

4. As mentioned before, the book shows the direction Africa should take, and for this it makes many suggestions. The reviewer, however, would like to point out the following problems.

If the forecasts made in the book are realized, Africa will overcome its economic backwardness by the beginning of next century. However, even if it could be realized (apart from the question of financing), would the African products be competitive against those of the Western countries? Would not there be a possibility of Africa remaining a market for investment goods of the more developed countries, if not a market of consumers' products as before?

Even if the international division of labour based on the principle of comparative advantage is to be realized, can the African economy develop itself within the framework of the world economy without subordinating itself to those of other countries? Especially, when discussing the industrialization of African countries, we should not miss the question of "identity". Who will realize the industrialization of Africa and how? If the industrialization is for the benefit of capital of the developed countries to maintain and seek economic returns in Africa where capital is relatively short, would the result really be beneficial to the African peoples? The book does not deal with these problems, but they are the ones which should be fully examined.

Lastly, what the reviewer would like to question is the problem of "average". Like other U.N. documents this book also uses average values in making analyses and forecasts. However, in view of the fact that Africa is the second biggest continent in the world, and most of African countries consist of multilateral economic structures organized by multi-racial societies, it seems that average figures do not exactly reflect the true substance of Africa. Therefore, average figures may even mislead us. In the future, when the analyses of the African economy are made, it is hoped that care should be taken to represent more correctly the social strata or racial structure, so that one does not form a false picture of the African economy. It is only such international organizations as are represented by the ECA which can provide the various statistical data on a unified base available for the whole Africa and evaluate them at the present moment. This is one of the reasons why we expect so much of the ECA. (*Kōji Fujita*)

GABRIEL A. ALMOND & JAMES S. COLEMAN (eds.), *The Politics of the Developing Areas*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1960, 591 p.

This study has been prepared under the editorship of G.A. Almond and J.S. Coleman, with four other contributors, namely, L.W. Pye, M. Weiner, D.A. Rustow, and G.I. Blanksten. The reviewer will concentrate his attention on the theoretical framework of this study as set out in the introductory and concluding chapters.

First of all, we should be grateful to Prof. Almond for having constructed a "theoretical framework of comparative politics which makes it possible to compare the political systems of the 'developing' areas, and compare them systematically according to a common set of categories." (p. 3) In constructing this framework, Prof. Almond examines the conceptual vocabulary of political science and that of sociological and anthropological theory, and presents seven categories resting on an "action" or "behavioral" basis. This is done under the presupposition that there are four characteristics of the political system as a whole—(1) universality of political structure, (2) universality of political functions, (3) multifunctionality of political structure and (4) the culturally mixed character of political systems. He then categorizes the input and output functions of the political system as follows: The former include (1) political socialization and recruitment, (2) interest articulation, (3) interest aggregation, and (4) political communication, while the latter include (5) rule-making, (6) rule application, and (7) rule adjudication. He concludes that "the political systems may be compared with one another in terms of the frequency and style of political functions by political structures." (p. 61)

Thus, Prof. Almond's theoretical framework of comparative politics can be summed up as follows: (1) all political systems perform political (input) functions and authoritative (output) functions, (2) these functions are performed by political structures, (3) all political systems may be compared in terms of frequency and style of political functions by political structures.

On the basis of this theoretical framework, Prof. Coleman, summarizing the studies of the developing areas (Southeast Asia, South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, the Near East, and Latin America) made by the above-mentioned four co-authors, has analysed "the range of variation among political systems and suggested propositions regarding relationships and developmental patterns in the process of modernization." (p. 532) In this chapter, Prof. Coleman sums up briefly the model characteristics of modern political systems and those of the developing areas, and, comparing them in terms of political functions, presents "functional profiles of type political systems," (p. 559)—political democracy, tutelary democracy, terminal colonial democracy, modernizing oligarchy, colonial or racial oligarchy and traditional oligarchy. This classification is based on the model of a modern political system which assumes that governmental and political functions are performed by specific structures. He says, "the distinguishing features of 'modern' politics are the greater differentiation of the secondary structures and the fact that they tend to penetrate and 'modernize' the primary structures." (p. 533) Thus, according to Prof. Coleman, the model for a modern political system is constituted by the characteristics of Western democracy, and other political systems are located respectively in accordance with the degree of competitiveness and the differences in their political functions.

Such being the content of the work, we may comment on the framework of the Almond-Coleman theory from the following viewpoints: (1) the orientation of comparative politics, (2) "action" or "behavioral" theories of

politics, (3) types of political systems in the developing areas, and (4) the political modernization of these areas.

### 1. The Orientation of Comparative Politics

It is apparent that comparative politics in America (as stated by Prof. S. Neuman in his "The Comparative Study of Politics," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Jan. 1959, pp. 105-112) has entered a period of "realism with vision" since the Second World War with two aspects in its orientation—one for finding out the uniformities, and the other for explaining the differences among the totality of political systems. Prof. Almond has set up his theoretical framework of comparative politics on the basis of the concepts of political functions derived from modern Western political systems. He has sought the uniformities of all political systems in terms of political functions and pointed out their differences in terms of the frequency and style of political functions. In this connection, I have gained the impression that Prof. Almond has been so eager to frame his general theory of comparative politics in terms of political functions that he has paid little heed to the individual political systems in their historical perspective. If a scholar makes a comparison of different political systems without taking full account of the peculiarities of each system, it is inevitable that his value concepts will provide him with an unconscious premise to his arguments. This seems to be the case with Prof. Almond, for we cannot but feel that with all his efforts to get rid of Western value concepts, he has fallen into Western parochialism in the end.

### 2. "Action" or "Behavioral" Theories of Politics.

Prof. Almond's theory of comparative politics is based on "action" or "behavior" and has the following frame of reference. All political systems may be compared in terms of *functions, structures, and the frequency and style of functions*. This frame of reference stands under the influence of Prof. T. Parsons in sociology and continues the tradition of Prof. C.E. Merriam and H.D. Lasswell in political science. The theory of "action" or "behavior" has, of course, a critical function in relation to the traditional theories which are based on legal, institutional, or philosophical frames of reference. In this respect, we must be appreciative of the efforts of Prof. Almond in constructing his unique theoretical framework based on "action" or "behavior." However, for this frame of reference to be effective as a tool of the social sciences, the meaning of "action" and the interrelation of actors must be construed in the context of the individual political systems as historically conditioned.

In Prof. Almond's work, in which little consideration is given to historical factors, the concept of a structural-functional framework seems to be less persuasive. But, on this point, we may look forward to further developments in Prof. Almond's theory, because he says in this work that "we must be even more tentative about the structural categories." (p. 62)

### 3. Types of Political System in the Developing Areas.

In the foregoing, we have mentioned that Prof. Coleman, following the theoretical framework of Prof. Almond and summarizing the studies of the developing areas, presented six types of political system in these areas. Here Western democracy is considered to be the most advanced political system and is taken as the standard for all others, while the political systems of the developing areas are classified in types ranging from political democracy to traditional oligarchy according to their value variables. In another work, Prof. Almond has classified the Soviet system as totalitarian, and analogous to Nazism in the sense that there is no free competition of interests. ("Comparative Political Systems," in *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. XVIII, Aug. 1956, pp. 403-405). But it must be pointed that he seems to have disregarded the essential differences between "socialism as the extension of political democratization to the sphere of economic power and Nazism as the reorganization of political power as an adaptation to conditions of economic oligarchy." (See Masao Maruyama, "Seiji Kenryoku" (Political Power), in the *Seijigaku Jiten* (Encyclopedia of Political Science) pp. 728-732). This means that in classifying political systems we must compare them not only in terms of political functions but also in terms of power structures. Thus, the concept of the political system without that of the power structure is not so effective.

### 4. Political Modernization in the Developing Areas.

As we have suggested already, the chief interest in regard to political modernization in the Almond-Coleman theoretical framework is how specified functions come to be performed by specified political structures. Though we are aware that such a differentiation of functions is one of the effects of political modernization, we must point out that the aspiration of the political leaders in the developing areas which are undergoing the process of modernization seems to be that of emancipating oppressed people from traditional bonds. And to achieve this, the political leaders in these areas, being in a transitional period, must bring about a concentration of political power in order to promote industrialization. The history of the advanced countries now enjoying democracy shows that they experienced something of the same kind in the past. This being so, we cannot limit the concept of political modernization to the differentiation of political functions and structures. In this connection, we may add that "the modernization of the policy-making process cannot ensure that the policies produced therefrom will be just in the light of history." (Junnosuke Masumi, *Seijiteki Kindaika* (Political Modernization), *Shiso*, April 1962, pp. 20-29) These reflections lead us to the conclusion that the Almond-Coleman theory is too much inclined to limit the concept of political modernization to differentiations of function.

We have examined four aspects of the Almond-Coleman theory, and the conclusion drawn therefrom may be summed up as follows: The Almond-Coleman theory is constructed to provide a general theory of comparative

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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