

TRENDS OF ASIAN STUDIES IN POSTWAR JAPAN

Preface

On the occasion of the inauguration of this English-language organ journal of the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs, I have been assigned, together with other three authors, to the task of writing on the theme of the "Trends of Asian Studies in Postwar Japan".

In order to write this kind of thesis, it is most desirable that we should first of all compile a list of documentary materials on Asian studies after the war with adequate time and manpower, arrange them systematically and then try to grasp the trend of the studies in this field taking up the major problems involved. Due to the limited time and space available, however, it has been decided, with the editors' concurrence, to have the following four persons divide the work in writing this comprehensive report as follows:

Part I. General Survey

1. Noboru Yamamoto: Trends of Research Activities on Asian Area in Japan
2. Jirō Sakamoto: Trend of Theories on the Development of Less-developed Countries in Japan

Part II. Area Studies

3. Hiroshi Kurimoto: Studies on Indian Economy in Japan
4. Sadao Morita: Postwar Researches in Japan on the Economies of Southeast Asian Countries other than India

Before setting about to write the reports, the four of us got together to discuss how to coordinate our work and avoid overlapping as much as possible. As for the orientation of the reports, however, it was agreed to leave the matter to the discretion of the individual writers. It was also decided that after the three reports from (2) through (4) had been submitted, I should take upon myself to coordinate and summarize their contents.

When these reports were submitted, however, I found it extremely difficult to coordinate their contents and, at the same time, I realized that it would be unwise to delete parts of the reports in an attempt to coordinate and adjust their contents because, as the writers selected documents and discussed problems from their own individual standpoints, each report includes its own significant observations.

I have decided, therefore, to give a comprehensive picture of Asian area studies in Section 1. I do not think this manner of handling is entirely satisfactory and I hope more detailed reports on the respective countries and problems will be made in the future. However, in the belief that our present undertaking is worth-while in giving general information on this subject, I have decided to print all the reports in their entirety.

Noboru Yamamoto

Part I General Survey

I. TRENDS OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES ON ASIAN AREA IN JAPAN

Noboru Yamamoto

I

It is needless to say that having been reduced to a minor Asian country after the Pacific War, Japan needed several postwar years to resume on its own initiative research on the Asian region.

In prewar and wartime years, voluminous documents were published concerning researches and studies on China and Southeast Asian nations in line with the national policy at that time. Among these publications were a considerable number of those containing results of excellent basic researches on this area, but on the other hand there were also a great number of books merely toeing the national policy line of that era and lacking in scientific and systematic analyses.

On the whole, therefore, these old research documents, with few exceptions, have lost their value after new situations developed in Asia in postwar years. The successive births of new independent countries in Southeast Asia after the war and the emergence of the People's Republic of China have contributed to wiping out the old colonial system in this area and, consequently, observations based on colonial policies are outdated. Instead, the positions of these newly rising Asian countries in the postwar development of world politics and economy, especially the problems of economic development of these countries to support their political independence, have become the major objects of academic interest.

The Asian region has been subjected to the effects of the postwar split of the world into the capitalist and socialist blocs and, with this situation in the background, the economic development of so-called developing countries based on the rise of nationalism has become the most pressing practical problem.

For several years after the war, Japan was placed under the Allied Occupation, being denied the right of maintaining regular diplomatic relations with other countries. In particular, Japan's political and economic relations with other Asian countries were cut off completely. In such a period, it was natural that no enthusiasm for Asian studies should have developed in Japan. What little interest there was centred on the development of the United States policy toward Asia.

The inauguration of the People's Republic of China in September 1949 turned out to be a significant factor in changing Japan's position in Asia. For it meant the complete failure of the postwar U.S. policy toward China and prompted the U.S. to lay stress in its Asian policy on developing Japan as powerful anti-Communist economic base. This is the reason why the idea of the Asian Marshall Plan began to be promoted both in the U.S. and Japan at that time, corresponding to the Marshall Plan for Europe which was started in 1948.

It was not until the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty in September 1951 that Japan became able to advocate a new Asian policy of its own from a more independent standpoint. In December 1956, Japan was formally admitted into the United Nations, but prior to this, Japan was permitted to join the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East division of the United Nations as an associate member in January 1952 and as a fullfledged member in April 1954.

In the meantime, the Korean war and the Indochina conflict had the effect of increasing the importance of Japan's position as an anti-Communist military and economic base. On such a foundation, Japan began to advocate the promotion of its own Asian diplomacy, especially economic diplomacy, toward this area of the world.

Thus, at a Cabinet meeting in December 1953, the Japanese Government proclaimed its basic policy of extending economic cooperation toward Southeast Asia. This policy statement stressed the following three points:

(1) In carrying out economic cooperation with Asian countries, Japan should respect the positions of the respective countries concerned and cooperate positively in the programmes of the U.N. and third powers.

(2) In principle, economic cooperation should be carried out on the initiative of private interests, and the Government should extend assistance necessary for its implementation.

(3) Japan should endeavour to settle reparations problems as soon as possible.

Leaving aside the question of how that basic policy was carried out subsequently, it is undeniable that this policy statement by the Government helped stimulate the Japanese public's interest concerning this region of the world and its problems.

In 1952, "Ajia Mondai Chōsakai" or the Asian Problem Research Association was established as a private organization and started its work of studying the conditions of the newly rising Asian countries and enlightening the Japanese public about these countries by means of seminars, lecture meetings and the publication of a monthly magazine *Ajia Mondai* (Asian Problems).

As interest in Asian studies continued to rise in Japan, the Asian Problem Research Association merged with other similar organizations and became a semi-government organization known as the "Asia Kyōkai" (The Society for Economic Cooperation in Asia) in the autumn of 1954.

II

As its name indicates, Asia Kyōkai was not a purely research organization; one of its major tasks being to facilitate Japanese technical collaboration with Southeast Asian nations. Incidentally, just at that time, Japan was admitted into the Colombo Plan as a "donor" country. However, the Research Department of Asia Kyōkai continued to publish the monthly magazine *Ajia Mondai*—a legacy from the Asian Problem Research Association of earlier mention.

Since its inaugural issue specifically edited on the general theme of "Analysis of the International Situation Centreing around Asia", the magazine picked one special theme for every edition in an effort to analyze the existing conditions in Asian countries and delve deeply into the various problems concerned. The publication of the magazine was continued until March 1958 when the Research Department was dissolved.

Considerable criticism was made about the editorial policy and contents of the magazine but a review of those back issues convinces this writer that the publication, clarifying as it did the focal points of Japanese interest in various Asian countries and the problems that preoccupied these countries at different periods, served as a pivot of Japan's Asian studies in those days.

During that period, Asia Kyōkai also published several hand-books on the study of Asian problems (*Ajia Mondai Kenkyū Sōsho*) for the purpose of "explaining, from a fair standpoint, the major political and economic problems confronting Asia and stimulating the public's interest in Asia in general". Of these books, two were found very handy and valuable as primers on Asian economic problems. One was *Kōshin Koku Kaihatsu Riron* (Theories on the Development of Underdeveloped Countries). (cf. The next section "Trend of Theories on the Development of Developing Countries in Japan"). The other was *Ajia no Keizai Kaihatsu: Tōnan Ajia Hen; Kyōkutō Hen* (Economic Development of Asia: Volume on Southeast Asia and Volume on the Far East).

The former introduced the theories of Western scholars on the development of less-developed countries and the latter explained the actual progress of economic development in Asian countries. Asia Kyōkai has also been publishing an English-language quarterly titled *Asian Affairs*.

In August 1953, the Japan ECAFE Association was established for the purpose of publicizing ECAFE's activities among the Japanese public. This organization publishes thrice-monthly *ECAFE Tsūshin* (ECAFE Information) containing various documentary materials published by ECAFE and commentaries on problems of topical interest. It has also published to date 25 books entitled *ECAFE Shiryō* (ECAFE Data) containing translations of reports issued by the working parties of ECAFE Secretariat and reports on assigned research on specific problems.

But, among the publications of the Japan ECAFE Association, the most notable as a good research product is the Japanese translation of the annual *Economic Survey of Asia and the Far East* compiled by the United Nations. Also worthy of special mention is the *Ajia Keizai Hatten no Kiso Riron* (Fundamental Theory on Asian Economic Development) published in 1959. This book, as pointed out by Mr. Sakamoto in a later section, represents the highest level of Japan's academic research undertaken so far on that subject.

In the academic field, an organization named "Ajia Seikei Gakkai" or Society for Asian Political and Economic Studies was established early in 1953 with the aim of promoting the theoretical and practical researches on the political and economic problems of the region through cooperation between scholars and those concerned with the practical side of the matter. This academic society, with 300 members at present, is rated as one of the influential research groups in Japan. Since its establishment, it has held month-

ly seminars and semi-annual national conventions and published its quarterly organ journal entitled *Ajia Kenkyū* (Asiatic Studies).

This society differs from other research organizations in that it concentrates on the study of a specific region and is composed of two divisions—political and economic.

As stated earlier, enthusiasm for studies on Asia was greatly stimulated by the Government's announcement in 1953 of a basic policy for Southeast Asia. Besides various research activities mentioned earlier, therefore, a number of comprehensive publications on the respective Asian countries were published subsequently. Outstanding among these are the following:

Ajia Seiji Keizai Nenkan (Asian Political and Economic Yearbook) compiled and published in 1956 by the Kokusai Nippon Kyōkai (International Society of Japan),

Tōnan Ajia Seiji Keizai Sōron—Jōkan (General Survey of Southeast Asian Politics and Economy—Volume I) compiled by Asia Kyōkai and published by the Diamond Publishing Co. in 1957,

Tōnan Ajia no Ippan Jōsei—Tokuni Kyōsan Shugi Seiryoku to no Kanren ni oite (General Situation of Southeast Asia, as Seen in Relation to Communist Influences) published by Asia Kyōkai in 1957,

Chūgoku Seiji Keizai Sōran (General Survey of Politics and Economy of China) compiled by the Society for Asian Political and Economic Studies and published by the Hitotsubashi Shobō (Publishing Co.) in 1954 (revised edition in 1960 and 1962), and

Chūgoku Nenkan (China Yearbook) compiled by the China Institute since 1955.

Research activities on Asian countries have gone ahead rapidly since that period and a large number of publications other than those listed above began to appear.

From the standpoint of the real value of the researches, however, most of them were mere reference books on the conditions of the respective countries. This was due largely to the fact that it was still difficult in those days to collect sufficient data from the respective countries and areas concerned. Even those books which showed evidence of fairly detailed researches, both theoretical and practical, mostly 'followed the beaten track' consisting of reproductions from the data made available by the United Nations or from the results of researches conducted in advanced Western countries. In other words, it was only after the lapse of a certain period that results of researches and surveys conducted by the Japanese themselves began to see the light of day.

Thus, the need for establishing an efficient setup for research on Asia was felt keenly. It was under such circumstances that the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs was organized in December 1958 as an over-all organ for Asian studies, with the cooperation of the Government as well as business and academic circles.

III

The Institute of Asian Economic Affairs started off as a private organization under the supervision of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry, but in July 1960, it was converted into a "special corporate organization" in order to make it financially stronger and capable of carrying out research work on a long-range basis.

Activities of this Institute are roughly divided into the following four categories: (1) collection of material, (2) domestic research, (3) overseas research, and (4) publicity. Although the name of this organization contains the word "economic", its research activities are not confined to economic matters alone but include studies of political, social and cultural problems as well as history.

Geographically speaking, the range of its research activities includes the People's Republic of China and other socialist countries, East and Southeast Asia and the Near and Middle East as well as other less-developed countries in Africa, and Central and South America. When the need arises, the Institute extends its researches to advanced countries as well. Thus it could develop into a world economic research institute in the future.

At present, however, the major subjects of research are Asian countries. Here is a brief summary of its activities carried out to date:

(1) Data Collection

The Institute is collecting data on Asia by dispatching experts to the respective countries concerned and through the purchase of books and other publications both in Japan and abroad. The ultimate aim is to make the Institute Japan's principal data centre for Asian studies.

(2) Domestic Research

Besides the research work conducted by the staff members, the Institute annually conducts surveys and studies by organizing 20 technical research committees (for both basic and specific researches) and by commissioning about 30 research projects to special study groups and individual researchers. More than a hundred scholars, researchers and experts are taking part in these projects to conduct comprehensive researches.

(3) Overseas Research

More than 20 persons from among the members of the committees mentioned above are dispatched abroad annually for on-the-spot surveys. Some staff members of the Institute and experts from outside circles are also dispatched abroad as resident researchers staying for one to two years to make on-the-spot researches mostly at foreign universities and research institutes.

(4) Publicity

Publication of the results of these surveys and researches constitutes the main part of the publicity activity of the Institute. To date, the Institute has published 30 volumes of books ("Chōsa Kenkyū Hōkoku Sōsho" or Research Report Series) containing the results of the researches conducted by the research committees. It has also published 32 reports ("Ajia Keizai Kenkyū Shirizu" or Asian Economic Research Series) on the commissioned research projects.

Besides, the Institute has published a series of translations of worthy foreign publications on Asia and a series of annotated bibliography ("Bunken Kaidai Shirizu"). The Institute's Japanese-language organ journal is *Ajia Keizai* (Asian Economy), which was formerly a bi-monthly magazine but became a monthly publication in January this year.

Also, there is the preliminary issue of the semi-annual English-language organ journal *The Developing Economies*.

While space limitation precludes detailed reference to the results of these researches (for some of them, see the thesis by Mr. Morita appearing in the last section of this article), a list is given below to show the major themes of the researches conducted in the past.

Fiscal Year

- 1958 Promotion of Economic Cooperation and Expansion of Intra-Area Trade
- 1959 Various Conditions for the Development of Asian Economy
- 1960 Economic Development of Asian Countries
- 1961 Economic Development and International Balance of Payments
- 1962 Long-range Outlook on the Economic Growth of Asia

We do not deny the fact that considerable criticisms and comments have been made on the books and data published by the Institute in the past. And indeed, some of these publications, as stated earlier, do not amount to more than mere reference books, but those which contain the results of on-the-spot surveys and original ideas and theories developed from the Japanese standpoint have attracted much attention. There are a few publications which can boast high academic standards.

On the whole, however, the publications containing the results of research activities conducted in the past are worthy in their own right in that they have served as elementary hand-books.

Starting this year, the Institute will, as it should, advance to the second stage based on the reflection of the past achievements. For example, plans are under way to conduct long-range research activities in collaboration with foreign governments, universities and research organizations in place of the short on-the-spot surveys conducted in the past. It is also planned to dispatch research groups, each consisting of several members, to conduct researches on specific subjects such as economy, natural resources and technology in compliance with the requests by the countries concerned.

Apart from the activities of the Institute, the writer wishes to refer to the grant of a subsidy made available for the purchase of documentary materials necessary for the study of "Asian Economic and Social Structures". This grant is a part of the scientific research fund started in fiscal 1958 under the sponsorship of the Education Ministry.

The grant is provided for the purpose of facilitating the purchase of documentary materials on Asia and is aimed at promoting a composite research project jointly undertaken by various research organizations. This programme is centred mainly on researches into government, law, economy, social affairs, religions and geography.

The grant of subsidy for research activity itself became included in the

budgets of research organs at large from fiscal 1961, and the fund has proved a great help in the purchase of documentary materials and promotion of composite researches concerning the Asian area.

IV

Thus, Asian studies in Japan have now completed the basic stage. From now on, the research work on Asia will proceed, on the basis of the results accumulated during the initial stage, to a new stage where a new set of research formulas will have to be employed. In other words, not only Asian economy itself but also Asian studies in Japan are about to reach the so-called "take-off" stage.

Needless to say, it is necessary to make use of the fruits of outstanding Asian studies made in other countries of the world, but it is to be hoped that Japan will be able to produce research results of its own based on the surveys carried out on the spot by Japanese researchers themselves instead of relying entirely on translated materials.

We are placing great expectations on the results which will develop from coordinated studies by the young scholars and researchers who have been dispatched by the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs to the respective countries for relatively long studies lasting from one to two years. It is also hoped that their research efforts will prove a driving force for the reorganization of Asian studies in Japan.

The era of desk research, both theoretical and practical, based merely on documentary materials is now becoming a thing of the past. The time has come when Japan's Asian studies should be carried out by persons who have lived and studied in the respective countries and areas for sufficient periods of time and who have learned from their own experience. To make this possible, one of the methods is, as mentioned earlier, the joint study with research organizations of the respective countries. Another effective method is a more active cultural interchange including the exchange of researchers and students.

It is necessary to conduct, on the one hand, short-term researches and surveys that will serve the needs of the country, such as Japan's economic cooperation with other Asian countries and expansion of trade, and, on the other, to carry out basic long-range research activities based on the realization that Asia's development is something that will take a long time to materialize.

In any case, we should not confine ourselves within the narrow framework of Asian studies. Instead, we should take a broader viewpoint that Asian studies are a part of a global research endeavour. At any rate, it would seem that now is about the time for a new generation of researchers to take over the task of Asian studies.

2. TREND OF THEORIES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF LESS-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES IN JAPAN

Jirō Sakamoto

I

The purpose of this thesis is to survey the trend of theoretical studies on the development of less-developed countries made in Japan. The writer will focus his attention on the relatively recent trend and then, on the basis of that analysis, pick out the problems of the present period and for the future.

Speaking from the academic standpoint, however, the theoretical studies on the development of less-developed countries made in Japan so far are still in an "underdeveloped" stage. In discussing relatively recent trends, therefore, it is unavoidable to refer to the prewar and wartime studies which form the basis of the current trend. I shall, therefore, divide my discussions into the following three stages:

First stage: up to 1945

Second stage: from 1946 to 1954

Third stage: from 1955 up to 1961

This way of dividing the stages is convenient for tracing the progress of the theoretical studies on the development of less-developed countries conducted in Western countries (mostly the United States and Britain) and also because similar researches in Japan have been centred, especially after World War II, on the translation, introduction, commentary and critique of the theories propounded in Western countries.

II

For studying the over-all trend of researches on less-developed countries conducted in Japan up to 1945, there is an excellent article which gives a "comprehensive view" of the academic world concerned. It is a thesis entitled "Senzen ni okeru Shokumin Seisaku Kenkyū no Kaiko" (Review of Colonial Policy Researches in Prewar Years) written jointly by Profs. Seiichi Tōbata and Noboru Yamamoto. The thesis is included in the first volume of *Nippon ni okeru Keizai-gaku no Hyakunen* (One-Hundred-Year History of Economics in Japan) compiled by the Economics Society of Keiō Gijuku University and published by the Nippon Hyōron Shin Sha in 1959 (pp. 345-379).

The following table of contents of this thesis will show the focal points of prewar Japanese researches on the subject under review:

1. Subjects of Colonial Policy Research
2. International Position of Japan, Less-Advanced Country
3. Structural Policies and Pure Economic Policies Toward Colonies
4. Japan's Advance and the New Mission of Colonial Policy Research

5. Reflection on the Past and Development of Theoretical Research
6. Study on the "Bloc Economy"
7. Process of the Development of Asian Policy
8. Progress of "Area Studies" on Southeast Asia
9. Theory on Asian Economic Construction and "Counter Colonization"

With a few exceptions, prewar studies on less-developed countries contained very little of the type of theoretical study on the development of less-developed countries which became particularly popular after the war. Among these exceptions are three theses by Prof. Tōbata—pioneering works which are valuable even today in studying the nature and causes of the backwardness of these countries. These were: "Shokumin Genshō no Honshitsu" (Fundamental Nature of Colonial Phenomenon) published in the August, 1940, issue of *Keizai-gaku Ronshū* (Collection of Economic Theses), "Shokumin Gainen no Yōin" (Factors of Colonial Concept) in the August, 1942, issue of *Kokka Gakkai Zasshi* (National Policy Institute Journal), and "Shokuminchi Seisaku no Dankai—Keizai Seisaku toshite" (Stages of Colonial Policy—as Economic Policy) in the January, 1943, issue of *Keizai-gaku Ronshū*.

One of the major components of prewar researches on less-developed countries was the empirical study on such countries. In particular, empirical researches of high level were made in the studies of agricultural economics in Manchuria, Korea, and Taiwan. This tradition has been handed over and developed in postwar years with the focus of attention shifted to Southeast Asian countries. Especially during the third stage (1955–1961), practical studies on the economic situation in Southeast Asian countries made remarkable progress in the form of a series of documents published by the Congress for the Promotion of Agricultural, Forestry and Fishery Productivity and the series of research papers issued by the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs.

Meanwhile, studies on colonial policy which occupied a considerably important position in prewar researches were naturally discontinued after the war, now that Japan has lost all of its colonial possessions and stands no chance of regaining them. In place of colonial policy studies, two types of researches have now become predominant. One is the historical area study and the other is the theoretical study on the development of less-developed countries.

III

Even in Western countries, economic theories of the development of less-developed countries became suddenly brisk only after World War II except for pioneering works relating to East Europe by such scholars as K. Mandelbaum, and Paul N. Rosenstein-Rodan.

In Japan, studies on theories of the development of less-developed countries during the second stage (1946–1954) were centred around the following three orientations:

1. Study of the historical background of the problem of developing less-developed countries.

2. Translation, introduction, commentary and critique of fundamental books on theories relating to the development of less-developed countries.

3. Survey of the trends in Western academic circles in regard to the theories at large on the development of less-developed countries.

As regards the first orientation mentioned above, three attempts are dominant in Japan :

(1) An attempt to find answers to the problem by revising and adapting the classic Marxist theory (capital and commodity export by imperialist countries) to the post-World War II situation.

(2) An attempt to find answers to the problem from the standpoint of "balanced growth" theory expanded on an international scale, that is, a viewpoint that the stable economic growth of Asia will serve for the long-range economic development of Japan which relies heavily on foreign trade both in raw material imports and the export of manufactured products.

(3) An attempt to study what the future prospects of Asian area economic integration will be when the European Common Market comes into being as an influential economic bloc in addition to American and Soviet blocs, and to consider what Japan's attitude should be regarding the emerging Asian economic bloc.

During the period from 1946 to 1954, two books published in the West attracted the keenest attention in Japan. These were *Some Aspects of Economic Development, Three Lectures* by M. Dobb (Delhi, 1st Edition, 1951) and *Problems of Capital Formation in Underdeveloped Countries* by R. Nurkse (New York, 1953). These books were immediately translated into Japanese and more than 20 introductory papers, commentaries and critical theses were published about them.

Then the following four publications drew attention in Japan: *Measures for the Economic Development of Under-Developed Countries* by the United Nations, Department of Economic Affairs (New York, 1951); *International Trade and Economic Development* by J. Viner (London, 1953); *The Economic Impact on Under-Developed Societies, Essays on International Investment and Social Change* by S. H. Frankel (Oxford, 1953); *The Future of Underdeveloped Countries, Political Implications of Economic Development* by E. Staley (New York, 1954). Of these, the works by Viner and Staley were translated into Japanese, while the U.N. report and Frankel's book were introduced and commented on in detail.

Meanwhile, research documents aimed at presenting comprehensive surveys on Western economic theories of the development of less-developed countries were mostly published during the third stage (1955-1961). Let us mention below those which directly concern Western books and articles published up to around 1954: *Kōshin Koku Kaihatsu no Riron* (Theories on the Development of Less-developed Countries) compiled by Asia Kyōkai and published by the Nikkan Kōgyō Shimbun Sha in 1956 (pp. 280). This is a collection containing the introduction, commentary and critique on the arguments of a number of Western scholars including R. Emerson, M. Dobb, E. Staley, V. Kollontay, U. N. report, R. Nurkse, J. Viner, H. W. Singer, B. Datta, H. Myint, S. H. Frankel, M. Zinkin, E. P. Reubens, A. Ekstein, and G. C. Allen.

Kōshin Koku Kaihatsu Riron no Kenkyū (Study of Theories on the Develop-

ment of Underdeveloped Countries) compiled by Kiyoshi Matsui and published by Yūhikaku in 1957 (pp. 237). This is a collection containing the introduction, commentary and critique made from the Marxist standpoint on the arguments of Buchanan & Ellis, Nurkse, Singer, Viner, Frankel, Dobb, and others.

Through the perusal of these fundamental books and articles, Japanese researchers realized the existence of sharply conflicting opinions in regard to a number of problems such as the definition of the "underdeveloped" status of a country, causes of the underdeveloped stage, strategic factors for overcoming the underdeveloped state, priority order of investments for economic development and the roles which advanced countries can play in helping develop less-developed countries. Thus, how to interpret and adjust these conflicting views became the primary concern of Japanese researchers. This naturally called for efforts to make a comprehensive survey of academic circles and opinions, and to find out both the focus of the problems and the basic contents of the relevant documents.

Among the major theses made public during this stage, which give an accurate picture of the situation concerning academic circles, the following deserve attention: "Kōshin Koku Kaihatsu Riron no Tembō" (Survey of Theories on the Development of Less-developed Countries) by Yoichi Itagaki, contained in *Kōshin Koku Kaihatsu no Riron* (Theories on the Development of Less-developed Countries) compiled by Asia Kyōkai. "Kōshin Koku Kaihatsu Riron no Kentō—Kōgyōka Mondai o Chūshin toshite" (A study of the Theories on the Development of Less-developed Countries, Centreing Around the Problem of Industrialization) by Masaru Morimura contained in the March, 1959, issue of *Keizai Bunseki* (Economic Analysis). "Keizai Yōjo to Keizai Seichō" (Economic Surplus and Economic Growth) by Akira Ōnishi in the September, 1959, issue of *Mita Gakkai Zasshi* (Mita Academic Society Journal). *Kōshin Koku Kaihatsu Riron no Tembō* (Survey of the Theories on the Development of Less-developed Countries) by Mitsuru Konami in *Kōshin Koku Kaihatsu no Kenkyū* (A Study on the Development of Less-developed Countries) compiled and published by Sekai Keizai Chōsakai (World Economic Research Institute) in 1959.

A number of theses on the subject of the economic development of less-developed countries were published in Vol. 7 of *Kokusai Keizai* (International Economy) published by Kokusai Keizai Gakkai (International Economics Institute) in 1955.

IV

There are two aspects predominant in the Japanese studies on theories of the development of less-developed countries during the third stage (1955-1961). One is the continuation and development of the researches carried out during the second stage, and the other is a new tendency which manifested itself for the first time during this latest stage. Four books written by Western scholars drew particular attention in Japan during this period. They were: *Economic Theory and Underdeveloped Regions*, 1957, by G. Myrdal. *Economic Backwardness and Economic Growth*, 1957, by H. Liebenstein. *Strategy of Economic*

Development, 1958, by A. O. Hirschman. *The Stages of Economic Growth*, 1960, by W. W. Rostow. Translations, introductions, annotations and criticisms of these and other books prevailed. An example of the work written during this period is *Tei-kaihatsu Koku Kaihatsu Riron no Keifu* (Genealogy of the Theories of the Development of Underdeveloped Countries) by Jirō Sakamoto, published by the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs in 1961. This publication gives a list of domestic and foreign publications on the subject of developing countries, bibliographical introductions of basic books and a survey of the academic circle concerned.

In addition to general academic surveys, this period also saw the publication of those theses which make profound surveys of academic achievements on specific problems such as the following: "Kōshin Koku Keizai Shakai no Kōzōteki Tokushitsu—Nijū Keizai Riron no Hihan to Tenkai" (The Characteristics of Socio-Economic Structure of Less-developed Countries—Criticism and Development of the Theory of Dual Economy) by Yoichi Itagaki, which was contained in *Keizai no Antei to Shimpō* (Economic Stability and Progress)—a collection of theses published in 1958 in commemoration of the 61st birthday of Dr. Ichirō Nakayama. "Tei-kaihatsu Koku Kaihatsu Riron o Meguru Genriteki Ichi Mondai—Bauer Shi no Myrdal Hihan" (A Fundamental Problem Centreing Around the Theories on the Development of Less-developed Countries—Critique of Myrdal's View by Mr. Bauer) by Masaki Hamazaki, published in the August, 1959, issue (No. 3, Vol. 8) of *Ritsumeikan Keizai-gaku* (Ritsumeikan Journal of Economics). "Indo Shōkōgyō Seisaku no Rironteki Kiban—Tei-kaihatsu Koku no Sanshutsuryō to Koyō Mondai" (Theoretical Basis of India's Small Industry Policy—Problems of Production Volume and Employment in Less-developed Countries) by Katsu Yanaihara published in the March, 1959, issue of *Mita Gakkai Zasshi* (Journal of Mita Academic Institute). "Kōshin Koku no Jinkō Mondai—Sho Gakuha no Kenkai o Chūshin toshite" (Population Problem of Less-advanced Countries—Centreing Around the Opinions of Various Schools) by Bun'ichi Kodan, published in the August, 1959, issue (Vols. 51 & 52) of *Keizai Riron* (Economic Theories) of Wakayama University. "Tei-kaihatsu Koku no Jinkō to Keizai Hatten" (Population and Economic Development of Less-developed Countries) by Ryōzaburō Minami, published in the October, 1959, issue (Vol. 85) of *Keishō Ronsan* (Collection of Theses in Economics and Commercial Science) of Chūō University. "Kōshin Koku to Hikaku Seisanhi Riron" (Less-developed Countries and The Theory of Comparative Cost) by Shirō Asada, published in the September, 1959, issue (No. 2, Vol. 10) of *Shōgaku Tōkyū* (Studies on Commerce) of Otaru Commercial College. "Gaibu Keizai, Kinsei Seichō oyobi Tōshi Kijun" (External Economy, Balanced Growth and Investment Standards) by Hisao Kumagai, published in *Gendai Keizai-gaku no Sho Mondai* (Problems of Contemporary Economics)—a collection of theses commemorating the 10th anniversary of the inauguration of the Economics Department of Osaka University (1959, Yūhikaku). "Sangyō Kōzō no Sakutei Kijun" (Criterion for Determining Industrial Structure) by Yūichi Shionoya, published in *Sangyō Kōzō* (Industrial Structure) compiled by Miyoei Shinohara and published by Shunjū Sha in 1959. "Tei-Kaihatsu

Koku no Kaihatsu o Habamu Mono"³ (Factors Hampering the Development of Less-developed Countries) by Hiroshi Kitamura, contained in No. 2, Vol. 1. of *Ajia Keizai* (Asian Economy) published by the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs in 1960.

In addition, one of the noteworthy academic products concerning the theoretical and practical researches on the problem of less-developed countries published during this stage is *Ajia Keizai Hatten no Kiso Riron* (Fundamental Theory on the Development of Asian Economy) compiled by the Japan ECAFE Association and published by Chūō Kōron Sha in 1959 (pp. 883). This is a collection of treatises on joint researches carried out by 30 experts and represents the pinnacle of the academic researches, both theoretical and practical, conducted in Japan up to the time of its publication. The book consists of four chapters: Chapter 1. Basic Structure of Asian Economy; Chapter 2. Subjective Conditions of Asia's Economic Development; Chapter 3. Asia's Economic Development and Theories on Development Projects; Chapter 4. International Conditions for Asian Economic Development.

V

While digesting and absorbing the basic books and articles from Western countries, two things became gradually clear to Japanese researchers. One was the fact that in the theories on the development of less-developed countries, there are two major schools of thought, conflicting and interwoven with each other, one being the traditional view and the other, a neo-orthodox opinion.

When compared in terms of the ideal types, the classic school tends to tackle the problem of economic development by progressing from agricultural to industrial development and by laying stress on international division of labour. In this approach, private businesses are placed in the position of being the major body of economic activity, capital calculation is regarded as the principal motive, the market mechanism as the pivotal structure and physical capital as the strategic factor.

On the other hand, the neo-orthodox school has a tendency to consider economic development from a different angle. In this school's approach, the state (government) is the principal body, the principle of necessity is the primary consideration and control and planning structure is made the pivot of operation. Industry is given priority over agriculture and the trade policy is geared to protectionism. Human capital (intellectual and institutional capital) is treated as the strategic factor.

The other thing which had become clear to Japanese researchers is that, with the progress of science, the sharp conflicting edges of these two schools have been blunted and the two are now becoming complementary to an increasing degree. With this trend as a background, studies on theories of the development of less-developed countries in Japan came to assume a new tendency during the latest stage—a move to reappraise the experiences gained during the 100-year history of Japan's industrialization, and use the result of the reappraisal for reconciling the points of conflict between the

different schools and make it the foundation of a more composite theory on the development of less-developed countries.

This move has been prompted by two external factors. One is the stimulation given to Japanese economists by the studies on Japan's economic development which have been made by foreign scholars and "re-exported" to Japan. The other was the progress of the empirical researches on Japanese economy carried out in Japan after the war.

About 100 years ago or during the 1860's, Japan shared two basic characteristics with the many Asian countries which still remain less-developed today. One of them was the fact that Japan, still in the pre-industrial period, had not reached the "take-off" stage and had not rid itself of the effects of the vicious cycle of poverty in the stage of quasi secular stagnation at a low economic level.

During this pre-industrial stage, the absolute level of real income per capita was, according to the estimate made by C. Clark, only 100 (I.U.) in Japan—the same level as, or even lower than, those of India and China; whereas in Western European countries, it was more than 300 (I. U.). (C. Clark, *Conditions of Economic Progress*, London: Macmillan, 1940).

The other was the strong impact from more advanced countries. This impact exerts two contradictory effects. One is the effect of suppressing progress due to the "disequalization factor" (Myint) and "back wash effect" (Myrdal) and the other, the development-accelerating effect resulting from the "anticipation effect" (Lenin) enjoyed by late starter countries.

As mentioned above, Japan started off from a lower absolute level of real income than Europe but she succeeded in holding down the development-suppressing effect and industrialized herself almost alone among Asian nations, reaching the level of quasi-advanced countries following a 100-year history of industrialization. Japan's prewar (1870-1938) annual average growth of real national income was about 4 per cent and the postwar (1948-1961) rate was about 9 per cent—both highest in the world.

The reasons and causes of this phenomenon have been scrutinized both by the Japanese themselves and by foreigners. Japan's industrialization formula was different both from that of Britain, which the traditional school of economists considers as a model, and the Soviet formula, which the neo-orthodox school regards as a model. Japan's formula was something between the two extremes and has employed elements of both in a manner all her own. This point has attracted the notice of both Japanese and foreign scholars.

This is a very important problem and the importance of clarifying the significance of this phenomenon has just begun to be realized and an attempt to solve the question has been started. Due to space limitation, the writer wishes to refer only briefly to the problematical points involved.

Of the various reasons why, among the many backward nations of Asia, Japan alone succeeded in industrializing herself during the latter part of the 19th century, the following two have recently come to be given renewed attention: 1. The fact that Japan was free from colonial-type backwardness both politically and institutionally. 2. The fact that at the start of her in-

dustrialization process, Japan possessed no less human resources than Western European countries at the time of their pre-industrial stage.

Then, the following three factors have been recently suggested as reasons why, after she entered the industrialization process, Japan was able to register a growth rate in real national income and industrial production higher than those of Western European and socialist bloc countries: 1. High propensity for adopting and carrying out innovations. 2. High propensity to save. 3. Priority distribution of investments. Especially in regard to the third point, it is emphasized that in Japan, individual households, business enterprises and the government showed exceptional enthusiasm for expanding reproduction of human resources by giving priority to investments in positive welfare items such as physical needs, requirements for efficiency, and education.

Thus, in order to achieve the objective of high-speed development, Japan adopted a mixed formula and, relatively speaking, this method proved fairly effective—at least for her. A full explanation of why this formula proved successful is an important question yet to be answered. The task lying before us is to answer, on the basis of Japan's own experience, the questions of what is the strategic factor for economic development, what are the relatively more efficient formulas for industrial and economic development, and how they should be worked out by the respective countries.

The lessons Japan may give are, in brief, as follows: 1. The decisive importance of human resources (intellectual capital and institutional capital). 2. Dynamic balanced relationship between agriculture and small scale industries on the one hand and large scale industries on the other; the former serving as the solid but flexible foundation of speedy growth and the latter acting as a powerful tractor. 3. The positive roles played by the export industry sector and the government sector in promoting high-speed economic development. 4. The role played by the collaboration of modern elements and pre-modern elements, in producing "creative harmony" (Myrdal). 5. The effect of the collaboration between market price mechanism and governmental guidance exercised through non-market channels in producing judicious distribution of various resources on a long-range and social basis.

These lessons would seem to serve as an agent for coordinating the contradictory theories on the development of less-developed countries between the traditional and neo-orthodox schools, which exist both in Western and, in consequence, among Japanese academic circles today.

It would seem that the task for Japan's academic world lies in solving the riddle of Japan's speedy economic development and giving it a theoretical explanation. The following are works valuable in this respect: *Keizai Shutaisei Kōza* (Lectures on Subjects of Economy), 7 Vols., by Drs. Hiromi Arisawa, Seiichi Tōbata, and Ichirō Nakayama, published by the Chūō Kōron Sha in 1960. "Nippon no Kōgyōka to Minshuka" (Industrialization and Democratization of Japan) by Dr. Ichirō Nakayama, in the June, 1961, issue of *Chūō Kōron Magazine*. *Nippon Keizai no Seichō to Junkan* (Growth and Cycle of Japanese Economy) by Miyoei Shinohara, published by Sōbun Sha in 1961. *Kōdo Seichō no Himitsu* (Secret of High-Rate Growth) by Miyoei Shi-

nohara, published by Nihon Keizai Shimbun Sha in 1961. "Nippon Keizai no Saihyōka" (Reappraisal of Japanese Economy) by Jirō Sakamoto, in the October, 1961, issue of *Hitotsubashi Ronsō* (Hitotsubashi University's Collection of Theses). "Kōdo Seichō no Himitsu" (Secret of High-Rate Growth), by Jirō Sakamoto, in the February, 1962, issue of *Keizai Orai Magazine*.

Part II Area Studies

3. STUDIES OF THE INDIAN ECONOMY IN JAPAN

Hiroshi Kurimoto

Japan's postwar research into the economies of South and Southeast Asia started in such fields as trade and international balance of payments. This was because Japan was then hastening to resume trade relations with the area. With regard to India, however, things were somewhat different. India's economic development plan was made the chief object of research from the beginning. The development formula of that country, in particular, was thought to present a striking contrast with that of China, and this evoked the interest of researchers. Thus, studies of the Indian economy have become a comparatively advanced section among the studies of South and Southeast Asia in Japan.

I. Economic Development Plan

The studies of the economic development plan started with outlining the First Five Year Plan. A comparatively detailed investigation was made of the actual performance of the First Plan and the planning of the Second Plan, and critical discussions on the subjects also began. The leading researchers in this field are, among others, Hikosaku Ozaki (Osaka Municipal University), Zenjirō Morita (Mitsubishi Economic Research Institute) and Hiroshi Kurimoto (Japan ECAFE Association). Some of the principal studies covering the First Plan period included Kurimoto's "Indo no Dai Ichiji oyobi Dai Niji Gokanen Keikaku" (The First and Second Five Year Plan of India) published in *Ajia no Keizai Kaihatsu: Tōnan Ajia Hen* or Economic Development of Asia: Southeast Asia, edited by Asia Kyōkai, 1957, and Ozaki and others' *Indo Keizai no Shomondai* (Problems of the Indian Economy), Osaka Municipal University, 1953.

With regard to the actual performance of the Second Plan and the planning of the Third Plan, the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs conducted two joint studies. One of these is *Indo no Kaihatsu to Shikinmondai* (Economic Development of India and Financial Resources, Institute of Asian Economic Affairs, 1960) and the other is *Indo no Keizai Kaihatsu Keikaku to sono Jisseki no*

Kentō (Economic Development of India: Programme and Records, the same Institute, 1962, mimeo.). The former is a joint work of Kurimoto, Z. Morita, Akira Maeda (Japan Export and Import Bank), and others, while the latter was prepared jointly by Kurimoto, Z. Morita, Miyazaki, Hachirō Fukazawa (The National Research Institute of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry), and Hiroshi Kazaoka (The Institute of Asia and Africa).

According to the *Indo no Keizai Kaihatsu Keikaku to sono Jisseki no Kentō*, Indian planning consists of two different lines of development programme: One is the so-called "Bombay Plan" and other non-government plans, which, having emerged from the national independence movement, aimed at a long-range objective to attain a higher rate of economic growth through rapid industrialization and a change in the economic and industrial structures of the country; and the other is a group of government plans formulated before and after independence, a conglomeration of various projects developed by ministries and departments of both central and state governments, which, however, did not share any general outlooks or ideas on the future of the Indian economy. The First Five Year Plan is identified with the latter influence while the Second Plan is considered to succeed the former.

The Second Five Year Plan can be said to be the first official work done virtually by the Indian planners centreing around the Planning Commission. Of course, it would not be true to say that the Plan was freely worked out by the planners alone, for it came out under various influences from state governments, private capital, and the still comparatively young organization of the Indian officialdom comprising staffs engaged in planning, industrial administration, and technology. It was also influenced by such factors as certain inclinations of the leaders of the newly independent government of India—for instance, the extraordinary zeal of Prime Minister Nehru and his associates for irrigation and power projects patterned after the TVA—and the contingency involved in foreign aids—for example, the construction of steel plants which invited an aid race from the Soviet Union, the U.K., and West Germany.

The same research report observes that, in the First and Second Plans, it was decided to implement a "production technique improvement policy" aiming at increasing agricultural production through irrigation, extension service, etc. parallel with a "structure policy" including land reform and cooperativization. In the First Plan period, however, the emphasis was rather placed on the former policy, centreing on large-scale irrigation projects, since it was considered to have less impact and friction upon the traditional social and economic structure of the rural communities. In the Second Plan, however, the priority was switched over, in a certain degree, to industrialization centreing around heavy industries and the relative importance of agricultural development declined. The emphasis in the production technique improvement policy was shifted from the large-scale irrigation projects on to the smaller-scale ones, and fertilization and seed improvement came to be regarded as more important than irrigation in increasing agricultural production. However, the emphasis on such labour-intensive projects as small-scale irrigation, fertilization, and seed improvement have necessarily to be substan-

tiated by a forceful implementation of the "structure policy". It is to be noted that, while in the land reform, intermediate landowners based on the Zamindari system were mostly abolished during the First Plan period, this was not followed up by any effective measures for restricting land-holdings and cooperativization during the Second Plan years.

It is true that the level of agricultural production was substantially elevated during the Period of the First and Second Five Year Plans, but it is difficult to determine just how high was the rate of increase, because the yearly changes in the volume of production are still big. However, it is expected that the requirements for increased agricultural production will become greater under the Third Five Year Plan, and this would call for an increased investment in agriculture. And more important, a clear-cut decision on the structure policy and its vigorous enforcement would become necessary.

In the industrial sector, a complete utilization of the existing equipment capacity was chiefly aimed at and the objectives of direct public investment set by the government was rather conservative, while no large-scale investments were intended in the private sector, under the First Five Year Plan. But during the period of the Second Plan which may be rightly called a "heavy industrialization programme", industrial investment was greatly augmented. The planners of the Indian government had at first intended to cover the greater part of heavy industrial investment with direct government investment; private investment being confined to a small part of heavy industries and consumer goods industries. However, under the strong pressures of private capital which wanted to stand on an equal footing to the public sector in the field of heavy industries also, the planners had to allow both public and private investments to expand equally, which resulted in the actual investments in both sectors exceeding the targets respectively. This is not desirable, of course, since it is due in no small degree to a miscalculation of the construction cost of the major projects including the steel plants, the lack of control on the private investments or of their proper management, etc. It is also worth noting that while the investment targets were exceeded, the actual production of goods somewhat underscored the targets. Responsible for this was the miscalculation on the part of the Indian planners regarding a time-lag between investment and production, as well as the fact that the steel plant construction project which had claimed a topmost investment priority had but little effect on production during the Second Plan period. The imbalance between various lines of industry both in investment allocation and in development such as noted between iron-and-steel and machinery industries, between machinery and coal, between coal and transportation, etc. also became serious. Therefore, the report points out, even if the basic line of a parallel expansion of public and private investments and the emphasis on heavy industries remain unchanged during the Third Plan, a more carefully considered adjustment of the imbalances as stated above would become necessary.

With regard to the financing of the development plan, the report points out the following, after making a rough computation of India's overall revenues and expenditures including those of both central and state govern-

ments: While the current incomings including tax revenues increased more than expected during the First and the Second Plans, the development expenditures also increased greatly, especially since the Second Plan, and besides, the non-developmental expenditures such as those on public administration, national defense, debts repayment, etc. tended to swell. This caused the greater dependence on the domestic and foreign loans as well as deficit finance. The scope of finance for the Third Plan is naturally expected to enlarge further, but if the current revenues, which are the most important source of finance for the plan, continue to depend, as in the Second Plan, mostly on excise duties and sales tax, while the popularization of income tax and the development of an agricultural tax remains neglected, a rise in commodity prices and an inflationary spiral will be sure to follow. On the other hand, if the deficit finance were to be avoided for fear of the price rise and inflation, a still greater dependence on foreign aids would be the consequence.

From the viewpoint of the self-sufficiency of India's economy, the raising of its income and living levels and the improvement of the employment situation, the First and the Second Five Year Plans have brought poor tangible results. Of course, one cannot take a too hasty judgement as regards a success or failure of India's development efforts merely from that point of view. In a developing country which has just emerged as an independent nation, some urge beyond economic rationality does usually influence its initial efforts to develop itself. Such efforts of India have so far been concentrated, so to speak, on certain mammoth projects such as the construction of multi-purpose dams and steel plants, and it seems that the question as to what impact these projects will have on the economy as a whole has not been paid much attention to. In that sense, Indian planning in the past may not be called synthetic in the true sense of the term, and such real planning will become vitally needed in the Third Plan or after it, so the report concludes.

One of the characteristics of the structure of the Second Plan is that it sought to decide on the allocation of investment after a certain model (the so-called Mahalanobis model), and this induced some scholars and researchers in Japan to study in India's planning technique. They include, among others, Shigeto Tsuru (Hitotsubashi University), Ryūtarō Komiya (Tokyo University), Isamu Miyazaki (Economic Planning Board) and Hikoji Katano (Kobe University). While they are all excellent economists, not all of them have expert knowledge of the details of India's economy. However, this sort of approach to the subject, if supplemented by a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the Indian economy, will surely make an important contribution to the Indian studies in Japan.

The comparison of the pattern of economic development between India and China has evoked the interest of many Japanese scholars and researchers about both countries ever since China, after the revolution, set about its First Five Year Plan in 1953, shortly after India started its own.

First to present the question was Kakuten Hara (Institute of Asian Economic Affairs) who wrote an article entitled "Ajia no Keizai Kaihatsu ni okeru Futatsu no Kata—Chūkyō to Indo no Gokanen-keikaku no Hikaku" (Two Pat-

terns of Economic Development in Asia—A Comparison between the First Five Year Plans of India and Communist China, in *Nōgyō Sōgō Kenkyū* or Quarterly Journal of Agricultural Economy, The National Research Institute of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, January, 1954). Then followed Akira Doi (Shōwa Dōjin Kai) and Kurimoto with their *Indo to Chūkyō: Sono Keizai Hatten no Hikaku* (India and Communist China: A Comparison of Different Economic Developments, Nihon Gaisei Gakkai, 1957, 189 pp.). They approached the theme from the point of view that the two countries do not necessarily differ so much in the pattern of economic development as in the approach to the common question of developing an underdeveloped country. Shigeru Ishikawa's (Hitotsubashi University) "Chūgoku to Indo no Keizai Seichō Hikaku" (A Comparison of Economic Growth of China and India, in *Chūgoku ni okeru Shihon Chikuseki Kikō* or Capital Accumulation Mechanism in China, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1960) is notable as a comparative study based on an econometric analysis, but the statistical confusions in China after the "Great Leap Forward" and the absence of published statistics are making further studies of such sort impossible.

II. "Mixed Economy" and "Socialist Pattern of Society"

The reason why the Indian formula of economic development is contrasted with that of China lies in India's adoption of a "mixed economy" formula. Since the Second Five Year Plan, India set forth a policy of industrialization with more emphasis on heavy industries, which is more or less similar to that of China, with an eye to building a "socialist pattern of society", and it has become an important theme of study for Japanese students to clarify the significance and essentials of the mixed economy and the socialist pattern of society. Concerned with such studies are Tsuru, Ozaki, Z. Morita, Bun'ichi Kodan (Wakayama University), Sadao Morita (Institute of Asia and Africa), Masanori Koga (Tokyo University), Kurimoto and others.

Tsuru points out that in considering economic development one should clarify an institutional motive behind it. He holds that both capitalism and socialism have their own institutional motives but that a "mixed economy" cannot possibly make the best of the merits of each different system but becomes a mere mixture of good and bad factors from them both ("Kongō Keizai to Kōshin Koku Kaihatsu Riron," or A Mixed Economy and Theories on Development of Underdeveloped Countries in *Ajia Keizai Hatten no Kiso Riron* or Fundamental Theories on Economic Development in Asia: Essays on Asian Economic Development, edited by Japan ECAFE Association, 1959). However, he does not necessarily deny the possibility for a still considerable development even under a mixed economy, for he thinks that certain things should be possible even within this framework, such as: removing the remnants of the *ancient regime* like the old land system; convincing the people of the character of the government as a friend of the working populace so that they may readily accept the necessity of austerity; regulating in a planned way the disposal of profits of private enterprises; helping the national capital

backed up by the working people in their effort to take the place of the foreign capital; promoting the economic development through expansion of foreign trade and mobilization of saving potentialities of the people through such popular channels as telephone bonds, housing bonds, and so forth. On the other hand, there is the view that a mixed economy after all can only bring about a slow tempo of development, besides its denoting the continuation and even the strengthening of a dependent economy of colonial character, and that a truly self-sustained economic development can only be promised by a socialist way such as followed by the Soviet Union and China (Kodan and Akimoto, "Kōshin Koku no Keizai Hatten", or Economic Development in Underdeveloped Countries in *Gendai Shihonshugi Kōza* or Courses in Contemporary Capitalism, Vol. V, Tōyō Keizai Shimpō Sha, 1959). Yet another view sees the possibility of the Indian economy following either one of the three ways of development: socialist, "mixed economic", and more capitalistic. India will certainly be on the road of the mixed economy for some time ahead, but the two successive five-year plans have obviously strengthened the third possibility, that is, of a more capitalistic development (Kurimoto, "Kaihatsu Keikaku to Keizai Taisei", or Development Plans and Economic Systems, Japan ECAFE Association, ed., *op. cit.* pp. 557-583).

However, before talking in conclusive terms, it would be necessary first to study the actual conditions of India's mixed economy or the "socialist pattern of society". The authors of the above-mentioned *Indo no Keizai Kaihatsu Keikaku to sono Jisseki no Kentō* (Institute of Asian Economic Affairs, ed.) try to clarify what bearings the present planning has on the mixed economy or on the socialist pattern of society. It boils down to the question of what is the role of the state in developing trunk lines of industry for industrialization with an accent on heavy industries and also how the state, in performing its role, should control or regulate the private sector. In constructing the Second Plan, the planners attempted to establish an absolute supremacy of the public sector over the private sector in the allocation of investment in trunk industries which had formerly favoured the latter sector, but encountering opposition from private capital, the government had to be contented with a relative, rather than an absolute, supremacy, resulting in an approximate equilibrium between the two sectors in respect of investment allocation, with, however, a slight balance in favour of the public sector. However, in order to realize such a mixed pattern of investment allocation, it would be necessary to control or regulate the allocation of savings and the savings-investment flow, to which the planners did not actually pay much attention. If a "mixed economy" was to mean nothing new, it might well accept the same old pattern of savings-investment flow. But if it was intended to establish a preponderance of the public sector in the interest of a socialist pattern of society, a mere mixed pattern of investment allocation would not be enough to suit a "mixed economy". Therefore, in the Third Plan or after it, planning with respect to the savings-investment flow will become an important question, and the planners must prepare themselves for that task by trying to grasp more precisely the actual conditions of such flow as well as the private willingness and capacity for investment. It is a consensus of the authors

of the above report that one cannot have a definite judgement regarding the fate of the "mixed economy" of India unless such questions are fully studied as to what changes will, or will be planned to, take place in the savings-investment flow in the country. Studies in this field have just been started in Japan, and examples of these include *Indo ni okeru Minkan Kigyō Shikin no Chōtatsu* (Financing of Private Enterprises in India, Mitsubishi Economic Research Institute, 1959) and *Indo no Kin'yū Seido* (Financial System in India, Institute of Asian Economic Affairs, 1962).

The question of how to characterize the "mixed economy" and the "socialist pattern of society" is being tackled by such scholars as Koga and Sadao Morita. They think that it can be defined as a state capitalism, but concerning as it does a characterization of the political power in present India, it may come beyond the scope of this review. However, if in the course of such study the true significance and functions of economic policies, legislation and organization of controls and regulations can be made clear, it will be an important contribution to Indian studies in Japan. For, the existence of certain laws and organizations and their actual operation or functions are often quite different things. Studies in this realm, however, have just been started in this country.

Important for studies of the Indian economy, as well as for the characterization of state power in that country, are those studies on the agricultural policies, particularly the land reform policy. Just as the agricultural economies in Asian countries have been more or less stagnant, notwithstanding that most of them are essentially agricultural nations, so studies in agricultural problems are generally in the state of stagnancy. Some of the workers in this field are Ozaki, Fukazawa, Koga, S. Morita and Kazaoka. Notable among their works is: Ozaki and others, *Ajia ni okeru Nōgyō Kōzō no Henkaku Katei* (Process of Changes in the Agricultural Structures in Asia, Economic Institute, Osaka Municipal University, 1960). As regards the effect of India's agricultural policies in the past decade, there are two opposing views: Fukazawa and others hold that, although with the abolition of the Zamindari system some tenant farmers became owner farmers and the strata of small- and medium-scaled owner farmers were somewhat enlarged, such follow-up measures as restrictions on land-holdings and cooperativization of agriculture are hardly in progress; whereas Koga and others take up the position that the policies centred on the middle-strata farmers having failed, a new direction is being sought through restrictions on landholdings and other measures. Of course, such controversy will have to be substantiated by more positive studies on both sides.

III. Specific Themes

The advancement of comprehensive studies like those concerning achievements of the economic development plans, the characterization of the "mixed economy" formula, etc. must of course be supported by numerous studies in specific fields on particular subjects. As the economic intercourse between India and Japan makes progress, studies in details of specific subjects are

also needed. However, such studies have only been undertaken by the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs after its establishment in 1958. The Institute has brought out many research reports, most of them being the results of joint studies, such as: *Indo no Rōdō Jijō* (Labour Situation in India, 1960; participated by Katsu Yanaihara of Keiō University, Takayuki Andō of Tokyo Office, ILO, Yukio Yasui of Tokyo Office, ICFTU, Toshitada Tateyama of Takushoku University, etc.), *Indo no Keiei Dairi Seido* (Managing Agency System in India, 1960; by Kinji Kaneda of Kobe City University of Foreign Studies, Tōya Sugawara of Institute of Asian Economic Affairs, etc.), *Indo Kōgyō no Gijutsu Suijun* (Technological Levels of Indian Industries, 1962; by Yōgo Shibamura of Chemical Economic Institute, etc.), *Indo no Kin'yū Seido* (Financial System in India, 1962; by Hiroo Hirota of Bank of Tokyo, etc.), *Indo no Kikai Kōgyō to Bōeki Kōzō* (India's Machinery Industries and Trade Structure, 1961; by Kōsaku Tachibana of Federation of Japanese Machinery Industry Associations, etc.), *Indo no Shōkibō Kōgyō* (India's Small-Scale Industries, 1962; by Terumaru Inoue of National Economic Research Institute, etc.), *Indo no Keizai Kaihatsu to Kōgyō Ritchi* (Economic Development and Industrial Location in India, 1961; by Genzaburō Shirayama of Kantō Gakuin University, etc.), and others.

The Cotton industry and the iron and steel industry, which are some of the most important industries in India and which also have a considerable interest for Japanese, have been made the subjects of study in such works as: Minoru Tanaka (Kureha Spinning Co.), *Indo Mengyō Ron* (India's Cotton Industry, Diamond Publishing Co., 1958), Kiyoshi Matsui (Kyōto University) and others, *Nichi-In Mengyō Kōshō Shi* (Indo-Japanese Economic Relations Revolving around Cotton Trade, Institute of Asian Economic Affairs, 1960), Kawasaki (Japan Iron and Steel Industry League) and others, *Indo no Tekkōgyō* (Iron and Steel Industry in India, Institute of Asian Economic Affairs, 1960), *Keizai Hatten Katei ni okeru Indo Tekkōgyō* (Iron and Steel Industry in the Process of India's Economic Development, Mitsubishi Economic Research Institute, 1960), and others.

It is expected that with the ever increasing volume of these works as well as others not cited here, studies of the Indian economy in Japan will advance both in their scope and in the number and quality of the researchers.

4. POSTWAR RESEARCHES IN JAPAN ON THE ECONOMIES OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN COUNTRIES OTHER THAN INDIA

Sadao Morita

Before and during World War II, there had been in Japan a traditional current in the studies on the actual conditions of the economies of Southeast Asian countries. The termination of the war, however, discontinued this tra-

ditional current, hampering the accumulation of continued studies in this field. It is only in comparatively recent years that comprehensive and empirical studies began to be conducted systematically and extensively once again.

It may be said that although interest in and study of these areas had always been in existence, a certain change in objective circumstances was required to motivate the establishment of a large-scale and systematic organization for conducting more detailed studies. By the words "a certain change" is meant that the relations between Japan and those countries with which ties were broken by the War, became newly adjusted, Japan's political and economic position was recovered, and it became possible for Japan to take the initiative to create new relations.

To make a general review of the studies on the actual economic conditions of Southeast Asian countries in recent years, the writer here intends primarily to examine a number of the studies published by the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs. For, it is an undeniable fact that the establishment of the Institute symbolizes the revival of the studies on Southeast Asian areas in Japan and that the Institute organized and enlisted the majority of outstanding researchers in prewar and postwar years, establishing itself as one of the biggest centres of studies in this field. The joint research groups which the Institute has recently organized, and whose results are being published, comprise a fairly large part, if not all, of the researchers in this field, and it may safely be said that they represent the current trends and standards of the studies in this field. It is true that there are many research groups and individual researchers in various universities and private research institutes that have no connection with the Institute, but few of the results of their studies have been published. Moreover, the establishment and activities of the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs doubtless paved the way for the promotion and strengthening of their research activities.

Prior to the establishment of the Institute, data concerning the Asian countries, particularly those other than India, had been very scarce, and the requirements for the full-scale enforcement of detailed studies on the social and economic situation of the individual countries had been hardly met. Up to that time researchers had tended either to make detailed studies confined to one specific sphere within a limitation of available data, or to merely trace political and economic phenomena, groping for what lies behind those phenomena. As the political and economic changes which have taken place or are taking place in those countries are so extensive and drastic, it has become an important task for researchers to inform the people about the situations even in such countries that had attracted little interest in prewar days, by tracing those changes and outlining the trends lying behind them. Therefore, we may say that it was in response to the reasonable request of the society that many experts made strenuous efforts along this line. However, all the researchers became aware, regardless of their standpoints, that they must not be content with the task of merely tracing current phenomena. Thus, it was a natural course of events that such an organization with a large fund as the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs should have become the centre of

research activities in this field. In the studies recently published there are two different trends: One is to deal directly with economic development projects which are the concentrated manifestation of the changes taking place in the developing countries, making detailed and comprehensive studies on them from as many angles as possible; the other is to inquire into fundamental factors lying in the socio-economic structures of those countries that are hampering such projects of national importance.

Burma no Keizai Kaihatsu (Economic Development of Burma, Research Report Series No. 14, Tokyo: Institute of Asian Economic Affairs, 1961) is a fairly well arranged work belonging to the former type. It is the product of combined research efforts, extending over eighteen months, of seven researchers (Noboru Yamamoto, Yoshimichi Magoshi, Katsu Yanaiharu, Kazuo Saitō, Shigeru Tamura, Akira Ōnishi, and Yamato Kawakami) under the leadership of Professor Noboru Yamamoto of Keiō University. The book tries to analyze the substance and process of the economic development projects of the Federal Republic of Burma carried out for more than ten years, as well as to point out the problems involved in the development programme. In this book the outline of the progress of development projects is given first, and then follows the comment that the development programme ended in failure. Perhaps this comment itself offers no particularly new problem. The first two year plan was not enforced. The Pyidawtha Plan which must have been tackled with great ambition, proved difficult to carry out due to the lack of foreign currencies, and was eventually replaced by the Revised Four-Year Plan, which considerably deviated from the fundamental policy and character of the original plan. In this respect alone, it is obvious that the programme was a failure. Therefore, the authors are right in their assessment. But, what constitutes this "failure"? By what and in what respects was it caused? These questions have not been satisfactorily answered, although they are of real importance. The failure of the programme is generally regarded ascribable to its being over ambitious and to the hasty industrialization by means of government enterprises at which it had aimed. In addition, there has been a tendency to discuss these causes in relation to the nationalistic and racialistic character of the development projects which was stronger than in India, as well as to the policy of making political and economic approaches to the Soviet bloc countries, which were adopted in advance of other developing countries. Is such a view right? How shall we consider these problems? This report does not intend to give direct answers to these questions, but, instead, it confines itself to finding out the causes of the failure in the development programme of Burma by making objective and scientific analyses on as many data as possible. This attitude is held consistently through the whole volume, and it may be said that it has succeeded to some degree in offering objective data as a basis for obtaining answers to the above questions.

In the first place, as the final evaluation of the programme, the volume examines the results of the programme in the light of its general framework as well as the figures based on the calculation of the gross national product. It has been made clear thereby that the development programme of Burma

has achieved an investment rate which is extremely high, perhaps the highest of all the developing countries, and that, nevertheless, the gross national product barely surpassed the prewar level in the fiscal 1959-60, being 20% short of the programme's target. This shows a sharp contrast with the case of the Philippines as dealt with in *Firippin no Kin'yū to Shihon Keisei* (The Finance and Capital Formation in the Philippines, Research Report Series No. 10, Tokyo: the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs, 1961). This report is the result of a joint study conducted by seven researchers including Tatsuo Futamura, Tsutomu Takigawa, Yuzuru Itō, Masakichi Itō, Yoshio Hirota, Tetsuo Matsumuro, under the leadership of Professor Keinosuke Baba of Hitotsubashi University. According to this report, the Philippines attained the increase in national income greater than that of Burma in the course of its economic development with an extremely low rate of gross capital formation (9.08% for the year 1948-57; in Burma 19.8% for the period from 1950/51 to 1959/60).

Of all Southeast Asian countries, the Philippines had the least degree of government interference in economy, having attained development mainly through the initiative and capacity of private enterprises (the ratio of public investments to the total investments being the smallest).

Therefore, the contrast between Burma and the Philippines is liable to be taken as a further proof of the correctness of the general view on the causes of the failure above mentioned. Such contrasting results of the programmes in the two countries were dealt with in the report of the first session of the Conference of Asian Economic Planners of ECAFE, in which some references were made in general to the causes of these results. By these research reports we are able to get more detailed and comprehensive information on this problem. Particularly, *Biruma no Keizai Kaihatsu* (The Economic Development of Burma) deals with and tries to elucidate this problem as its main theme. Let us therefore quote the conclusion of this report.

The high rate of investment of Burma was achieved by public investment. Accordingly, the ratio of the national finance to the national income is remarkably large when compared with the case of other developing countries, being at a level with Britain where such ratio is among the largest in all advanced countries. The extremely large portion of this stupendous finance is covered by the revenue from foreign trade. The main source of annual revenue, other than customs duties, is a contribution from the profits on the monopoly by State Agricultural Marketing Board and other governmental organs of the purchase and export of major export items such as rice. (This contribution has the nature of an export custom duty.) This state monopoly of the transactions of agricultural products produced considerable profits as the prices of products purchased from farmers were fixed at extremely low levels, and the international transactions of rice in the early years of the programme had the nature of a seller's market. The foundation for carrying out the "ambitious" programme was formed by the Government being able to secure ample funds. However, as a natural result of the policy to have the national finance based on the export of such monocultural primary products, a marked instability of national revenues eventually took place, and the decrease of contributions as a financial resource owing to the transition

of rice trade to the buyer's market upset the financing plan of the government. Thus, there came a usual set of events—the cumulation of financial deficits, aggravation of inflation, increase in imports, and the foreign currency crisis. Finally, the government was forced to amend the Pyidawtha Plan, and to change its financing plan so as to depend largely on external funds, with the keynote of the plan, to promote industrialization by way of public enterprises, being altered at the same time.

It must be noted, however, that there was almost no difference between the gross investment rates before and after the amendment of the plan, and that Burma has been maintaining till quite recently a high rate of capital formation unparalleled in other developing countries since the early 1950's. In this connection, however, the following facts must not be forgotten: the gross investment rate which had been lower than the gross national savings rate up to a certain time, surpassed the latter around 1956-57 period when the Pyidawtha Plan was amended; after that time, the domestic savings fund proved insufficient to finance investments, and the high investment rate could only be maintained with the help of external funds. Thus, the conversion from seller's market to buyer's market in rice transactions was first witnessed (in around 1952), and secondly, an inflational deficit covering policy had to be adopted on account of financial difficulties (in 1954), and then finally the plan was amended (in fiscal 1956-57). It becomes clear that this amendment of the plan indicated such a change in the financial situation that with financial funds run short and public investment declined, the gross investment rate was barely maintained by external funds including the reparation from Japan; in other words, it implied a reverse of the balance between savings and investments. Further, this reverse overlapped the reverse in the shares of the government and private enterprises in the gross investment.

A further account of the financial situation of Burma is given as follows: In Burma, by taking command of the marketing field of rice farming which is a major industry, the government became able to absorb a considerable portion of the surplus produced by the domestic economy (even though there remained without doubt much potential surplus), which constituted a basis for maintaining the high rate of investment. Despite the continuance of such a high rate of investment, the growth of the national income was not satisfactory on account of the low efficiency of investment, and the ratio of the economic surplus which was to be a basis for this high investment rate diminished. It can be said that the report has made these points fairly clear by referring to as many statistical data as available, and that it threw much light on the peculiar character of the programme as well as the reason why it ended in failure.

What, then, is responsible for the unusually low efficiency of investment due to an unusually high investment rate which constituted the failure of the programme? The authors of this report try to answer this question by examining the substances and results of the fund disbursement programme as a whole, the agricultural plan, and the industry and mining plan. As a conclusion, the authors point out the following facts: Neglect in the development programme of agriculture which yields the major part of economic surplus;

the priority for investment given to unproductive sectors (security and defence for the government; house construction for private enterprises); the low rate of operation of equipment in newly established enterprises due to the insufficient coordination of the programme as a whole; an extraordinary inefficiency in running the state enterprises. We must not expect, however, that by these analyses the authors will make a decisive evaluation, either affirmative or negative, of the formula for promoting industrialization mainly through government enterprises. While the authors point out that the neglect of agriculture was a grave defect in the programme from the viewpoint that what is really important is the diversified economic development with an adequate balance between agriculture and industry, they do not ascribe the failure of the programme to the excessive investment in industry. Also they point out the remarkable inefficiency of public enterprises, but, on the other hand, they admit the necessity for such investments made by the government in direct productive activities. Such inconsistencies may come partly from the different theoretical viewpoints of the respective authors which do not necessarily agree in conclusion, but it may be said that as far as our present purpose is concerned, their standpoints are reasonable, and have made a certain contribution to the study in this field.

In order to answer the question of greatest interest both practically and theoretically—that is: “What is the most appropriate formula of economic development in contemporary less-developed countries?,” it would be necessary to conduct more positive studies of the actual conditions as well as development projects of yet more of these countries. In this respect, the Philippines, whose situation forms a contrast with that of Burma as was stated earlier in this review, should evoke one’s research interest, although, of course, a hasty answer should not in any case be sought. The *Firippin no Kin’yū to Shihon Keisei* takes up the relation of the investment ratio with the capital-output ratio which presents itself as an opposite case from that of Burma. But since the report is chiefly concerned with the problems of the financial system and capital formation, rather than with the whole structure of economic growth, its analytical attention is directed to such aspects as the extraordinarily low rate of investment in the Philippines. The report tries to clarify both positive and negative effects upon the capital formation of the peculiar structure of an economy which has long been tied up with U. S. economy. It is interesting to note that the report points out that the peculiar economic structure of the Philippines has resulted in an underestimation of the investment rate in that country. More precisely, the par value of the peso is pegged to the U. S. dollar at a level far exceeding the actual value of the former, resulting in an undervaluation of capital equipments, for import of which the Philippines depends mostly on the U. S. However, even if the peso value was adjusted to its actual standing, the new investment ratio would still bring about a considerably high investment efficiency, as the report points out. A low rate of investment with a high efficiency of investment may be characteristic of all less-developed countries, but this seems to be a theme which is yet to be delved into in more empirical studies.

While the above two reports are the results of joint studies organized by

the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs concerning the two Southeast Asian countries each representing extremely different types of development programmes, the same Institute also published research works which attempt to throw light on the problems of social structures underlying those national efforts for economic development of less-developed countries, namely *Indonesia no Seiji Shakai Kōzō* (Politico-Social Structure of Indonesia, *Chōsa Kenkyū Hōkoku Sōsho*, or Research Report Series, No. 13, 1961) and *Maraya no Kakyō to Inkyō* (Chinese and Indians in Malaya, the same series, No. 8, 1961).

Although in Asian and African countries, which became independent after the war, the national consciousness has somehow risen to maturity through resistance to the Western colonial rules, a substantial basis for a nation as an integrated entity does not always exist. This fact, which is connected inseparably with their economic underdevelopment or the lack of an integrated domestic market, manifests itself in the form of peculiar duality or plurality in economic as well as social structures in Southeast Asian countries. Malaya is typical of such examples, and the *Maraya no Kakyō to Inkyō*, the result of a joint study by Hiroshi Matsuo (chairman), Naosaku Uchida, Ryōzō Kurai, Masahiko Saigō, Teruhisa Sasaki, and Taku Suyama, gives a detailed account of the situation in which three peculiar types of community formed by Europeans, Chinese, and Malays are supported by a "modern capitalistic economy", a "pre-modern capitalistic economy", and a "deformed self-sufficient economy" respectively, a fact which may be called a triple economic structure. Of particular interest is the part of the report which is devoted to the study of "Pan" that forms a nucleus of the Chinese community. This report seems to indicate that although there obtains a political stability in Malaya under the state power primarily based on the Malays, a true national integration of a racially plural country would only be realized after the triple economic structure was dissolved through efforts for the modernization of national economy.

In Indonesia, on the other hand, a stable political power has failed to emerge since the Independence, which makes it difficult to carry on effectively a consistent programme of economic development. The *Indonesia no Seiji Shakai Kōzō* by Yoichi Itagaki (chairman), Terutarō Nishino, Iwao Ariyoshi, Atou Masuda, Shigeo Miyayama, and Kōichi Kishi, takes out four basic factors underlying the process of political instability in Indonesia, namely, "Daerahism", "Sukuism", the Communist Party of Indonesia, and the military. The report brings to light these four subjects as well as the "Guided Democracy" which is presented as a solution of the political difficulties in that country. While the view that the above five factors are the most important determinants of the political trend in Indonesia may leave room for debate, it would be justified to consider that such factors as "Suku" and "Daerah" (a sort of regional community ties based on traditional customs) constitute a considerable influence in the process of forming an economically integrated national entity that is a central objective of the political activities of the Indonesian people, who are struggling against colonialism for a complete national independence. In this sense, the advancement of studies in such aspects of Indonesian society which is attempted by this report should be

quite welcome, for without fully inquiring into such factors one can hardly hope to have a correct outlook on the questions of national independence, accomplishment of unification, and social modernization of Indonesia.

Finally, the writer, may bring to the reader's notice one of the works produced outside the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs, namely, *Ajia ni okeru Nōgyō Kōzō no Henkaku Katei* (Process of Changes in the Agricultural Structures in Asia, Economic Institute of Osaka Municipal University, 1960), which is the result of a joint study by Hikosaku Ozaki, Kenkichi Honda, Hisatarō Yamada, Hyōe Kubo, Akira Fujimoto, and Akio Sugino, all members of the Institute's staff. This study makes inquiries into the problems of land reforms in India, Burma, Indonesia, and North Viet Nam. A study such as this no doubt belongs to the first of the two groups of studies mentioned earlier, since the land problems have important bearings upon the institutional factors which fundamentally condition the economic development of these countries. This report takes the position that the reform in land systems is the most important prerequisite to the transformation of closed agricultural communities, the creation of an integrated domestic market and a modern industrialization in less-developed countries; thus it constitutes a most fundamental step towards removing obstacles in the way of economic development of these countries. In its attempt to characterize the task of institutional reforms faced by these countries, the report seems to single out the tendency toward encouraging producer's cooperatives in the course of land reforms as an important feature common to all of these countries. In other words, the state-capitalistic policies taken by the governments of Burma, Indonesia, and India in implementing their development plans are, as the report sees it, manifested in the form of cooperativization in agriculture. The view is also expressed that the inevitability of the development of agriculture along this line lies deep in the Asiatic and colonial nature of the agricultural structures in these countries. However, while this attempt at a joint study in this sort of problem with such a broad perspective is no doubt worth praising, one may say that the report is but a first step, leaving much to be worked on in the future.

Now, having introduced five research reports on Southeast Asian economies, the writer hopes to have somehow given an outline of a part, if not all, of the recent Southeast Asian studies in Japan. It must be admitted that we are only in an initial stage of positive study in this realm which should be based on primary and basic materials, since our studies are still dependent mostly on the literature available in Japan. However, as an increasing number of scholars and experts are being trained in universities and research institutions throughout Japan, one may well expect a rapid advance of studies with a variety of standpoints.