Landownership Transformation

In the course of transition of agricultural structure from the feudal system to the capitalist one, if the moments of landownership transformation take their places in the manner which so far we have seen, then what relations do they have with bourgeois revolution? We can make the following 5 points from the viewpoint which we have acquired within our study on the landownership transformation.

[1] Bourgeois agricultural evolution inevitably comes into contradiction with the feudal landownership and so proceeds on through destroying it. Every revolution which tries to disintegrate or abolish the feudal landownership on a basis of a certain maturation of this contradiction is bourgeois revolution. However, this does not mean at any rate that every bourgeois revolution has or must have the subject of landownership transformation as a fundamental one. It is true that the maturation of contradiction between the feudal landownership and the bourgeois agricultural production (capital) must operate as an objective power which brings about the bourgeois revolution. But in reality, when and at what moment the revolution takes place depends on the whole of more concrete conditions both objective and subjective given in a society at large.

Therefore, in some cases, even if the bourgeois evolution of agriculture is still immature, the bourgeois revolution can start, determined by other conditions. Some bourgeois revolutions take place when the evolution has reached the specific stage at which the problem of landownership transformation can be put forth, and others when the evolution has already gone to the higher stage. Please recall what we have already made clear. Please recall the transitional nature of the contradiction which arises during the transitional period over the abolishment of the feudal landownership.

For example, in the case in which the class-differentiation of peasantry has already come to be so fully matured that the interests of 'peasant' bourgeoisie are separated from those of the rest of peasants, and the former feudal large landownership also has already come to be fit for the capitalist agricultural production basically, — in this case the revolution does not make it her task to solve the problem of landownership transformation, and, if it does, has no room for the peasant land revolution at all. The abolition of large landownership is by no means regarded to be a subject and ex post facto the revolution can not but approve the landlord-type spontaneous process of bourgeois reconstruction of landownership which has been already realised or make slight amendment to it.²⁸⁾

Or for another example, in the case where the class-differentiation is going on but has not yet reached its full maturation, and the feudal large landownership, though slowly and gradually coming to be fit for the capitalist agricultural production, still as a whole keeps its original character of old landownership relations, — in the cases like this, the landownership transformation becomes an all-out issue, and is to be achieved either through destroying large landownership or through maintaining

28) For example, see how Lenin saw the circumstances at the time of 'Cut-off Land' Programme. Cf. Lenin, 'Agrarian Programme', *op.cit.*, pp.291–292.

and putting out the conditions for the bourgeois reconstruction of it, in short, either through the peasant land revolution or through the landlord land reform. It is only at this moment of the development that the actual confrontation of 'two paths' between each other can become a serious issue in the revolution.²⁹⁾

[2] Bourgeois revolution denies the multi-layer and estate-hierarchical system of landownership as a juristic expression of the relations of feudalistic production. On the other hand, the relations of bourgeois production, having been formed within the multi-layer and estate-hierarchical system of landownership, manifest themselves as a new rights-and-duties relation which constitutes actually one right to one object, given its content by the private absoluteness of ownership of commodity. And this new relation of rights-and-duties the bourgeois revolution authorises as the real rights system of private ownership which should be the norm of the fundamental formation of bourgeois state, that is, Constitution, by the state's will. Thus, to say in legal terms, if the revolution needs to solve the problem of landownership transformation, first of all it has to sublimate the old multi-layer landownership, by giving a legal approval of private ownership either to the landownership of the feudal lord or to the peasant land possession, both of which have consisted of the multi-layer and estate-hierarchical system of real rights as to the landownership.³⁰⁾ — Which is permitted to have place in the real rights system of private ownership as a base of bourgeois law, the nominal ownership of former feudal lord authorised as private ownership, or the peasant proprietorship of land as the legalization of his actual rule of land? The question is the result of this conflict. Bourgeois revolution is essentially the bourgeois reconstruction of the real rights system as a legal expression of ownership relations, and so the landownership transformation is made to come out onto the stage of political struggle as a question of class interests over the rights and duties arising about landownership first of all.

[3] In the revolution where the landownership transformation has actually come into a question as the sublation of the old landownership relations, there inevitably appears a certain correspondance between the extent of this sublation and the extent to which the old authority based upon the old landownership relations is disintegrated, in other words, between the width and depth of the landownership transformation and that of political change.³¹⁾ That is to say, only the creation of 'the class of landowning free peasants' by the peasant destruction of the old landownership relations — the destruction through the most voluntary, conscious and organisational actions of peasantry³²⁾ — can

29) Though it is true that because there can be so many moments of development, in the course of bourgeois agricultural evolution process determined by the combination of the extent of class-differentiation of peasantry and that of disintegration of old landownership, the subject of landownership transformation presented in respective bourgeois revolutions necessarily differs variously for one revolution to another (it is much more so when other conditions are taken into account), two basic types — which come into our sight when we take the viewpoint of 'two paths' theory and which determine the very direction of development — never stop existing even in this diversity. So, it is obviously a mistake to deny the significance of these two types because of this diversity.

30) In its general meaning, this question is that of bourgeois changing of the system and nature of landownership. However, obviously in some cases it cannot be wholly solved without presenting the question of distribution of land. Here, keep in mind to taking into account it fully.

31) Cf. Lenin, 'Agrarian Programme', *op.cit.*, p.344 et.seq.

32) Historically, the peasant land revolution as a whole is not only what makes conditions of bourgeois agri-

make 'the basis for the full realisation of democratic reconstruction' of state authority.³³⁾ And, vice versa, only the democratic reconstruction which gains the perfect victory—only the 'peasant' bourgeois democratic class dictatorship based upon the peasants' revolutionary actions³⁴⁾—can secure and guard the creation of 'the class of free peasants'. Therefore, where the subject of landownership transformation is actually brought forward as a main and fundamental one, the perfect victory for bourgeois revolution must be the peasant land revolution. The thoroughgoing democratic reconstruction of political system and the thoroughgoing reconstruction of social and economical relations (the peasant land revolution) are interdependent with each other. This presents a sharp contrast to the case of the landlord land reform. The landlord land reform creates the conditions for making the former feudal lord, who is still with his one foot in the old exploitation though in the line along the bourgeois evolution, enjoy the life of 'the master landowner' 'without losing' his existing position of ruler, and as such the reform provides the material basis for, so to speak, the 'landlord' bourgeois dictatorship and is guarded by the authority of this kind.³⁵⁾

cultural evolution thoroughly released from the existing old landownership. It also makes the peasants get out of the miserable living conditions and the desperate servitude unavoidable in the old system and improve their living conditions as far as possible though within the commodity economy, so to speak, it includes the moment for releasing the peasants as human beings, and by implication, the moment which makes the peasants make revolutionary actions with such voluntariness, consciousness and organisation that they have never experienced. The crucial historical importance of the peasant land revolution as the bourgeois democratic conversion of political relations lies in these moments both objective and subjective (for example, think about the importance of the struggles which are being fought for the peasant land revolution for the people who want to emancipate themselves from the imperialist world system—which has one of its most important bases in 'grafting' 'modern' exploitation on the old system in the so-called 'developing countries' or subordinated countries).

- 33) It is very this point that Marx, Engels and Lenin admitted to be fundamental proposition about the landownership transformation and the bourgeois revolution; Marx and Engels, when they distinguished 'the English Revolution', in which the institution before the revolution survived after it and the 'alliance of the bourgeoisie with the majority of the big landowners' was created, 'essentially from the French, which eliminated big landed property by parcellation' in 'Guizot, Pourquoi La Revolution D'Angleterre A-T-Elle Reussi? Discours Sur L'Histoire De La Revolution D'Angleterre' (1850) (*Collected Works*, vol.10, p.254), and when Marx contrasted the French Revolution, in which the 'bourgeoisie... never left its allies, the peasants, in the lurch', and placed 'the base of its rule' on 'the abolition of feudalism in the countryside and the creation of a free, landowning peasant class', with the German Revolution of 1848, which resulted in the 'perpetuation of feudal rights and their endorsement in form of the (illusory) commutation', because the 'bourgeoisie... unhesitatingly betrays the peasants, who are its natural allies... without whom it cannot stand up to the aristocracy', in 'The Bill Proposing the Abolition of Feudal Obligations' (1848) (*Collected Works*, vol.7, p.295), and then Lenin, when he developed their discussions into the following propositions. 1) The uncompleted German revolution differs from the completed French revolution in that the German bourgeoisie betrayed not only democracy in general, but also the peasantry in particular. 2) The creation of a free class of peasants is the foundation for the consummation of a democratic revolution. 3) The creation of such a class means the abolition of feudal services, the destruction of feudalism, but does not yet mean a socialist revolution. 4) The peasants are the "most natural" allies of the bourgeoisie, that is to say, of the democratic bourgeoisie, which without them

[4] The whole process of bourgeois landownership transformation is consisted of four moments. Even though the question of landownership transformation is solved practically by either way, what the bourgeois revolution is concerned to in this case is only the first one of these moments. Moreover, even if the landownership transformation in the revolution gives newly the private landownership a place in the bourgeois real rights system, the economical substance of the landownership, which gets a new character in this law and real rights system, is independent of this character and is neither more nor less than that which is given by the historical nature of actual agricultural production process carried on upon the land. That is to say, if we give a look to this landownership at its economical basis, it is a combination of, in the case of landlord land reform, feudal landownership and capitalist landownership, and in the case of peasant land revolution, a combination of small

is "powerless" against reaction.... all these propositions are fully applicable to the Russia of 1905' ('Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution' *Collected Works*, vol.9, pp.135-136).

- 34) That the task of peasant land revolution is being brought forward means that the peasants as a whole still retain some common interests about the question. But at the same time we must not forget that in this case the peasants have a tendency of differentiation and disintegration of themselves, for the commodity production constantly destroys their unity and cohesion as the class of peasantry. So, the peasant revolution needs not only the existence of a conscious and solid class of peasantry but also the 'coalition' between the class of peasantry and that of bourgeoisie or proletariat both of which are such classes that, on the contrary to peasantry, respectively form themselves into conscious classes more and more as the commodity production develops. Therefore, to say more concretely, the power and authority mentioned here is either the revolutionary dictatorship based upon the coalition between 'the democratic bourgeoisie' and the peasantry (Marx called it 'Jacobin Terror'), or what Lenin characterised as 'the revolutionary democratic dictatorship by the proletariat and the peasantry'.
- 35) Don't forget that as long as the landlord-type bourgeois evolution is the bourgeois response on the part of the landlord economy and as long as the landlord-type landownership transformation is the bourgeois landownership transformation, they are in their essence never compatible with the continued existence of absolute monarchy without any change in the fundamental nature of it. For the absolute monarchy is formed as the power and authority for the nation-wide feudal response made on the part of feudal lords as a whole against the feudal crisis brought about by some development of commodity economy, and bases itself upon binding direct producers (in particular peasants) to the status of villain all over the country. The landlord-type bourgeois evolution and the landlord-type bourgeois landownership transformation both need at least some changes in the existing feudal power and authority (i.e., need the power and authority which has the bourgeois nature at least to some extent) and without it, they remain only accidental and cannot make sure of their existence at all. However, on the other hand, as long as they are the bourgeois reform of the feudal landlord economy, they do not exclude the possibility that under certain conditions, the absolute monarchy, driven by circumstances, launches upon pushing them forward positively. But, also in this case, they will come to require the power and authority of absolute monarchy to be reformed into bourgeois one, and the absoluteness of the existing absolute monarchy may substitute for, or complement, capitalist rule in the course of this reform process, though the process must be slow and gradual and inevitably accompanied by some retardations of recessions. In Japan, the landlord-type evolution is often directly connected with the absolute monarchy, and regarded to be the feudal reaction for the reason that the latter is the feudal reaction. But this is the same wrong understanding that we have already seen. As long as we remain to see the matters in this way, neither the relationship between the landlord-type landownership transformation and the bourgeois revolution nor the various phases which the absolute monarchy comes to have in the actual conditions can we understand at all.

economy (peasant) landownership and capitalist landownership.³⁶⁾ In either case, the landownership is as a whole economically transitional. Within and based upon the transitional landownership of this kind, the second moment and, as long as overlapping the second one, the third moment come into being and go toward their full realisation, and in this way, the substance of capitalist private ownership is gradually given to the landownership which is but legally authorised to be the private landownership. It is obvious that this process is one in which the primitive accumulation, already started, goes on toward its final goal.

What is of crucial importance here is that it is now given the authority which intervenes this process positively. Indeed, for the first time, the bourgeois revolution makes it possible for the systematic and conscious policy of primitive accumulation to be pursued. Besides, according to the result of the revolution, that policy is hammered out as one with different characteristics, in correspondence with the contrast character of two sorts of authority from the present standpoint, though they are equally bourgeois, and with the historically given economic substance of landownership behaving as private landed property. That is the primitive accumulation policy of two types, i.e., that which is aimed at protecting the landlord 'land clearance', that is, 'the economical progress based upon and for the maintenance of the power and interests of landlords' or that which protects the peasant 'land clearance'.³⁷⁾

[5] Keep in mind. It is only through the class struggle between landlords and peasants that the bourgeoisie agricultural evolution emerges as the 'two paths'. The landlord path is the spontaneous path based upon existing premise. The basis for the peasant path is quite different. Because the peasant path represents a bourgeois evolution of agriculture which is possible only if a revolution takes place at an appropriate moment of development and an all-out class-struggle between landlords and peasants results in a complete victory of peasants.³⁸⁾

36) The actual economic process provides so many middle forms between the to-each-other-opposing two extremes of landownership in either type of landownership transformation, and they more or less have both phases, increasing the determination of one of them when we gradually divert our attention from one extreme to the other. So, we can almost never draw lines in the actual facts which show where the one type of landownership loses its determination and where the other gains it. Keep in mind that we are making our discussions taking into account this limitless variety of landownership forms peculiar to the transitional period.

37) This characterisation of primitive accumulation policies is that which can be made when we consider them from the viewpoint of landownership transformation only and never be more than that. And if we make some additions to prevent the possible misunderstanding, whether the primitive accumulation process assumes the characteristics of landlord-type 'land clearance' or the characteristics of peasant-type 'land clearance', it is obvious that what plays 'a main part' in the process is capital, and that the crucial event that occurs in the process is the 'deprivation' (in particular land deprivation) of the majority of the peasants. What is important here is which of two classes of peasants and of landlords gains a victory in the class-struggle related to the landownership transformation, and the characteristics which are stamped on the the process of 'deprivation of peasantry' according to the result of this class-struggle.

38) In this sense, Lenin's 'two paths' theory is above all the theory of class struggle—the theory for the struggle of peasants. This is the most crucial point among what the popular notions upon the 'two paths' theory, especially upon the peasant path fail to understand.

* The 'two paths' and the tripartite division — the abstract nature of the 'two paths' theory

[1] The four moments of bourgeois landownership transformation are, as we have already seen, the ensuing moments of bourgeoisie reconstruction of landownership which inevitably takes place in the course of bourgeois evolution of agricultural structure. They represent, so to speak, the historical trend of the bourgeois transformation of landownership which proceeds interdependently with the bourgeois evolution of agricultural production, that is, the principle of development, which can be found on the abstract dimension, excluding theoretically the restrictive and disturbing conditions of feudal landownership relations. Then, if we see the bourgeois agricultural evolution more concretely in the context of transition of agricultural structure from feudal to capitalist, the question of sublation of feudal landownership relations comes out. And according to how to solve this question and therefore how the first moment is realised, the principle of development can carry out itself through two different courses. It is this law of transition that we call the 'two paths' of bourgeois agricultural evolution. So, if paying no attention to the fourth moment by the nature of things, these 'two paths' represent two each-other-opposing forms of the process of bourgeois agricultural evolution from the feudal structure to the tripartite division system, although both of them are truly bourgeois evolution.

In Japan, however, prevails a notion which is different from this understanding. According to this notion, the peasant path (in this notion, the peasant path is in itself equal to the path which allows the class-differentiation to go) alone can make its way toward the tripartite division, or only what can reach the tripartite division is the peasant path. On the other hand, the landlord path (equal to the 'Prussian type' in this notion) does not lead the agricultural social structure to the tripartite division at all. For once the agricultural social structure has found its way in the Prussian type landownership transformation (in the following, we use the term 'landownership transformation' narrowly as representing only the final disintegration of feudal landownership to make the comparison between this notion and ours easy), it comes to be thoroughly determined of its whole evolution structure and, therefore, off the route of bourgeois evolution, destined to become an 'established specific "capitalist" structure of agriculture' (so-called 'Prussian-type agricultural structure') which is feudal in its essence. We have already made some criticism upon the false ideas which notions of this kind premise (see * note 'The landlord path and the class-differentiation of peasantry', for II, 2 [4] in this article). Here again, we must discuss them to make clear the abstract nature of the 'two paths' theory.

[2] What makes the matter here is whether the agricultural structure created by the landownership transformation, especially by that of landlord-type, has a relation or not with the tripartite division, and if it has, how it does.

The starting point is a certain set of economic relations in agriculture created by the 'Prussian-type' landownership transformation. According to Lenin's characterisation, it is, first of all, the landowner's (Junker's) direct farming which is 'ultimately capitalist', so that the landownership is a result of the gradual 'accommodation' of feudal landownership to 'capitalism'. However, second, this landowner's direct farming still depends upon the land-

ownership, requiring 'some dependence of rural folk' upon the landowner, and as long as it is so, the landownership also assumes feudal nature. Thus, our starting point is the totality of these two aspects (Lenin, 'Agrarian Question', *op.cit.*, p.140).

The goal is the tripartite division.

Therefore, what makes one of the decisive moments of economical changes which take place between the starting point and the goal is that the landownership and the agricultural enterprise get rid of depending upon the dependence relations of rural folk, i.e., upon the feudal exploitation of them, and that, to say in an opposite direction, the direct producer 'rural folk' come to be separated completely from the land. Then another decisive moment is the separation between the landownership and the agricultural enterprise.

Let our discussion begin with what can be seen from the viewpoint of abstract principle of the development. Yet here, we don't have to give a logical proof again to the exclusion of peasant from the land as a result of the class-differentiation of peasantry — peasants come to be free from the personal dependence by losing their land — or to the progressive separation between the landownership and the agricultural enterprise. It is enough to quote Marx's comprehensive characterisations made in the final chapters of *Das Kapital* Vol.III. That '... the capitalist mode of production ... divorces landed property from the relations of dominion and servitude, on the one hand, and, on the other, totally separates land as an instrument of production from the landed property and landowner'; 'the independent separation of landed property from capital and labour, or the transformation of all landed property into the form of landed property corresponding to the capitalist mode of production'; these are 'the continual tendency and law of development of the capitalist mode of production' (Marx, *Das Kapital*, Bd.III, SS.630,892, also see S.759.). From the viewpoint of principle of development put forth in Marx's *Kapital* in which he made his discussions constantly reminding himself such capital as developed into the totality, the economic relations resulted from the 'Prussian type' landownership transformation are to transit into the tripartite division with an absolute inevitability and without any qualifications.

If we start with one possible result of the peasant type landownership transformation, that is, the economic relations made up of the peasant small commodity production which is carried on basing upon the peasant proprietorship of land parcels and of such infant 'bourgeois' enterprise that has just come out of the category of small commodity production, the course of events is same. The development of capital is, with an absolute inevitability, to get rid of both the obstacle which the peasant proprietorship of land parcels sets because of its private nature and the remnants of communal relations attaching inevitably to this land proprietorship, and to separate the agricultural enterprise from the landownership, and thus to transform this transitional economic relations into the tripartite division.

Whatever economic relations may be created by the bourgeois landownership transformation, as long as the economic relations make the bourgeois evolution the goal is always the tripartite division. This is the stand-point of principle of development, and therefore, of *Das Kapital*. — Don't forget that *Das Kapital* makes only, and absolutely, the tripartite division the object in its economical analysis of capitalist agricultural structure.

Next, if we look at the transformation from the viewpoint of the 'two paths' theory, what conclusion comes out about the question? The theoretical premises upon which Lenin made his characterisation of the 'two paths' possible for 'bourgeois Russia' are the following two very simple and plain points ('Agrarian Question', *op.cit.*, p.135 et seq.). First, the development of capitalism in agriculture carries out itself as an absolute natural law (in this point Lenin follows the viewpoint of *Das Kapital*). But second, the feudal landownership/exploitation (and the private landownership) is such an element that opposes this principle. In the total understanding of these two points, the concreteness of Lenin's theory lies in comparison with the theory of *Das Kapital*.

Now then, from this viewpoint, let's look back again at the economic relations created by the 'Prussian type' landownership transformation. Though 'ultimately capitalist', they remain within a half-feudal transitional form on the way to the goal of bourgeois evolution as long as they still depends to some extent upon the feudal exploitation, and the elements of the half-feudal transitional form themselves make a hindrance to the principle of development. Or in other words, this economic relations is a kind of transitional form of capitalist agriculture which still retains elements of hindrance like these.

In this case, can we conclude that this economic relations never shift into the tripartite division? No, never can we. For, the extent to which the element hinders the realisation of the principle of development can never be determined as long as it is considered within the limit of two given theoretical premises. What we can say here is not about the absolute, qualitative character of this hindrance element. We can say only that as long as the hindrance elements are contained (the more these elements there are), the development of productive power, the development of capital based upon it, the economic changes which accordingly take place later, and on the whole, the realisation of principle of development might take a process which is more zigzag and slower and sublates the half-feudal characteristics more slowly, retaining them as long as possible, in comparison to the case where no such element is contained or there is less (this is the very point that Lenin made). Beyond this we can say nothing. By contraries, the peasant land revolution, which breaks up the feudal large landownership all at once, provides better conditions for the capitalist development of agriculture (much better in the case of nationalisation of land, for it denies even the private landownership) than the landlord land reform which brings the large landownership accompanied by the feudal relations of exploitation into the bourgeois relations. It is true that here are clearly two types, but they are determined only by these conditions and can be applied only to the evolution process.

This is all that we can say about the bourgeois agricultural evolution from the viewpoint of the 'two paths' theory. Because this is not the mere theoretical abstraction which has come about only through the pure logical thinking and also the conditions which the landownership transformation directly gives to the following historical process of agricultural development are thoroughly showed in the above. What is beyond this— all forms that social and economic relations in agriculture take in the course of development of capitalism in a certain country after the landownership transformation are not determined solely by such historical

conditions directly given by the landownership transformation, and therefore, from the viewpoint of the 'two paths' theory, they cannot be predicted at all. That is to say, at this level of theoretical thinking, whether the bourgeois evolution goes on by the peasant path or the landlord path, it at last must reach the same goal of the tripartite division, and in this form establish itself as the capitalist agriculture. Thus the established form of capitalist agriculture is nothing other than the tripartite division for both two paths.

Even if we take it as such an agricultural structure that is structurally linked in an established capitalist economy of a certain country, what we can say about it is likewise limited. Indeed we can say only as follows; when it has not accomplished its bourgeois evolution and remains within some transitional form, its structural characteristics are still determined to some extent by the conditions provided by the landownership transformation, and on the contrary, if it has already accomplished, there is no determination of this kind. Such a proposition that the agricultural structure which has got through a certain landownership transformation (for example, that of 'Prussian type') will necessarily remain within (rather, reach?) one particular transitional form (rather, one particular self-perpetuating 'type?') and does not transform into the tripartite division can never be found within the 'two paths' theory.

[3] Thus, the agricultural evolution makes its progress towards the tripartite division in both cases of the peasant land revolution and the landlord land reform, though in the former the progress is conditioned smoother and in the latter more sluggish. However, it is only when other things are equal that we can say this absolutely. There are so many conditions other than those directly given by the landownership transformation, and they all take their own parts in shortening or lengthening the evolution process. Moreover, it is occasionally possible in either case that the agricultural structure virtually stops in a certain transitional form, and this is not only what we can find in historical facts but what can be deduced from theoretical thinking. But these are the questions beyond the reach of 'two paths' theory. Therefore, in discussing the 'two paths', it is a wrong way to introduce such understanding that 'Prussian type' path is destined for the 'Prussian type agricultural structure' into the theory of two paths directly from the 'historical fact' that the Junker type agricultural enterprise 'did not' transform into the tripartite division after all in 'real' Prussia. It is wrong like to say abruptly that Lenin's characterisation on the peasant path is of no validity as a law of history because a certain stagnation occurred in France where the large landownership had been abolished through the creation of the peasant proprietorship of land parcels (as we have already seen, even this most favourable form for the bourgeois evolution can never escape having some obstructive aspects). If one tries to explain these concrete 'historical facts' from top to bottom through only the 'two paths' theory, he will necessarily become confused or come into some 'riddle'. (As far as 'the Prussian Path is concerned, a noticeable book was recently published. It verifies a certain resemblance between the Prussian agriculture at the end of the 19th century and 'the so-called English tripartite system'. Cf. Fusao Kato, *Doitsu-seshuzaisan to Teikokushugi* [*The German Hereditary Estate and Her Imperialism. A Historical Study of the Agrarian Problem in Prussia*], Keiso-shobo, 1990.)

To understand clearly all the major determinants of 'overall-structural characteristics' of the agricultural development process and therefore the agricultural relations at a certain point in this process, in a certain capitalist nation which has already undergone the bourgeois landownership transformation, we should study the following points, however difficult it may be, besides the direct conditions about landownership and agricultural production mentioned above (including as far as those conditions given in terms of the 'two paths'). The points are; first, the conditions given in those capitalist relations (relations of production and circulation) existing out of agriculture, particularly those for the development in manufacture (The reason why these are of critical importance for the question is, as we have already seen in the former part [* note 'Stages in the development of capital predominance in the entire social production: the class differentiation of peasantry and the capitalist ground-rent', for I , 2, [3]], that as soon as capital comes into existence and begins to make its movement as a result of some disintegration of old land relations, the capital as a whole, which is led mainly by the level of development of manufacture, begins to take the initiative in the total organic each-other-premising relations between itself, wage labour and landownership, and therefore as a main determinant it has the landownership and further, by implication, the agricultural structure as a whole remade to be suitable for its own necessities [though of course both are interdependent upon each other]. Still more, we have to take into account the exploitation of agriculture or rural society by manufacture or urban society, an uneven development of manufacture and agriculture and so on.); second, conditions given to the 'state', and further, to the 'foreign trade' and 'world market'; third, conditions given to the capitalism as a whole determined by the point it is situated at in the world history, which we can grasp only as the whole of all the characterisations (contradictions) made at all levels of thinking from 'capital' to 'world market' (world crisis) (think about the role played by the so called Plan for Economics in the historical analysis). We have to give attentions constantly to all these conditions when we consider the question.

It is not only when we try to make a theoretical and historical explanation upon such concrete situations found in France or in the 'backward' Prussia that to make clear these conditions becomes necessary. It is also necessary when we discuss about the Britain where the bourgeois evolution reached its goal of the tripartite division at any rate. That is, as long as we remain at the level of 'two paths'theory, we can never explain the ultimate moments which made the evolution proceed in such a way that it actually proceeded in the Britain (We can not discuss these ultimate moments now, but we can read the chapter upon the primitive accumulation given in *Das Kapital* as such, though it also does not get rid of the abstract nature inherent to principle of development discussed in *Das Kapital*. Also see the suggestive discussion made in Marx, *Grundrisse*, SS.188-189.).

[4] Compared with these conditions lying out of the direct determination of landownership transformation, the abstract nature of the 'two paths'theory is apparent. However, we must not forget that without remaining within this abstract nature (which is fit for the actually given conditions as long as the theory is applied to the relationship between the landownership transformation and the bourgeois agricultural evolution), we cannot grasp the

two different types of process of bourgeois agricultural evolution and their respective structural characteristics, which are both determined only by the conditions given by the direct result of landownership transformation. Therefore, when we proceed into the more concrete terms in our study of agricultural structure, too, we should keep in mind the understanding of this principle. As the law of 'two paths' is the law of transformation which comes into our mind as the totality of combination and contradiction of and between the law of development and the hindrance elements mentioned above, so the phenomenon which seems to be the 'stagnation' at first glance is a result of the whole of interdependent contradictions between this law of transformation and the tendency of other conditions, i.e., another law, and so we can not explain this phenomenon without taking into account the former law. This point has relevance, too, to our criticism upon the notion of some scholars, who argue that Lenin's theory upon agriculture makes a mistake in basing itself from top to bottom upon the law of development of capitalist mode of production and then reduce everything to what is determined by the 'stage of imperialism', taking it for granted that agriculture is to stagnate. By this way, it is impossible to make clear the theoretical structure of the characters of 'stage', and therefore the whole of laws resulted into the 'stagnation'. Generally speaking, those notions which are prevailing in Japan understand neither the concrete nature of the 'two paths' theory nor the abstract nature of it—what concrete realities this theory deals with—.

All the false notions seem to come from this failure. In particular, when this failure takes the shape of such an idea of history of comparative historical 'types' that grasps respective capitalist nations in the cause and effect order which starts from the 'type' of landownership transformation, then goes to the 'overall-structural characteristics' of agriculture, and ends in the type of capitalism, it can be said to have had an effect of making the entire historical studies on the development of capitalism seriously stiff. The discussions of this kind, so called typologies, have taken the historical process to the stiff structures of types instead of considering it in terms of its development and contradiction—of the totality of its contradictions—, and in this context, have given exorbitantly much more significance to the landownership transformation and the history of agricultural development than they can bear. In order to understand correctly the significance which the agricultural evolution and the landownership transformation have in the course of development of capitalism, to make our analysis of their processes able to deal with more concrete conditions, and to manage to grasp the historical process as the totality of laws, i.e., contradictions, overcoming critically the 'new' trend which misses the meaning of the agricultural evolution or of the landownership transformation by looking at limitless, various concrete conditions only, and further comes to laugh and ignore the standpoint of the law of development, we are in urgent need of getting rid of the stiff typology. (See Fusao Kato, *op. cit.* This work is such an important attempt with historical accuracy of Germany.)