

# **Memorial Museums as Social Capital: an Introduction**

*What and why do people memorialise?*

Hiroshi UCHIDA

(Professor Emeritus, Senshu University)

# Memorial Museums as Social Capital: an Introduction

## *What and why do people memorialise?*

Hiroshi UCHIDA†

More and more people these days are offering their hand to help others in order to live together with them. We may be entering a wonderful period. Signs of this are appearing in different forms, one of which is known as “social capital”<sup>1</sup>. Social capital is coming alive in various forms.

In this essay I will examine from a social and historical perspective the significance of taking up the memorial museum as an instance of social capital. That is, I intend to validate the premise of memorial museums as social capital, and aim to clearly show the reasoning behind it.

I will, in the below order:

- 1) examine the historical background as to why social capital has become such an essential practical and political concept today;
- 2) examine the significance and necessity for people to memorialise such things as people, projects, events and incidents; and look into who provides the necessary funds in order to memorialise;
- 3) in bringing together the above two considerations, attempt to clarify the underlying basis of “memorial museums as social capital”.

---

† Professor Emeritus, Senshu University

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.socialcapitalresearch.com/references.html> (10 Nov 2009)

As can be seen from this reference, the concept of social capital is extremely varied. Social capital takes society in terms of regular human relations, and is found in any place where people gather. This is why we should discuss "why" and "how" social capital is being sought today. It is for this reason that, as a prerequisite to the discussion of memorial museums, this essay reflects on the historical development of civil society, posits the current age as the third stage of civil society, and explains the background behind the current day demand for social capital.

### **(1) The transformation of capitalism - a historical look at the emergence of the concept of social capital**

In 1993, less than 20 years ago, I noted a number of emerging trends such as “free time”, “volunteering”, “NPOs”, “NGOs” and “job satisfaction surveys”<sup>2</sup>, terms which at the time had not entered the everyday vernacular; I wrote something of the following:

#### *A womb that spawns nihilism*

We have conventionally considered our social system under the triple-entity framework of “business”, “the government”, and “the household”. But, there are issues now emerging that transcend this framework; issues that the current framework cannot handle. Local communities become hollowed out when people leave for work each day. Day and night local communities are in a state of near desertion. Because of long working hours, it is now rare for an entire family to sit and eat together. When the children arrive home from school, no one is there to greet them, and their friends are all inside studying with no time to play. Shopping is done at the train station supermarket so stores in local shopping arcades are shutting up for good. Even in the middle of the day on the main streets of regional towns and villages, no one can be seen. They have become ghost towns. Once upon a time, group problems were solved within the group, but now they’re entrusted to outside professionals. If there’s trouble at school, the teachers go straight to the emergency services. The teacher-student bond has diluted. How a child’s education can progress in such a dubious state is anyone’s guess.

If everyone else is studying to achieve some unspecified goal, then one also simply heads the same way, as if urged by the trend. One thus studies, convincing oneself that “the now” is there to be used as only a “means” to achieve the goal. When the next block of time becomes available, one will simply regard it as another opportunity for achieving “the goal”. Thus, one’s whole life becomes simply a means for achieving “the goal”. A system consisting of such people becomes a system of means – thus resulting in a hollow system, as the system itself becomes a system of no value: a system of nihilism. But people are now beginning to wake up to this critical situation. They are calling for more family time, free time, time to enjoy themselves. This call has not yet reached critical mass, but it is persisting. In Japan, too, efforts to re-energise households, schools, communities - places that produce the next generation - are beginning to make themselves heard. Takashi Uchiyama (*Asahi Shimbun* July 2009) points out that the

---

<sup>2</sup> Ref. Uchida, H, (1993). This essay on free time, as shown by the year of publication, was written just after the bursting of the bubble economy which began to weaken following the Plaza Accord in 1985. As you will see further on, this essay provides a hypothesis on the “sophistication of capitalism”. In it, I note a trend whereby capitalism is transforming by absorbing social elements. This trend has become more vivid in 21st century capitalism, a sign of which is the spread and practice of social capital. In constructing the future it is not enough to only statistically observe fait accompli that have already been demonstrated. Symptoms, which hint at future trends but which cannot be caught through mere statistical means due to their paucity, must be caught in advance through acute observation and intuition.

problem lies in the depths of the current economic dislocation:

In the current age of supposed progress, scientific development and the establishment of freedom of the individual, there are many who are left feeling dull and unfulfilled, as if they are wandering through a sort of bogus world...at their core is a kind of nihilism towards the untrustworthy modern day system and a society with no power to sustain itself<sup>3</sup>.

People began to notice this situation in the 1980s, which was also the time when people around the world began to utter the words “social capital” and implement its concept. The World Bank’s attention and positive commitment to social capital was also around this time<sup>4</sup>. In the case of Japan, the formation of a new system was delayed due to the bursting of the bubble economy in 1991 and the subsequent protracted economic slump. Attempts are currently being made to make up for lost time.

### *The transformation of capitalism and spread of technology*

Such a state of affairs can be rendered as the “transformation of capitalism”. Capitalism is an innovative system. The essence of technology is not just natural technique, which is based on natural science, but rather a combination of natural technique and social technique, which is based on social science (Kiyoshi Miki). “Technology is an integration of teleology and causality<sup>5</sup>.”

Technology is the art of applying the process of cause and effect so that the envisioned result - to obtain things that are essential to survive - becomes the actual result. But not even a new, beneficial technology will be adopted if it is not profitable. The promise of profitability (i.e. income greater than expenses) is the prerequisite for the adoption of a technology. In many cases royalties will be one of those expenses. For example, once medicine effective against AIDS has been developed, its production becomes triflingly cheap. But the cost of royalties, relative to production costs, is immense, meaning that the medicine does not reach many people who need it. NHK broadcast a programme in early 2010 called *Kome Ku Hitobito*<sup>6</sup> (people who eat rice) which looked at the continuous selective breeding of rice that has been carried out since rice cultivation began 1200 years ago in Jiangxi, China, giving us the rice we have today. Thus far there have been virtually no patent applications lodged concerning the selective breeding of rice. And just like rice, almost everything that humans need to sustain their lives has come as a

---

<sup>3</sup> *Asahi Shimbun* 22 July 2009 (evening edition)

<sup>4</sup> Gates, J, (1998), p.146 notes, “research on the component of civil society that most affects people’s waking lives (i.e., work), suggests the time is ripe for some creative paradigm-shifting to restore depleted social capital in the work environment.” This observation is also a criticism towards the view that social capital can only be found outside the economic domain. Further, it indicates that economic activity itself will not be carried out properly if the economic domain does not have a proper grounding in civil society. Nan Lin’s concept of social capital, which will be discussed later in this essay, shows a bias to narrow the issue into a domain outside of economics.

<sup>5</sup> Ref. Kiyoshi, M, (1967), p.228

<sup>6</sup> 11 January 2010, 8pm-9:30pm (rerun)

result of a voluntary selfless service. Admittedly, 1) technological innovation will advance if there are royalties - the reward for time and effort spent on technological innovation. It is rational to recover the costs of investing in a new technology and having reserve funds for the next technological development. However, 2) the spread of the results of technological innovation is being obstructed by the high price of royalties and the length of time they are obtained for. The justifiability of royalties is doubtful.

There are currently calls for the correction and compatibility of the above two points. Global spread of innovation is the destined mission of technology, which is the crystallisation of human wisdom. Technology transcends local areas and national borders and spreads on a global scale. Its spread is where the cause for the conversion of a human concept into a realistic concept lies. The creation of new technology is, on the one hand, a product of the talent and effort of the inventor, but on the other hand, just like the telescopic lens for astronomical observation that put Galileo down in history, in order to create the invention the inventor applies premises that people before him or her conceived. The glory for the inventor is not in receiving monetary reward, it is in the promotion of human well-being through the spread of his invention. In that sense, the goal of promoting the spread of technology certainly seems righteous.

Correcting the faults of society relies only on the goodwill of individuals. Disregarding the social system itself, which persistently generates the results that require goodwill, is negligence and failure of responsibility of the social scientist. The goal of the social scientist is to scientifically envisage society with the view that the social system is morally designed and managed, and that morals are built systematically into the social fabric. The fact that technology must be the integration of natural technique and social technique is linked to that goal.

### *The sophistication of capitalism*

This is not the time to be content with discussing “capitalism in general”. It is not the time to be satisfied emphasising only the negative side of capitalism. Twenty-first century capitalism is transforming into sophisticated capitalism. If we break down the word “sophistication” we find the root word “sophist (*sophistēs*)” which in Ancient Greece meant, “one who makes a business out of teaching rhetoric or sophistry<sup>7</sup>”. As rhetoric is the art of language, it will, if necessary, denigrate into sophistry - the art of persuading someone that black is white. Disputes over land ownership were a particularly serious problem in Ancient Greece so there was an ever present danger of degenerating into sophistry.

However, in retrospect, it is unlikely that we could speak the truth without the ability to manipulate language to express ideas. At the core of the problem of philosophical truth is

---

<sup>7</sup> English version (2003) of Huizinga, J, (1944) “...these same sophists were responsible for the milieu which gave rise to the Hellenic idea of education and culture...For the Greeks, the treasures of the mind were the fruit of his leisure, and for the free man any time that was not claimed by State service, war or ritual counted as free time, so that he had ample leisure indeed...In that milieu, that of the free time of the free man, the sophist as the first representative of a life of contemplation and study was perfectly at home.”

how exactly to make maximal use of the art of language. Philosophy cannot separate itself from rhetoric. Rhetoric as philosophy must be recognised. The reason Aristotle left us not just the theory of logic (*Corpus Aristotelicum*) but also *technē rhetorikē* (*Treatise on Rhetoric*) was that he saw a necessity for it. In his *Metaphysics* and *De Anima*, the study of truth and falsity, is founded on the notion that philosophy and rhetoric are inseparable<sup>8</sup>.

Therefore rhetoric itself is most certainly not sophistry. This was all the more reason why Socrates was alarmed at the prevalence of the Sophists, singling out for criticism men such as Gorgias. He cleverly and rhetorically exposed falsehoods through Socratic irony. We witness the necessity and inevitability of rhetoric as philosophy in Socrates' critique of Gorgias. Socrates was a rhetorician par excellence.

The reason that we are discussing the problematic side of rhetoric as such is because the problem by which the "sophistication" of capitalism can also be ambiguous and double-sided. We may have to face a problem that is logically similar to the problem Socrates was once faced with. We must bear in mind the ambiguity and double-sidedness of rhetoric which on one side is (a) "a linguistic basis for the definition of truth"; but on the other side is (b) "sophistry by which people are cleverly tricked to believe a false proposition to be true. In the same way, there is certainly a double-sided nature in the sophistication of capitalism, and we must scrutinise which one of those sides is surfacing. In other words, "sophistication" means (a) "the substantial improvement of quality"; and (b) "to claim as the truth that which is false".

Modern capitalism these days is not, all in all, crude capitalism. One side of it (Side A), fraught with serious disparities and problems of poverty, is shifting into "green capitalism" (i.e. capitalism oriented towards environmental issues). That is, it is trying to solve poverty issues by solving environmental issues. Contemporary capitalism has a side that is transforming into a capitalism that sings the praises of life and expresses beauty. It does not take a brutal approach to problem solving as seen in tales such as *Kanikōsen* (a short story published in the 1930s in Japan that emphasised the cruelties of worker exploitation). Modern capitalism teaches us that the days of "economic value" are over. It proposes "virtue as social value" as an alternative and complementation of economic values. We constantly receive letters requesting monetary donations to the poor children of the world, meaning we are living in an age in which such a solicitation activity has a high value.

On the other side (Side B), the true brutal nature of capitalism is exposed. The economic trend since the bankruptcy of Lehman Brothers on the 15th of September 2008 showed once again the savage side of capitalism. When it was exposed, action to mend it was quickly enforced. Side A was integrated with Side B.

The complicated state of affairs is due to both Side A and Side B speaking at once and intertwining. The formulation of green capitalism (capitalism oriented towards environmental problems) is moving forward at the same rate as the establishment of *hakenmura* (temporary

---

<sup>8</sup> Ref. Uchida, H, (2007)

communities or shelters in Japan where many homeless, often temporary dispatch workers, gather and live mostly during the New Year period). The problems of present day capitalism must, above all else, be seized at the roots philosophically and rhetorically. It is at a fundamental level. What is required, however, is a sensitivity and flexibility that can capture accurately and clearly concrete and vivid trends of the matter, and a dynamic ability to criticise the situation with a sharp eye on the aggressiveness and deceptiveness that come from this trend's inherent ambiguity and double-sidedness. We mustn't watch only Side A while conveniently ignoring Side B. But this does not mean looking at Side B from the ivory tower not wishing to be a part of it – that would, in the end, be futile. People at the forefront live their lives in both Side A and Side B.

The current situation brings great waves of problems crashing onto us one after the other, and before we clearly understand how the previous wave was subsided the next one comes crashing down. We often tend to fail to see how the previous wave was dealt with. We casually forget the effect of the previous wave as if nothing happened. We are becoming accustomed to the glut of information. We desire big problems, get excited facing them, but forget them quickly in readiness to see the next. What is needed is a method and attitude for recording important facts and memorialising them. Such a method and attitude must be firmly established when looking at these problems.

What we are seeing here may be only the surface of the matter. While the surface of the sea is indeed rough, there may be a different current running at the bottom. And that different current may be social capital.

## **(2) Social capital and the historical development of civil society**

### *Social capital and civil society*

People are now seeking social capital. Not just in Japan, not just in East Asia, it is being sought in a number of forms throughout the world. So, why social capital now? To deal with this question we must, as usual, take an historical approach. For some time now, I have been considering a “three stage theory of civil revolution” from the perspective that civil society is something that develops historically<sup>9</sup>. The main points are given as below.

The term “civil society” as a practical and political concept took root globally over the last twenty years. The penetration of capitalism on a global scale brought various positives and negatives. It became clear that the results of economic development were not necessarily linked to social, political, or human development, and there was a clear need for a body to correct and regulate corruption such as decision makers of developed and developing countries monopolising the fruits of economic development and, in turn, diverting financial aid into illegal channels. Furthermore, there was also a need for a body to relay the fruits of economic development into social, political, and human development. That body became known as “civil

---

<sup>9</sup> Ref. Uchida, H, (2008a & 2008b)

society”. The need to establish and construct civil society lay in the global development and penetration of capitalism, so an awareness of the need for civil society also to take a global stage emerged; and many such literary works on the subject were published. If we place global civil society in the historical development of civil society, its function becomes clear. As such, we shall now review the historical development of civil society.

Civil society comes down to the concepts of “liberty”, “equality” and “fraternity”. Most people think the origin of these principles is in the Declaration of the Rights of Man from the French Revolution in 1789. But this is not the case. These principles come from the Constitution of France that came into existence on the 4th of November 1848. So why the fundamental misunderstanding? The concepts of liberty (*liberté*), equality (*égalité*), and fraternity (*fraternité*) can be seen in the preamble of the current Constitution of France (1958):

The French people solemnly proclaim their attachment to the Rights of Man and the principles of national sovereignty as defined by the Declaration of 1789, confirmed and complemented by the Preamble to the Constitution of 1946, and to the rights and duties as defined in the Charter for the Environment of 2004. By virtue of these principles and that of the self-determination of peoples, the Republic offers to the overseas territories which have expressed the will to adhere to them new institutions founded on the common ideal of liberty, equality and fraternity and conceived for the purpose of their democratic development<sup>10</sup>.

As can be seen, the Preamble of the current French Constitution is provided by the 1789 Declaration of the Rights of Man, the Preamble of the 1946 Constitution, and the 2004 Charter for the Environment, with the French Constitution of 1848 is nowhere to be seen. The current French Constitution was written as if the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity - principles on which the country supposedly builds itself - were taken, or rather mistaken, from the 1789 French Revolution. The principle of fraternity, however, did not appear until the Constitution of the Second French Republic on the 4th of November 1848 following the February Revolution of 1848, 59 years after 1789. This was the first time the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity appeared together. The principles claimed by the 1789 Declaration of the Rights of Man were not liberty, equality and fraternity. They were liberty, equality and “property” (*propriété*)<sup>11</sup>. The “property” in the Declaration of the Rights of Man was “bourgeois property”. The civil society that emerged from this first civil revolution was a bourgeois society, which more than anything, was an economic society. People could participate in government only if they possessed property. Those who did not have property did not have suffrage. Property was the prerequisite. People who did not own property - the proletariat - and women were called “passive citizens”. They were put beyond the bounds of civil society (bourgeois society). As for the so called “rights” of the Rights of Man of 1789, they were the rights only of property owners. Suffrage was only for rich men. Men without money and all women did not have

---

<sup>10</sup> Ref. Takahashi, K, (2007), p.278

<sup>11</sup> Ref. Takagi et. al. (ed) (1957), p.131, par.2



suffrage. The government that the bourgeois aimed for was one that protected and enlarged bourgeois property (a policy of constructing a capitalist system for primitive accumulation). There would no doubt be many that accept the conventional thought that France is a nation of “social revolution,” a “politically advanced nation.” It may, therefore, be astonishing to such people that French women have only had suffrage since 1945 - the same year that women in Japan were granted suffrage. French men had had suffrage since 1848, the year of the February Revolution, but French women were not given suffrage for almost 100 years after this. One might counter this with a claim that French women were conservative, but this ignores the fact that during the French February Revolution there were loud calls for women’s suffrage. For French women up to 1945 France was constitutionally a “politically undeveloped nation”.

### *The beginning of liberty, equality and fraternity*

The principles of liberty, equality and fraternity in the current French Constitution were inherited from the 1848 February Revolution<sup>12</sup>. The Revolution of 1789 was, in essence, a bourgeois revolution principled on liberty, equality, and property (ownership). This meant the civil society of that time was a bourgeois society centred on property owners. Some researchers consider the First French Revolution as a classic type of civil revolution. Classic in what sense? It is, naturally, not the model that should be aimed for today. More importantly, the traditional image of civil society that the left wingers had, i.e. civil society being essentially a bourgeois society – a capitalist society –, is incorrect. Such an image of the left wingers that delimits civil society to the first civil revolution in 1789 is parallel in recognition but opposes in evaluation those researchers who praise the French Revolution as a classic type of civil revolution, in that they both do not see the changes of civil society that occurred afterwards. Those views they are equally wrong as they are unaware that they are based on wrong premises. In other words, they both do not know of the changes that took place in civil society afterwards - the difference being that the researchers consider civil revolution a once off event in the distant past whereas the left wingers are steadfast in the belief that civil society (i.e. bourgeois society, capitalist society) is essentially an irrational system that should be overthrown.

The history of civil society that followed was an amendment of the principle of civil society as bourgeois society. Civil society is not something that is bound. It is not, by principle, in a static closed state. Civil society historically went through change, giving us what we have today. That watershed was the Constitution of the Second Republic of 1848. Starting there, the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity (*fraternité*) replaced the principles of liberty, equality and property (*propriété*). So, what happened to “property”? It, along with “labour”, was changed to form the basis of French civil society. Property and labour together with “family and public order” were altered, to be positioned as the basis of French society. In doing so property (owners)

---

<sup>12</sup> Ref. Takagi et. al. (ed) (1957) p.160, IV. “The Constitution of France is principled on liberty, equality and fraternity”. “The Constitution of France has its foundation in family, labour, property, and public order”

and work(ers) became equals. Through this, the people who sweated their way through work, including labourers and craftsmen - direct producers - and property owners such as capitalists and landlords were recognised as equal social constituents, at least officially. What pressured the change was the fact that the workers (direct producers), as the bearers of productivity, had increased their skill capacity to the extent that the bourgeois had no choice but to compromise. The bargaining power of others, in the form of required skills, was the foundation of the right to speak to others. Here, we must acknowledge the cold fact that power, in the form of ability, gave birth to rights; rights are sustained by power. Old women, who did not or were not allowed to have purses of their own, now work cooperatively to earn money. Disabled people prepare batter and bake bread to earn some income however small that may be. The joy of this is the fact that ability in particular is the basis of self respect. Fraternity, which is sustained by that skill, is the political expression of the development of the ability of such direct producers. This skill caused the principle to change from ownership to fraternity<sup>13</sup>.

*The problematic nature of the current Preamble and Constitution of France*

The current Constitution of France was simplistically written, which probably explains why it does not explicitly state in the Preamble that fraternity originated in the Revolution of 1848. The current Constitution of France discreetly takes the important principle of fraternity from the 1848 Constitution without explicating as much. The Preamble of the current (1958) Constitution is taken from the Preamble of the Constitution of the French Fourth Republic which was established in 1946, directly after the Second World War - when the Cold War began. They recognised at that time that the Socialist Sphere, which was expanding drastically through the Socialist Revolution in Soviet occupied Eastern Europe (refer to the film *Ashes and Diamonds*) immediately following the Second World War, also had ideological origins in the French February Revolution. In other words, despite the fact the principles of freedom, equality and fraternity originated from the February Revolution, there is no mention of it in the Preamble of the Constitution of France perhaps because of a desire to cut off any resonance between the Constitution of the Fourth Republic and the Red Republic lineage (Jacobinism to the February Revolution to the Paris Commune to the Russian Revolution to the Socialist Revolution in Soviet occupied Eastern Europe to the Chinese Revolution), as signs of the Cold War were starting to appear. The Preamble of the current Constitution of France, which took the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity from the 1946 Constitution, is perhaps a legacy of the political

---

<sup>13</sup> In this regard, it should be noted that the concept of democracy has been resurrected from the memory of political history. In the Industrial Revolution, which was at the end phase of the process of primitive accumulation and the beginning stages of capitalism, learned workers flew the flag of democracy and pushed for and won recognition as citizens legally equal to property owners. The dual concept of capitalism and democracy has been revived in the United States today. Refer to the Michael Moore film *Capitalism: A Love Story*, and the associated guide (Junichi Arita 2009: <http://capitalism.jp>). The emergence of the concept of social capital is the re-emergence of democracy. This movie focuses precisely on capitalism and democracy.

forethought of the constitutors of the 1946 Constitution, which was to remove any resonance to the ever expanding Red Republics. The February Revolution is the junction of the lineages of the second civil revolution and the Russian Revolution, but the current Preamble discreetly hides this junction.

There are some people who try to devalue the civil revolution by restricting as a first civil revolution and simplifying and equating it as “civil revolution equals civil society equals bourgeois society”. They are of the viewpoint that the second civil revolution, which followed the first civil revolution, is within the lineage of the abovementioned Red Republics. This is probably the reason that they position the second civil revolution as “a failed socialism revolution”, or as “its lower form”. In order to succeed in social reform, it is mandatory to be ready to see not just negative elements in the present situation but also to have insights to be able to see positive and creative elements and have attitudes to nurture such positive elements. Such positive and creative elements have a universality that is not to be defined by the distance from an individual and partisan position.

What characterised the 1848 Constitution of the Second Republic as it relates to the evaluation of the second civil revolution was the fact that it recognised “social rights (*droits sociales*)” for the first time. Efforts that called for social rights were actively undertaken in the February Revolution, and, as such, they were incorporated into the 1848 Constitution. Social rights were grounded in the idea that society should collectively protect people whose right to existence is endangered by not having property. The important thing about this Constitution overall was “pacifism”. Social rights and pacifism are based on the spirit that people of differing standpoints or social standings shall live together and coexist together. This is “fraternity”. The English “fraternise” and the French “*franernizer*” mean “to transcend social class and coexist”.

#### *Two kinds of liberty and equality*

The important point at issue thereupon is whether, despite the similarity in language, the “liberty and equality” as related to “property rights” and “liberty and equality” as related to “fraternity” are the same or different. They are, of course, different. The liberty and equality of the former is the liberty of the bourgeois and equality among the bourgeois. Outside of this were a great many people (the proletariat and women) who were treated unequally and without liberty. They were excluded to the outer bounds of civil society. In contrast, the freedom and equality of the latter is premised on the realisation of the demands of those on the outside to be welcomed as members of civil society. It is premised on reconciling the gap in the terms and conditions for existence between the haves and have-nots (implementing the principle of fraternity). The incorporation of social rights and pacifism into the 1848 Constitution, in which the principle of fraternity was specified, was for this purpose. It is an agreement or contract to peacefully reconcile the interests among classes (i.e. protect "social rights").

#### *21st century notion: four kinds of coexistence*

The principle of fraternity, which first emerged in the 1848 Revolution, became an extremely

important principle for redefining civil society and expanding civil rights to more people. The European Union of today is also dependent on the fraternal principles of “human rights”, “social rights”, “peace”, and “coexistence”. As for the question of when and by whom did liberty, equality and property change to liberty, equality and fraternity, the birth of the EU offers a clue. Consideration of this issue will, in coming years, be very important for reflecting on the historical development of civil society and as a principle of future expansion of civil society.

In 2004 the Charter for the Environment was added to the Preamble of the current French Constitution. The notion of four kinds of coexistence - “mankind and nature”, “man and woman”, “abled and disabled”, and “the majority and minority” - is a sign of a third civil revolution. These four notions are putting into effect the principle of “things that possess life coexist on the basis of life”. This indicates a common foundation by which mankind in the 21st century lives. In that sense, it is a standpoint from which no one can leave.

It seems that the notion of the four kinds of coexistence was born out of our historical reflection and self-searching of modern history that all living things are valuable only when they learn to coexist. The four kinds of coexistences are ideals that should be placed at the core of modern day social capital, and are goals that should be concretely realised.

#### *What is “social”?*

The notion of coexistence, which is our goal, becomes clear if we confirm what the “social” in “social capital” means. Does it simply mean “human relations”? We will distinguish it using German as a point of reference. “Social” in German has two meanings: *gesellschaftlich* and *sozial*. (1) *Gesellschaftlich* simply means “the relations of humans”. It has a neutral meaning where value judgement is non-existent. (2) *Sozial* has the sense that there is a problem in the aforementioned human relations (society) that should be solved. The English word “social” has the sense of both (1) and (2), and you must distinguish it through context. The “social” in “social capital” has the sense of (2). In this “social” there is an issue that should be solved, and capital is required to solve the problem.

Such an awareness and way of thinking probably began in Britain in the middle of the 19th century. This was when the foundations of capitalism had been finally set in Britain for the first time (the industrial revolution, i.e. the end of the period of primitive accumulation). A direct example would be the National Association for the Promotion of Social Sciences<sup>14</sup>, 1857-1886. This association stood for the real awareness of the problems in Britain at the time – unemployment, poverty, slums, infectious diseases, short life expectancy, begging, prostitution, crime – problems that emerged from faults in the British capitalist system itself. It held its annual meeting in a different British city each year and published its annual proceedings in a report called *Transactions*. The association itself was not a mere scientific society. Not being such, it

---

<sup>14</sup> Ref. Uchida, H Igirisu Shihon Shugi (British capitalism) in Shin Marukusu Gaku Jiten (The Neo-Marxology Lexicon), Matoba, A, Uchida, H, et. al. (ed) (2000)

looked at the above problems as practical political problems of citizens. Its annual general meetings were like places of propaganda from which all citizens would push for solutions to problems. The movement expanded throughout all of Britain. The association, of which Prime Minister John Russell was a central figure, was made up of social science scholars, members of the business world, the bureaucracy and different regional organisations. John Stuart Mill was also a member.

The image of issues that people came to see when they observed society directly, without avoiding seeing the contradictions of capitalism, came to be embedded in the adjective “social”. Incidentally, one of the definitions of “social” in the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* is:

Concerned with, interested in, the constitution of society and the problems presented by this.

The first appearance of “social” in that sense was 1841. This was exactly the time of Britain’s Industrial Revolution, a social revolution. Should the constituents of society (civil society) remain as is? Is there anyone that should be included in society? Are there people who should participate still standing outside of society? The adjective that describes such questions was born during the Industrial Revolution in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century England. Britain had already gone through a first civil revolution with the 1649 Cromwell Revolution and the 1688 Glorious Revolution, the goal of which was the construction of the Glorious Revolution Settlement, an order based on British capitalism, or rather, a national order of primitive accumulation<sup>15</sup>. In the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the final stage in the process of primitive accumulation, various revolutions occurred: the repeal of the regulations of wages in the Elizabethan Law in 1813, universal manhood suffrage in 1832 (which gave suffrage to commercial and industrial men in the cities), the Slavery Abolition Act in 1833. In shedding the stage of primitive capitalism Britain was modernised and reorganised for the initial stages of a bourgeois revolution. The Factory Act, which by law limited working hours for all wages earners to 10 hours, was enacted as late as until 1851. Suffrage was granted to male town and city workers in 1864, and suffrage for male agricultural workers in 1886. British women had to wait as late as until 1928 for suffrage.

The above meaning of “social” incorporates the reality-facing realism held by the British bourgeois who were aware of the social limitations of capitalism.

#### *The realism of the British capitalist leadership*

The English word “social” has the above historical realistic meaning. Considering this, “social capital” does not have the vague meaning of “the general power of human relationships”. It is not such a vaguely defined adjective. It is a term closely linked to the attitude of people who

---

<sup>15</sup> Ref. Mochizuki, S, (1982), p.89. Mochizuki unerringly points out that “the end of the 17th century” (Das Capital ch.24 on primitive accumulation) refers to a series of reforms in relation to the 1688 Glorious Revolution and the results thereof.

challenge and look to solve current day problems.

After all, when people gather together a collective force arises, which is exerted at a particular object. The question, however, is to what problems the combined potential power of individuals will be targeted, and in what form it will appear. In this sense, “social” is not a neutral word void of value judgement. Matters such as this cannot be addressed from the perspective of collective force in general. Anyone who wants to discuss “social capital” should be free from asking the indefiniteness or arbitrariness of question.

In France the same type of examination and reflection that Britain made into the initial stage of modernisation came rapidly after its first stage of modernisation. The equivalent to Britain’s social reform (the Industrial Revolution in the first half of the 19th century which came roughly 100 years after the two stage bourgeois revolution of 1649 and 1689) in France was the February Revolution, roughly 70 years after France’s first stage of modernisation. The social rights in the enacted Constitution, which were taken from the February Revolution, acknowledged the systematic limits of capitalism. The rights of workers were recognised as equal in substance to those of property owners by replacing restrictions in the “terms and conditions of survival” for the possessors of labour with a system that regarded the commodity of labour as property.

The end result of this real awareness was the emergence of the welfare state. In search of sources of funds for this, nations advanced technologically and at the same time advanced into foreign lands. As such, “the arrival the imperialist era” and “the appearance of the welfare state” are two sides of the same body. The First and Second World Wars that followed were struggles for sources of funds. Although those wars ended the issue still was not settled. These great wars were battles between the democratic powers and the fascist Axis powers. After these wars the Cold War era between the capitalist system and socialist system began and lasted until 1991. Nations that, under the Cold War, gained independence from imperialist control and attempted to become nation states did not choose the “socialist system”, and moreover, the problem of developing a strategy so as not to end up fascist like Japan, Germany and Italy became the central problem for the capitalist system’s global strategy.

#### *Development studies and industrialisation*

“Development studies” then emerged. Development studies is generally concerned with (1) economic development; (2) social development; and (3) human development. The idea of it is to pass the fruit of (1) economic development on to (2) social development, which in turn passes it onto (3) human development. Development is carried out by advanced countries, or more precisely, by multinational corporations that emerge from advanced countries, in collaboration with developing countries. Relations between advanced and developing countries are characterised by alliance between the rich and the rich. Moreover, the efficiency of capital aid is deteriorating, and therefore the efficiency of capital must be raised. Development strategy in the past has been limited to the capital efficiency of business but we have arrived at a stage in which this strategy is being reviewed. The most important issue is the “efficient management of total capital” taking into account not only business capital, but also government capital and

human capital of citizens. This demand for efficient management is stipulated by such things as the increasing global needs of people and environmental regulations.

Capitalist development, according to the historical experience of developed countries, followed a path by which industrial revolution led to the emergence of socialism. That is, lying dormant within industrial revolution was a path that led to the socialist system. Development studies had to be pioneered in such a way that industrial revolution led to nothing more than social improvement. As such, the early pioneers of development studies went to great lengths to demonstrate that the historical experience of countries such as Britain and France was not rapid industrial revolution, but rather, “gradual industrialisation”.

The moral lesson from the industrial revolutions of developed countries was that trouble would brew over the distribution of increasing wealth within a country, leading eventually to the so-called socialist movement. They, therefore, wanted to keep a close eye on its emergence on the back of democracy. Socialism, in the case of Japan, lasted from the early 20th century to the 1920s. Workers emerged from industrial revolution as an entity of equals that opposed the propertied class (bourgeois). If development were to take off in developing countries, industrial revolution would emerge, and with that the problem of socialism. This was something they wanted to avoid at all costs.

Basically, in order to theoretically arm themselves against extreme demands over the distribution of wealth, they had to re-examine the modern history of Britain and develop a theory that said the process of development was not through “industrial revolution,” rather it was “industrialisation” - gradual economic growth.

Historically, the results of technological innovation first appear in military campaigns. New technology was blatantly prominent in World War I. Military power in the Great War - tanks and fighter aircraft, gas guns and chemical weapons, massive and rapid mobilisation of troops through military trains and transport craft - was dramatically superior to the military power that Nelson and Napoleon had at the beginning of the 19th century before the industrial revolutions of Britain and France. Napoleon travelled just as fast, or slow rather, on horseback as Hannibal did during his exhibition over the Alps two hundred years before Christ. It would certainly suffice to say that there was a rather large difference between the mobilisation speed, troop numbers and the extent of supply logistics in Hannibal and Napoleon’s armies and those of World War I, and that there was quite a degree of advancement made.

#### *Theory of industrialisation and Chinese economic development*

This criticism of the theory of industrial revolution and discussion of industrialisation was perhaps part of a global development strategy to mobilise academia with regard to developing countries after World War II. However, successful industrialisation of developing countries was, in fact, industrial revolution. This was not an irony of history. There has been no “gradual long term process of industrialisation” in the economic development of the People’s Republic of China since the economic reform of 1978. The below facts and figures from the *Asahi Shimbun* (19 October 2009) illustrate just how economically powerful China has become since 1978:

- US debt holdings (July 09): US\$800.5 billion (second is Japan at US\$724.5)
- Current account surplus (2008): US\$426.1 billion (second is Germany at US\$235.2 billion)
- Crude steel production (2008): 500.92 million tonnes (second is Japan at 118.73 million tonnes)
- Mobile phone production (2008) 559.64 million units (50% of global share)
- Mobile phone users (August 2009): 710.5 million (54% of entire population)
- Laptop production (2008): 185.8 million units (more than 80% of global share)
- Internet subscribers (end of June 2009): 338 million (26% of entire population)
- Digital camera production (2008): 81.88 million units (50% world share)
- Beer consumption (2007): 39.13 million kl (second is US at 24.85 million kl)
- Wheat production (2007): 193 million tonnes (2nd is India at 75.8 million tonnes)

This is a list of the areas in which China already leads. Nobody would call this “gradual industrialisation”. The fact of China’s experience virtually destroys the theory of gradual industrialisation, which Japanese academics had been purporting. The figures per capita will also rapidly increase.

The below table compares the recent history of Japan and China, showing some interesting historical trends:

Japan	China
1945: Surrender	
1947: Constitution of Japan comes into effect; Equal rights among men and women.	1949: Establishment of the People’s Republic of China; Equal rights among men and women.
1951: San Francisco Treaty; Treaty of Mutual Cooperation between the United States and Japan; Return to the international community.	1971: Kissinger visits China.
1952: IMF accession	1972: US-China summit meeting; Normalisation of Japan-China relations
1955: GATT accession	1978: Economic reform and beginning of rapid growth
1955: Beginning of rapid growth (until 1973)	1989: Tian’anmen Incident
1960: Strife over Japan-US Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security	2001 WTO accession
1964: Tokyo Olympics	2008: Beijing Olympics
1970: Osaka Expo	2008: Enforcement of the Property Law (law on real rights)
	2009: Enforcement of Labour Contract Law
	2010: Shanghai Expo

From this table we can see certain similarities in the paths of development taken by post war Japan and post economic reform China. That is, the path that Japan first took (entering the international community, then entering the global market, then high growth (second stage industrial revolution), then internal strife, then hosting the Olympic Games, then hosting the



Expo), China is now following. The approval of equal rights of men and women, which took place two years apart (Japan 1947, China 1949), is also worth noting. The first industrial revolutions of Japan (1880s to 1910s) and China (first half of the 19th century) were responses to the military prowess and demands of trade from the powers of Europe and America. China managed to carry out industrial revolution to some degree during the end of the Qing Dynasty, but failed to fully progress into first stage industrial revolution. However, Japan, in response to the same foreign pressure, was able to shift gear into first stage industrial revolution (Ref. Britain and France, a comparative modern history and Japan and China, a comparative modern history at back.) As can be seen, there are common fundamental historical trends between Japan and China. How China's rapid growth will shift gear in the future to the social capital of global capitalism is an important matter in question.

Around the 1980s the World Bank and other institutions cast their attention towards social capital and shifted gears to ensure investments fostered it. It was a change of the development model.

### (3) In search of social capital today

Fig.13.1 (Modeling a theory of social capital) in Nan Lin's *Social Capital: a theory of social structure and action* illustrates the connection between inequality, capitalisation, and effects. He holds that wealth, power, and prestige are the instrumental returns of the effects<sup>16</sup>. Such a model seems very similar to the model of the American Dream. The admiration Bill Gates receives for his transformation from businessman to philanthropist is symbolic of this<sup>17</sup>. But is this model meaningful for ordinary Americans these days? Although it may have been an effective model for some once upon a time, the current state of affairs seems to show more of a parallel to sentiments in *I Dreamed a Dream*. Can this model really urge people towards a goal? Surely the era of change is more about waking up to the reality.

#### *Lin's wealth, power and prestige*

At a seminar on social capital at Senshu University in December last year, Professor Lin made reference to Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Let us now then take a look at what Smith wrote in this work in respect to a society in which people's *raison d'être* was wealth, status and prestige:

This disposition to admire the rich and the powerful is the great and most universal cause of our corruption of moral sentiments<sup>18</sup>.

---

<sup>16</sup> Lin, N, (2001) p.246

<sup>17</sup> Prof. Nan Lin speaking at a symposium on social capital hosted by the Centre for Social Capital Studies, Senshu University (19 December 2009, Senshu University, Kanda Campus, Bldg.7)

<sup>18</sup> Smith, A, (1976) p.61; cf. Mizuta, H, (2009), p.371. This was a partial quote from Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Those interested in the full quotation should refer to the original text. 90 year old Hiroshi Mizuta's *Adamu Sumisu Ronshu* (2009) is a compilation of essays from Mizuta's many years of research on Smith. Any discussion on Smith should begin by a perusal of this work. Chapter 17 *Nihon ni okeru Adamu Sumisu* (Smith in respect to Japan) is a must read for anyone considering Smith in the context of Japan. The above quote is also in this chapter.

So Lin's view, supposedly inspired by Smith's theory, is the complete opposite of what Smith was espousing. Moreover, although we are living in an age that needs social capital, we are heading further and further towards the type of society that Smith described above. What good could there possibly be in a model that inevitably results in a privileged minority that monopolises prestige against the backdrop of wealth and power, and a majority that is excluded from such? There are many things to learn about civil society from work done in Japan. We should examine work done on the subject overseas but also scrutinise it against what we know from research conducted at home before putting it to actual use. I made the below remark following Lin's talk at the seminar:

Professor Lin, your model seems very much like the so called American Dream. Japanese people have distinctly changed since the 1995 Hanshin earthquake. They have quit pursuing a life of fame, power and prestige, attainable by only a tiny minority. They are now seeking a peaceful, friendly society - one that satisfies the basic requirements of life. For example, victims of the earthquake flatly rejected the offer of support from religious groups who obviously had ulterior motives. They only accepted genuine support from people who were sincere - people who were not seeking fame, power and prestige. This is the change we should keep our eye on.

Professor Lin responded positively.

To back up my remark, here is part of an article published in the *Asahi Shimbun* (12th of January 2010) titled *Shimin no kokorozashi, ima mo - tasukeau shikumi* (Aspirations of citizens still alive: mechanism of mutual support in place).

Budding growth in Great Hanshin earthquake disaster area... I had my reservations about this money is everything society. In the aftermath of the bubble economy it wasn't money that motivated people in the earthquake hit area. Seeing people truly helping each other made me think that this country was going to change.

There are more and more people who are seeing things this way these days. The Law to Promote Specified Nonprofit Activities was enacted in 1998, only three years after the Hanshin earthquake.

In the US, too, since the infamous bankruptcy of Lehman Brothers (15 Sept, 2008) a trend has been emerging to protect and respect the livelihoods of workers at work and home in a more fundamental way. This trend is vividly depicted in the Michael Moore film *Capitalism: A Love Story*. The subtitle, *A Love Story*, implies love for not only one's own money, but also love for the money of others to the point of stealing it. A system for such a purpose is the reality of financial liberalisation. The film exposed the fact that the panic stricken US government threw a monumental amount of taxpayers' money into the system with no thought at all about how the money would actually be used. It also brought into the light of the true owners of wealth, power and prestige. In Japan the number of people going to see this film was beyond expectations and soon enough by the 9th of January 2010 it was being shown in 19 theatres. The fact that it is a "just a film" is no reason to dismiss its relevance. For the leaders of the West films are an essential part of the global media strategy and many Western universities have film

departments. In Japan, too, there are film departments at universities and academics engaged in the study of films as social science, although still small in number.

*Café Philo: an example of social capital*

Films bring together a large number of people, only for them to disperse once it is over. Not so for café Philos which have sprung up in recent years, as reported in the *Asahi Shimbun*<sup>19</sup>. Café Philos are gatherings of complete strangers who anonymously discuss social and human related themes. Anything from “are we really free?” to “what is a father?” might be discussed. Originating in France, the first Café Philo to start up in Japan was by teachers and graduate students from Osaka University in 2000. One Japanese Café Philo has had over 200 meetings with between 20 and 50 people turning up each time. They are examples how cafes can be used as a venues for social capital. In Tokyo a library at Meiji University has become the venue for a Café Philo. To quote the aforementioned *Asahi Shimbun* article, “globalisation both unites people and divides them. People are brought together through the marketplace and the internet, but at the same time there are many cracks appearing in the system.” Within this faulty unifying system people are searching for and forging new social connections.

*The macro-micro loop*

Now in this context I would like to revisit Professor Lin’s *Social Capital*. In his book, Lin presents us with the “micro-macro loop”<sup>20</sup>. He identifies the relevant and important issue of the interaction between various discrete components. He seeks the main medium of cohesion for such components in nation-states and technologies. This is consistent with the fact that Lin starts his book by narrowly defining Karl Marx’s idea of capital as a predominantly economic concept. However, when nation-states bring together micro-level components, it is finance or capital that provides the medium of cohesion. Capital is also the medium for the development and spread of science and technology. Moreover, capital or money is an aggregate concept, inserted from outside to aggregate micro events into a macro whole, a fact that is overlooked in Lin’s model. Logically speaking, the aggregate of micro does not necessarily mean macro. How would it be possible to aggregate micro into macro? Conventional aggregation simply sums up individual matter by adding some arbitrary units of aggregation from the outside. These units of aggregation are arbitrarily established for the purpose of creating the macro in the first place.

In the conventional study of social capital, model building has been carried out based on the demand of financial efficiency in the construction of social capital, on the assumption of such an exogenous macro-micro loop. But is this an accurate methodology? Has it been demonstrated as valid? And just what motivates the bearers of social capital to work so hard? Social capital studies may not be valid if these essential questions are not addressed. The relationship between particulars (first substance) and universals (second substance) has been a

---

<sup>19</sup> *Asahi Shimbun* 11 January 2010 (morning edition)

<sup>20</sup> Ref. Lin, N, (2001) p.186

difficult philosophical question since the time of Aristotle. The aggregation of micro (specific particulars) is not macro (universals). It cannot be arrived at linearly. There is a deep gulf dividing particulars and universals. They do not link directly. They link through a medium. For capitalism that medium is money, which is an endogenous object, not an exogenous object. What kind of evidence would show why and how money is endogenous? Lin seems to forget Marx, who solved this all important problem with his value-form and exchange process theories, shifting instead into the Pierre Bourdieu domain of social science. However, the economic domain (characterised by money and capital) does fundamentally dictate the non-economic domain of social capital. This is unintentionally shown when Lin presents a highly economic concept, or a concept based on a highly economic concept - wealth, power and prestige - in reference to instrumental returns of the effect of social capital.

*The economic background of the non-economic domain*

This non-economic macro-micro loop is consistent with the social capital model building attempts seen earlier which were also non-economic in terms of methodology. This also makes Lin's model consistent with the others in their unrealisticness. Can wealth, power and prestige really only be attained in the non-economic domain? Lobbying activities at parliaments, church and other community work, and various charity activities are heavily linked to the domain of business and industry, and are essential for business and industry's pursuit of economic wealth. Their roles, however, are auxiliary in nature. The economic domain is completely absent in Lin's model because he discarded it in his criticism of Marx. Yet, the entire structure of his model is highly economic. This exposes the paradoxical nature of Lin's concept of social capital.

Rather than studying social capital from a macro perspective, the starting point of examination should be based on shared sentiments found within concrete aspects of social capital formed and maintained in the process of its occurrence. Perhaps we should think of social capital as an analogous chain of discrete embodiments (known as the micro). We shall look at this through the example of memorial museums.

**(4) Why memorial museums and what do we memorialise?**

As we saw from the discussion on the three stage theory of civil society, mankind in the 21st century is aiming to live by four kinds of coexistence (man and woman, abled and disabled, the majority and minority, mankind and nature), the common ideal of which is to return to the root of life to coexist. Mankind is advancing by returning to the root of life.

*Memorial museums and local communities as an apparatus for memory*

Memorial museums, in respect to the 21st century notion of the four types of coexistence, are found at the very heart of the idea of memorial museums as a type of present day social capital. This idea has a dual nature of historical reflection and future outlook, which is also what we mean by "to memorialise". To memorialise is primarily to rescue from oblivion the person who pursued an idea, events or incidents that arose from the idea in question, and organisations that

carried out work based on the idea; attempting to historically inherit them. Memorial museums are apparatus for doing such a thing. This is also where they differ from other types of museums such as natural history museums. People will confide a memory or experience to a tangible object, which they treat as a symbol of the idea, using the symbol to remember. A photo is not a mere object for the person who remembers and memorialises the symbolism behind it. It is a memorial. When they peer into it, they see all the people, events, and goings on behind it. This is what it means to them. We do not remember something just because we have a memorial with which to remember it. Rather, it is because we have something to remember that the memorial bears meaning, working as an apparatus for memory. Memory lurks deep, at the very bottom of the human mind. But occasionally it rises up into the immediate consciousness.

Accordingly, memory in this context has its underlying foundation in history. History is not, naturally, something we memorise for the short term. Rather, it lurks at the deepest layer of memory at the bottom of consciousness. The characters used in the Japanese word for “memory”, ‘an (暗)’ and ‘ki (記)’, meaning “darkness” and “record”, gives us a clue at its significance.

#### *History by abstraction*

History has a dual function of memory and oblivion. It discards that which is not necessary and keeps only that which is. Temporary feelings and narrow interests are washed and erased by its unrelenting waves. This is the harsh selective work of history. Moreover, that which is negatively abstracted is stored inside that which is positively abstracted in the form of the discarded. That which continues to mentally live through this dual function is “history in the form of memory”. That which is committed to deep memory and suddenly rises to the surface of our mind is “history in the form of memory”.

Memorial museums are found in many communities. They are one of the centres of the community as an apparatus for memory. They are something that the local community shares, and act as a meeting point for the people. It is in this way that they are a social capital. Further, they go beyond local communities and bind communities. People outside the memorial museum visit it, then cast their minds back to and talk together about the memorialised people, events and incidents, and projects, which warms the collective heart. They think about the future. Circles of people overlap and grow, they pass on the story which is then stored into memory.

#### *The question of funding memorial museums and research societies*

Memorial museums are not mere apparatus for remembering the past. Their function is for the past to be exposed to the present, re-examined, and re-evaluated. This is the positive and negative abstraction of history as mentioned before. Accordingly, memorial museums should have an academic nature, positioned as subjects of research. If they do not, there is a danger that they may fade, lose their attraction, and even disappear completely. Memorial museums that do not have an associated research society may end up being consumed by their own self promotion. The tradition of memorial museums must be continuously innovated. This is the job of memorial

museums' research societies.

To give some examples, the Kiyoshi Miki Research Society is linked to the Kajōkan Museum in Tatsuno city which memorialises Kiyoshi Miki. The Seichō Matsumoto Memorial Museum in Kokura ward, Kitakyūshū city has the Seichō Matsumoto Research Society. The International Society of Takuboku Studies meets annually at the Hakodate City Central Library in Hokkaidō where the works and materials of Takuboku Ishikawa are kept. Research activities are being enthusiastically undertaken throughout many other local chapters also. These societies are not just for discovering new biographical facts or materials concerning the memorialised person, they are also making efforts geared towards the future to redefine the significance of the person memorialised.

There are issues over funding for the setup and maintenance of memorial museums in the context of social capital. Considering the different types of memorial museums - public, foundations, and ones established and maintained through private funding - the source of money or funds very much determines how a museum is managed and what its aims are. That said, the source of funding alone may not always determine the nature and aims of the museum. Nevertheless, the social significance of memorial museums is determined by whether or not the museum is appropriately managed. The significance will be determined by the openness of the managing committee, which affects its potential to improve, and the openness of the research society also.

*A look at the significance of Memorial Museums through the Kajōkan Dayori*

The example of the Kajōkan Museum (Uekajō 30-3, Tatsuno-shi, Hyōgo-ken, Japan, 679-4179) should give us insight into the significance of memorial museums. The Kajōkan Museum publishes a newsletter called *Kajōkan Dayori*, and memorialises Kiyoshi Miki, Kanji Yano, Nobuyuki Utsumi, and Rofū Miki. Let us first look at an extract from essay titled *Kiyoshi Miki and Shinshū* by visitor Iori Yoshida<sup>21</sup>:

Finally arriving in the town of Tatsuno I could see even more clearly the vestiges of a castle town baking in the strong sunlight. ....It was lovely walking along those streets with slightly bending earthen walls and shops bearing tacitly elegant lattice windows. I wonder if perhaps the townscape was built in the old measurements based on stature and feet? Despite its undulation, walking along the back alleyways had a soft buoyant feeling, as if they had been beaten down by footsteps.

Although I suddenly turned up at the Kajōkan Museum looking somewhat like a vagabond the staff treated me with utmost kindness. I was very fortunate to be able to meet a Kiyoshi Miki researcher in the hometown of Miki himself, who showed me to the soon-to-be demolished birth house of Miki. I was then advised to visit the local library where I was able to clarify little by little the connection of Kiyoshi Miki with the Shinshū region.

---

<sup>21</sup> Ref. Yoshida, I, (2000)

Yoshida's essay gives the following points and implications:

- 1) A vivid description of the features of Tatsuno's townscape;
- 2) An acknowledgement of the courtesy of the staff at the Kajōkan Museum;
- 3) A account of how the Miki researcher welcomed him, despite his sudden visit, and shared his research; and
- 4) How the visit to Tatsuno affected his research thereafter. That is, his research progressed to examine Kiyoshi Miki's historical thought connection with Tatsuno and Kyoson Tsuchida's connection with Shinshū-Ueda.

Point (1) reminds us that Tatsuno's historical streets can be appreciated by thinking back to their origin.

Point (2) testifies the fact that the staff of the Kajōkan Museum are clearly aware of the role played by Tatsuno as a cultural centre, fulfilling their own duties accordingly.

Point (3) illustrates the fact that Kiyoshi Miki researchers can be found in the vicinity of the Kajōkan Museum, and that they are ready to accommodate unexpected outside visitors as occasion may demand.

Point (4) tells us that Yoshida's visit to Tatsuno as per points (1), (2), and (3) inspired him in his research thereafter, acting as a springboard for further development.

The above points epitomise the very function of memorial museums as social capital and show exactly why they should exist. Incidentally, the Kajōkan Museum based Kiyoshi Miki Research Society was started on the 3rd of April 1999 (*Kajōkan Dayori*, Issue.29).

I also have written an article for the *Kajōkan Dayori*, titled *Miki Kiyoshi no Kokyō no Shisōteki Kifu* (the ethos of Kiyoshi Miki's hometown)<sup>22</sup>. Here are the main points:

- a) I have twice visited Tatsuno, the hometown of Kiyoshi Miki. On my first visit I went to see both the Kajōkan Museum and a monument dedicated to Miki and his philosophy. I also took some photos.
- b) I took in the old nostalgic streets of Tatsuno. The air of a castle town drifts about, perhaps because it did not suffer any war damage. According to Mr Muroi, they decided to save the streets of Tatsuno.
- c) I was deeply impressed by the determined attitude of the participants who attended my lecture *Miki Kiyoshi no Shisōteki Tokuchō* (the philosophical traits of Kiyoshi Miki), and the sincerity of the questions and opinions that followed.
- d) I visited the reservoir where Miki was saved after almost drowning when he was a boy, the site of his residence, the monument at the site of his birth home to the left of the road, and then graveyard where he was laid to rest.
- e) I also visited the site of the residence of Kunio Yanagita, and the former home of Tetsuro Watsuji which were relatively nearby.

---

<sup>22</sup> Ref. Uchida, H, (2009b)

- f) I felt right through to my bones the ethos that prevailed throughout the entire Tatsuno-Himeji area. It was an extremely sobering experience. Kunio Yanagita and Tetsuro Watsuji were also from this area, as were literary men such as Tomoji Abe and Rinzo Shiina.
- g) I learnt about the networks of local people throughout the Himeji-Tatsuno area. Kunio Yanagita, who would help Kyôsuke Kindaichi, the Japanese linguist and scholar of the Ainu language, who in turn would give support Takuboku Ishikawa. Ishikawa, the incessant spiritual wanderer who died at age 26, finally arrived at a philosophy on the “necessities of life”. Kiyoshi Miki held Ishikawa, who developed this awareness and composed *tanka* poetry, in high esteem as a person who transformed *tanka* into a form of literature that common folk could compose. Miki often pointed out the fact that “culture” is rooted in “cultivation”. In his thesis *seikatsu bunka to seikatsu gijutsu* (culture and art of life), he emphasised the importance of cheerfulness, health, and rationality in everyday life. When Miki's mother and wife died, he apparently wept severely. This was the intense sentiment Miki had towards the root of life. This sentiment was perhaps born of the spirit of this area.
- h) I keenly felt the sombreness and earnestness for life pervading within the spirit of the people of this region. This could be explained as nothing else than the 21st century notion of coexistence and returning to the root of life which I covered earlier.

There are many common points in the above testimonials of Iori Yoshida and myself. For example:

- a) being deeply moved by the spirit of Tatsuno city (point 1 in the description of Yoshida's experience, point b in mine)
- b) sense of fulfilment after visiting the Kajōkan Museum (point 1 in Yoshida's, point c in mine)
- c) contribution to future research of the visitors (point 4 in Yoshida's, points d, f, g in mine)

Memorial museums are not limited to the Kajōkan Museum - there are many all throughout Japan, East Asia, and the world. Each no doubt has its particular reasons and sentiments for being established. The many people that visit a memorial museum each embrace it with different sentiments. They visit many different memorial museums. They gather together at memorial museums, connect with one another and share their sentiments. And then they return once again to their own homes. The memory and experience of their visit to the memorial museum lurks silently in their everyday lives, and quietly makes them consider the signs and direction of life. Memorial museums are humble places, but have a definite presence. Turning back to time that has passed and considering the future. That is the memorial museum as social capital.



## References

- Ban'no, Junji (1993), *The History of Japanese Politics in Practice*, revised ed., Association for Promotion of Education, Broad Casting University.
- CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation (1994), *CITIZENS: Strengthening Global Civil Society*, CIVICUS.
- Gates, Jeff (1998), *The Ownership Solution: Toward a Shared Capitalism for the Twenty-First Century*, Allen Lane, The Penguin Press.
- Howell, Jude and Pearce, Jenny (2001), *Civil Society and Development: A Critical Exploration*, Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Iwanaga, Shinji (2008), *Globalization, Citizenship and City*, Shumpusha.
- Kaldor, Mary (2003) *Global Civil Society : An Answer to War*, Polity.
- Keane, John (2003), *Global Civil Society?* Cambridge.
- Lin, Nan (2001), *Social Capital; A Theory of Social Structure and Action*, Cambridge.
- Martinussen, John (1995), *Society, State and Market: A guide to competing theories of development*, Zed Books Ltd.
- Miki, Kiyoshi (1967), Logic of Imagination, *Miki Kiyoshi Collected Works*, vol.8, Iwanamishoten.
- Mizuta, Hiroshi (2009), *Essays on Adam Smith*, Minerva shobo.
- Mochizuki, Seiji (1982), Scope and View axis of Primitive Accumulation, *Shiso* (Monthly), No.695.
- Nakamura, Yoshitaka (ed. & trans) (2003), *Collection of the French Constitutions*, Horitsubunkasha.
- Niita, Junichi (2009), *Capitalism: Money is dancing*, Toho Publishers.
- Orito, Kota (2007), *Chinese Economic Reform and Movement for Western Civilization Reception*, Hakuteisha.
- Zhou, Qigan (1989), *Economic Development of the Meiji-era and China*, Rokkoshuppan.
- Smith, Adam (1976), *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, edited by D. D. Raphael and A.L. Macfie, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Takagi, Hasshaku et al (1957), *Collection of Declarations of Human Rights*, Iwanamishoten.
- Takahashi, Kazuyuki (ed.) (2007), *Collected Constitutions of the World*, Iwanamishoten.
- Tominaga, Ken'ichi (1998), *Max Weber and the Asian Modernization*, Kodansha Publishers.
- Uchida, Hiroshi (1993), *Free Time*, Yuhikaku Publishers.
- Uchida, Hiroshi (2007), Problematic of Marx's Study of Aristotle's *De Anima*, *Quarterly Studies on Materialism*, No.12.
- Uchida, Hiroshi (2008a), Three Stages of Development of Civil Society, *FORUM OPINION*, No.2.
- Uchida, Hiroshi (2008b), Marx's *Grundrisse* and the French Revolution, *Economic Studies of Chiba University*, Vol.23, No.3.
- Uchida, Hiroshi (2009a), The Problematic, Making-Process and Logical Structure of Miki Kiyoshi's *The Logic of Imagination*, *Economic Bulletin of Senshu University*, Vol.43, No.3.
- Uchida, Hiroshi (2009b), Ethos of Miki Kiyoshi's Home Town, *Letters from Kajokan*, No.47.
- Yoshida, Iori (2000), Miki Kiyoshi and Shinshu, *Letters from Kajokan*, No.29.
- Kajokan (2008), *The History of Kajokan documented in Letters from Kajokan*, Tatsuno-Shi.

**Britain and France, a comparative modern history**

△<sub>1</sub> global market = ▲<sub>1</sub> imperialism → civil revolution① → primitive accumulation state① = △<sub>2</sub> global market = ▲<sub>2</sub> imperialism → industrial revolution○ → civil revolution② → △<sub>3</sub> global market = ▲<sub>3</sub> imperialism  
 ① first stage civil revolution ▲ imperialism △ global market ① primitive accumulation ▼ feudal reaction ○ industrial revolution ② second stage civil revolution ② development authoritarianism & nationalism ③ civil strife。

Britain	France
1640-60 ③① Short Parliament · Long Parliament	
1649 ① Declaration of Republic (abolishment of monarchy) ① Arrest of the Levellers	
1650 ▲ Cromwell, conquest of Scotland	
1651 △ Navigation Acts	
1652 ▲ Act for the Settlement of Ireland	
1653 ① Oliver Cromwell Lord Protector (dictator)	
1655 ① Rule of the Major Generals (military government)	
1660 ▼ Restoration of monarchy	
1688 ① Glorious Revolution → 1689 Bill of Rights	
1694 ① Establishment of Bank of England	
1702-13 ▲ Anglo-French colonial wars (War of the Spanish Succession)	
1707 ▲ Act of the Union	
1756-63 ▲ Seven Years' War	
1765-88 ○ Watt's improved steam engine	
1779 ○ Crompton's invention of spinning mule	
1775-83 ▲ American War of Independence (= first stage civil revolution)	
1787 ○ Cartwright completes power loom	1789 ③① Adoption of the Declaration of the Rights of Man (liberty, equality, property) (26 <sup>th</sup> August)
	1791 ① Le Chapelier Law (banning of guilds)
	1792 ① Founding of French First Republic
1794 ① Abolition of slavery	1793 ① Abolition of feudal rights (Constitution of 24 June 1793)
1795 ○ Industrial exhibition	
1793-99 ▲ First Coalition	1796 ① Babeuf attempts suicide on route to guillotine
	1799 ① Napoleon's coup of 18 Brumaire. Financial and judicial reform
1799-1802 ▲ Second Coalition	1799-1812 ① Restrictions of freedom. Censorship. ▲ Napoleonic Wars
1801 ▲ Act of Union (merging of Irish Parliament)	1800 ① Establishment of Banque de France
1805 ▲ Third Coalition	1803 ① Reaffirmation of 1791 Le Chapelier Law (banning of guilds)
	1804-15 ① First French Empire. Authoritarian plebiscitarian democracy
1807 ① Slave Trade Act (abolishment of slavery)	1804-07 ① Establishment of Napoleonic code (Men without property and women "passive citizens")

1811-14	○ Luddite Movement		
1812-13	② Repeal of the regulations of wages in the Elizabethan Law		
1814	○ Stephenson's invention of steam locomotive		
1815	▼ Congress of Vienna	1815	③ ▼ Restoration of imperial rule (to 1830)
1817	② Seditious Meetings Act		
1819	② Peace Preservation Act		
1825	② Factory Act. Recognition of trade unions		
1830	○ Liverpool and Manchester Railway	1830	② July Monarchy (to 1848) ② Factory Act
1832	② First Reform Act		
1833	② Slavery Abolition Act throughout British Empire	1833	② Guizot Act (primary education law) (substantiated by Ferry laws 1881-82)
1840-42	▲ First Opium War	1841	② Child labour law
1846	△ Importation Act (repeal of Corn Laws).	1842	○ Railway laws
1847	② Factory Act (Ten Hours Act).	1847	△ Panic of 1847
		1848	③ ② Adoption of the French Constitution of 1848 (liberty, equality, fraternity)
			② Universal suffrage ② Ten-Hour Act
1849	△ Repeal of Navigation Acts	1850	② Electoral law. Strengthening of censorship.
1851	△ ② The Great Exhibition in London (formulation of global capitalism).	1851	② Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte's coup d'état
		1852	② Second French Empire (to 1870). ○ Establishment of Crédit Mobilier
		1853	○ Renovation of Paris
		1858	△ ② Paris Exhibition (participation in global capitalism)

### Japan and China, a comparative modern history

**Japan** : △<sub>23</sub> global market = ▲<sub>23</sub> imperialism → ② *sonnō jōi* (revere the emperor, expel the barbarians) movement → ○ primary stage of industrial revolution → ①<sub>1</sub> Meiji Restoration → ① capitalist primitive accumulation state = ▲<sub>23</sub> imperialism → ○ industrial revolution → ②<sub>1</sub> civil revolution → ▲ imperialism<sub>3</sub> = surrender → ②<sub>2</sub> civil revolution (post war reform) → △<sub>4</sub> global market → ○ high growth

**China** : △<sub>23</sub> global market = ▲<sub>23</sub> imperialism → ② *metsuman kokan* (destroy the Manchus, revive the Han) → ○ primary stage of industrial revolution → ① Xinhai Revolution (failure) → ② United Front Against Japan → ② victory = ① socialist primitive accumulation state → △<sub>4</sub> global market → ○ reform and liberalisation → ① civil revolution + ② civil revolution

① first stage civil revolution △ global market ▲ imperialism ① developmental dictatorship (primitive accumulation) ▼ feudal reaction ○ industrial revolution ② second stage civil revolution ② nationalism ③ civil strife

Japan		China	
1858	△ ② Ansei Five-Power Treaties (United States, Great Britain, Russia, Netherlands and France)	1840-42	② First Opium War
1850s	○ Primary stage of industrial revolution	1851	② ① Taiping Rebellion (anti Quing, anti queue hairstyle)
1867	△ ② Participation in Paris Exhibition	1856	② Second Opium War
1868	① ① ② Meiji Restoration	1861	○ Construction of war plant in Anqing.
1868-69	③ Boshin War		

1869	①Abolition of the stipend system Emancipation ①Liberalisation of land sales		
1871	①Abolishment the titles of discriminated classes ①Freedom from hair restrictions, decree banning carrying of swords ①Freedom of marriage		
1871	▲ Taiwan Expedition		
1872	①Freedom of occupation○ Construction of rail line between Shimbashi and Yokohama		
1873	① Land tax reform (modern tax system to 1881) ① Conscription Ordinance		
1874-84	①Freedom and People's Rights Movement		
1875	▲ Ganghwa Island incident		
1877	○ First National Industrial Exhibition		
1881	①○ Meiji Coup of 1881(→ <i>fukoku kyohei</i> ("rich country, strong army") - system to encourage strong industry)	1881	○ Construction of Tangshan Coal Mine railroad
1882	① Establishment of Bank of Japan		
1884	▲230,000 soldiers, 1470 tonne navy		
1855	○ Purchase of ring machine from Britain		
1880s-1910s	○Industrial revolution		
1889	①Meiji Constitution (Constitution of the Empire of Japan)	1889	○ Construction of spinning factory in Nantong by Zhang Jian
1894-95	▲Sino-Japanese War ○ Completion of government run Yahata iron works (war ship and weapons manufacturing)	1894-95	② First Sino-Japan War
1898	①Enactment of civil law (general law, contract, real rights, family, inheritance)	1895	② Treaty of Shimonoseki
1900	① Peace Police Act	1900	② Eight-Nation Alliance invasion of Beijing
1903	○ Fifth National Exposition for the Encouragement of Industry	1902-05	①○ Zhang Jian education reforms
1904-05	▲② Russo-Japan War	1903	①○ Yuan Shikai education reforms. Zhang Jian attends Fifth National Exposition for the Encouragement of Industry
1906	▲Conference on the issue of the South Manchurian Railway	1905	①②②① Formation of Tongmenghui
1908	① Red Flag Incident▲ Establishment of colonisation in East Asian.	1907	②① Uprising in Shaoxing & Anhui (Xu Xilin, Qiu Jin)
1910	① High Treason Incident▲ Japan-Korea annexation		
1911	②Factory Act (executed in 1916)	1911	②① Xinhai Revolution
1914-18	▲ First World War		
1917	▲ Siberian Intervention	1917	③ Adoption of the constitution of the military government of China China north-south spit
1917-18	▲ Nishihara Loans, current day value 200 million yen		
1918	②Rice Riots		
1919	▲ March 1st Movement, May 4th Movement ①①Japanese Army "Democracy Study"	1919	② Japan's Twenty-One Demands. May 4th Movement ①②②① Establishment of Chinese Nationalist Party ② Launch of Japanese capital on cotton spinning
1920	△ Post war panic ②First May Day – Japanese Socialist Alliance		

		1921	②①②① Establishment of Chinese Communist Party
		1922-	②○ Foreign capital increases spinning mills
		1923	② First United Front
		1924	①②②① Sun Wen's Three Principles of the People
1925	② Universal suffrage law (executed 1928)	1925	①②②① Death of Sun Wen
	① Peace Preservation Law		
1931	▲ Manchurian Incident	1931	② September 18 (Manchurian Incident)
			①② Land reform and banning of bound feet by Jiangxi Chinese Soviet Republic
1932	① Bank of Japan contribution system (BOJ's payouts its surplus to the national treasury) ② Execution of Poor Relief Act	1932	② Establishment of Manchukuo
		1934-36	②①②① Red Army's Long March
1937	▲ Beginning of Sino-Japan War. Nanking Massacre	1936	③② Xi'an Incident. Second United Front
1941	▲② War against US, Britain, the Netherlands begins	1937	② Nanking Massacre
1945	▲ Pacific War defeat		
1945-	①② Post war reform (constitution, three labour laws, dissolution of zaibatsu, agricultural reforms etc.)	1948	① Establishment of People's Bank of China (government of North China)
		1949	Establishment of the People's Republic of China
1951	△ Peace Treaty, Security Treaty		
1955-75	○ High growth. △ 1952 Accession to IMF. △ 1955 Accession to GATT.		
1960	①② "Peace Treaty" National Democratic Movement	1966-76	②② Cultural Revolution
1964	△② Tokyo Olympics		
1970	△② Osaka Expo	1971	△ Kissinger visits China.
		1972	△ Shanghai Communiqué. Normalisation of Japan-China relations
		1978	○△ Reform and openness (recommencement of Chinese industrial revolution)
			① Contract responsibility system. Beginning of Wenzhou model
		1989	①① Tian'anmen Incident
		1992	○△ Deng Xiaoping's "Southern Tour"
		2001	△ Accession into WTO
		2008	△② Beijing Olympics ① Property Law (law on real rights)
		2009	② Labour Contract Law
		2010	△② Shanghai Expo

Note: The above tables were made available at a seminar on Japan-China current economic issues at Tokyo Metropolitan University on 8<sup>th</sup> Nov. 2009.