



(3) Anthropology allows a different approach again. By inquiring into the economies of primitive societies, it tries to discover the manner in which the livelihood of man is bound up with the totality of his motivations and valuations as organized in his culture (Malinowski, Thurnwald, Ruth Benedict). *including language and culture*

Finally, I come to (4) the institutional and historical approach, which is the one to which my present course is dedicated. Through an analysis of economic institutions as they present themselves in the societies of the past, we should be able to gain worthwhile indications concerning the general nature of the mechanism and the structure of economic institutions, as well as of *the* their shifting place in the society as a whole. Among the economic historians who came nearest to such an approach in the past, we would have to mention Cunningham in England, Pirenne in Belgium, Rostovtzeff in Russia, Gustav Schmoller, Carl Buecher, and Max Weber in Germany. Of these authors, it is Max Weber whose General Economic History is nearest to my own starting point, and I regard the work done here as a *development of* continuation of the line inaugurated by him.

Let me now briefly point out the main difference between the present period and that at which Max Weber made his memorable attempt at a recasting of Economic History.

(1) Weber nourished an unshaken belief in the viability and vitality of the market economy. He attached no special significance to Bolshevism and Fascism, which had just made their appearance. The Russian Revolution seemed at that time to most observers as a mere continuation of the march of the French revolution toward the East, overthrowing absolute monarchy, emancipating the peasant from semi-feudal landlordism, and liberating racial minorities oppressed by a dominant nationalism. Fascism was still restricted to Italy. Max Weber's own life experience was thus limited to the Nineteenth Century type of