

politics which will enable us to compare and analyse all political systems in terms of political functions, and in this sense it is a monumental theoretical framework in the history of political science. However, as already suggested, the circumstances and political realities in which the developing countries are placed are too complex for anyone to analyse them in terms of political functions alone. This being the case, the Almond-Coleman theory would be best applied to the whole context of political systems viewed in historical perspective. In other words, in so far as Western democracy, which has been shaped over the three or four centuries following the absolutism of the late feudal period, cannot be regarded as a political system immediately acceptable for the developing countries which have just come out of a semi-feudal economic structure which has developed under colonial domination, we are required to make further studies of political systems in transition.

In the autumn of 1962, when Prof. Almond visited Japan, the reviewer was one of those who were given the opportunity of meeting him and being instructed by him in the latest developments of his theoretical framework. In reviewing the present work, the reviewer has ventured to point out some problems which he feels must be considered in furthering the comparative analysis of the developing countries in the hope that in the future he may be further enlightened by Prof. Almond. (*Yoshiyuki Hagiwara*)

R.P. DORE, *City Life in Japan— A Study of Tokyo Ward—*, London, R & K Paul, 1958, x+472 p.

The Japanese version of Dr Dore's study of a Tokyo ward made its appearance in July 1962 after being four years in preparation.

Whilst the contents approximate only a third of the original work, it is enhanced by the author's postscript in his own beautiful Japanese. This postscript provides the key to appreciating his point of view. It is hoped that the forthcoming English edition will include this significant addition to the original work.

Present-day Japan has never been so well described as by this Englishman. This book must be included on the library-shelf of every person who is interested in Japan and the Japanese.

Needless to say, Dr Dore's work is far superior to Profs. Scalapino and Masumi's *Parties and Politics in Japan*, for Dore's methods of observation and analysis are far more profound and can be compared to those of E. H. Norman, whose studies on the Meiji Era were scholarly enough to enlighten even Japanese.

But, against E.H. Norman's painstaking works Dr Dore's has the merit of being the more readable and can be commended to wider intellectual circles.

In terms of Area Studies, it is not possible to agree with him on all points even after making allowances for the differences in theoretical back-

ground and academic discipline.

Adopting the ways and methods of Lynds' *Middle Town*, 1928 in the studies of a neighbourhood, the author pursues the process of social change in Japan electing as his subject a Tokyo ward. By direct observation, an excellent achievement was attained in the items of "Levels and Standards of Living, Family, Education, Religion, Political Attitude, Neighbours and Friends", etc.

"It was, however, written and the data were collected, within the framework of a loose theoretical picture", which is the author's own economic interpretation of social change; at one end of this "ideal scale" of development was a traditional society based upon peasant agriculture, and at the other end of development lies a modern industrialized urban society. Inevitably, since England is the one industrialized society which the author knows best, his picture of this end of the scale tended to be an abstraction of English social structure as he knows it. (*cf.* p. 5) Specific Japanese appearances and events in the social change were explained in terms of social change in England; and his explanations were persuasive and reasonable in reference to R. Benedict's which asserted the eternal, unchangeable cultural pattern of Japan.

In this connection, it must be pointed out that this work does not formulate English society in detail in its structure and characteristics. His description of the industrialized society is "more vague and amorphous", as he admitted. This is, consequently, the weak point in terms of comparative sociology and his lack of a rigid theoretical framework of model building. For this reason, it is impossible to place Japan's position on his "hypothetical scale".

The same point is raised on his indices of social change: such as urbanization and industrialization, and their correlation. It is true that the author explicitly states: "It is in its concern with social change that this book does attempt to go beyond simple ethnographic description. It does not try to confirm or to falsify any general theory of social change." (*cf.* p. 5) But if so, what kind of contribution can he be expected to make to establishing a theoretical framework of area studies and more specifically of social change, going beyond the limitation of a specified case study of Japan?

His study, however, intends "to test the validity of the model itself" (*cf.* p. 6), even if his primary purpose was not to commit himself to the general theory of social change. Since he expressed himself desirous of the validity of his theoretical model in his study of Japan, would he have not done well, at least, to test the validity of bureaucratization as an index of social change. As the process of social change in Tokyo inculcates the unified course of development of the indices, industrialization and urbanization, making reservation for bureaucratization, the study of Tokyo would be confronted with determining the relation and/or motive power which drive the combination of the two indices, although they might be independent of each other as indices.

He studies Tokyo to study Japan, and "Shitayama-cho" to study Tokyo. Therefore, Tokyo is a Japan in miniature, and the "Shitayama-cho" is a microcosm of Tokyo. As a logical consequence, then, "the" Shitayama-cho must be identified with "a" Shitayama-cho not only in statistical similarity but also in structural homogeneity, because the "Shitayama-cho" itself is a modelled Tokyo. But for such a Shitayama-cho, the Shitayama-cho cannot be the model of Tokyo.

Today, in the city hierarchy of Japan, Tokyo holds the top place, politically, economically, and culturally. Tokyo's horizontal, centralizing influence is exercised all over the country and works against the principle of local self-government: Tokyo is a "state within state". The typical example for the deepened vertical urbanization is seen in the preponderance of smaller industrial enterprises inside Tokyo which are involved in cut-throat competition with each other for the orders of the big industrial combines.

The advanced growth of Japan's economy was achieved by such a deepening process of urbanization, which enlarged the bias of the so-called "dual structure" of Japan's economy. The official statistics reveal that these tendencies existed even in prewar days. Dr Dore does not explain lucidly the structural relationship existing between Tokyo and Japan, or Shitayama-cho and Tokyo; instead he describes the situation as a combination of static patterns within a "loose picture" of Japan's socio-historical transition.

Here it may be concluded that this work is a very successful study of Japan, but it fails as a model of the theoretical treatment of an area study.

Would his ways and methods be as successful if they were applied to studies of the East End of London or to the urban communities of Scotland? Dr Dore's success depends upon his personal ability, and does not arise from his scientific model building.

Technical approach should be universal, and should be valid for all areas, and not just a small part of Tokyo. It is not enough to express change even in historical terms only.

Social anthropology has concentrated on primitive and developing societies, yet has done little in solving the problems and difficulties of modern civilized societies and the disturbing events that occur within them.

For example, the author could not fully explain the causes of political decay which led to military Fascism in Japan. Because of this, his diagnosis in his postscript is not convincing. After the downfall of military Fascism, which had checked the course of development briefly, according to his account, postwar Japan developed smoothly in every sphere with many institutional reforms. He recognizes a new-growing national feeling in Japan, and advises us on internationalism.

It is evident that he is less sensitive in appreciating the complexity and bias of the political scene in Japan and her international political relations. E.H. Norman did better in this respect. Frankly, the author's comments are attributable to the inadequacy of theoretical coherence and consistency of this model which he built concerning an English society and applied to

Japan.

Japan's foreign studies benefit from homeland studies, and foreigners' studies of Japan help in our studies in other countries.

Those who work in the field of area studies will appreciate the difficulties in finding answers to these queries, and these somewhat critical remarks are not intended to detract from the value of this most excellent work.

His descriptions accurately reflect the character and ethos of the Japanese. He speaks and thinks in the manner of a highly intellectual Japanese.

For this reason, reading the book is a pleasure, and it gives the easy feeling of being written by one of our own scholars. This makes the work of criticism less than easy.

Those who have had some experiences in the field of area studies will find in this short review a measure of praise. (*Takeshi Hayashi*)

KEIKI ŌWADA (ed.), *Ajia no Tochi-Kaikaku* (Land Reform in Asia), Tokyo, Ajia Keizai Kenkyusho (The Institute of Asian Economic Affairs), Vol. I, 1962, 364 p.; Vol. II, 1963, 397 p.

1) These two volumes of studies deal with the agricultural systems and land reform in Asian countries and represent the work of a group of scholars under the leadership of Mr Keiki Ōwada. The research was sponsored by the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs.

The nations chosen for these studies were India, Pakistan, Burma, Indonesia, the Philippines, Ceylon, Thailand, Viet-Nam, Malaya and Taiwan—the ten principal countries of Asia excluding Japan and the Communist bloc.

The first volume is concerned with the first five of these countries, and the second volume covers the remainder. The contents of these volumes and their writers are as follows:

Volume I.

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| I. Land Reform in India | Yoshito Jinnouchi |
| 1. Land System During the Colonial Rule. | 2. Land Policy |
| After Independence. | |
| II. Land Reform in Pakistan. | Keiki Ōwada |
| 1. Pakistan's Agriculture and Land Problems. | 2. Land System |
| in Pakistan. | |
| 3. Land Reform in East Pakistan. | 4. Agrarian |
| History of West Pakistan Prior to Land Reform. | 5. Land |
| Reform in West Pakistan. | 6. Land Reform and Economic |
| Development. | |
| III. Land Reform in Burma. | Kazuo Saitō |
| 1. Land and Agricultural Problems in a Plural Society. | 2. |
| Farmer Protection Policies of a Colonial Government and the | |
| Influence of the Japanese Military Occupation. | 3. Agricultural |
| Policies and Land Reform After Independence. | 4. Details of |