

opposition can be avoided by the pseudo-psychological device of the *nade*. An absence of a feeling of *nade* implies an absence of opposition on the issue under discussion.

If I may conclude by criticizing the author, I should like to state that in spite of the interesting theory he has propounded, he has completely failed to illustrate it with sufficient actual case studies. What has always interested me very much in the study of Japanese society is the numerous cases in which Japanese do *not* behave in a stereotyped fashion according to the theory that those higher in a hierarchy completely control their juniors. Japanese progressive industrial management is filled with examples of junior members of the industrial hierarchy taking fundamental decisions sometimes without reference to their superiors. My personal opinion is that once one has entered a Japanese business firm, the level of management about five years after graduation has a much greater degree of responsibility than in an equivalent Western firm. It seems almost as though once the individual in the hierarchy accepts the principles of Japanese business, he is free to do what he wishes provided he does not openly try to overthrow the system. The formal system and the actual behaviour are a long way removed from each other. This is the fundamental criticism against such foreigners as Benedict or Abegglen. They mistook the form of Japanese society for the behaviour of its members.

Although I have never worked in Burma, I deeply suspect that the Burmese are not so dissimilar from the Japanese insofar as they will always *explain* their behaviour in terms of concepts such as *kan* (in Burma) or *on* or *giri* (in Japan) but in fact behave in accordance with the actual situation. It is thus very important for any anthropologist or sociologist working in Burma or Japan to give numerous examples where the same principles operating in a different (or even the same) situation may have a different conclusion. Hardly a single example of actual behaviour is given by the author, so that the whole book appears much more tidy than, I suspect, the Burmese really are. (*William Newell*)

V. V. BALABUSHEVICH & A. M. DYAKOV eds., *A Contemporary History of India*, New Delhi, People's Publishing House, 1964, viii+585 pp.

This study stands as a brief history of, or an introduction to, contemporary India worked out by the outstanding India study group in the USSR. The historical stage dealt with in this book covers a time-span of about 35 years, starting from the end of World War I and extending to 1955, by which time India had been independent for some time. The main emphasis of the analysis is put on the political aspect of Indian history with the economic development during the same period as a foreground, or, more concretely, on the co-relationships between the national independence movement led by the

Indian National Congress and the national liberation movement under the hegemony of the workers and peasants.

As is pointed out in the Foreword, there have been published many studies and papers on specific problems and phenomena falling within the modern or contemporary history of India, but there has been no concrete and coherent work to cover a whole process of Indian history in contemporary times yet. On the other hand, the traditional Oriental Studies of Western Europe, including those in the United Kingdom, have been developing a curious tendency to neglect or ignore the modern or contemporary stage of Indian history, and even when attempts are made to cover this very part of it, it has seldom been given a proper position in the whole perspective. Merit of this study, therefore, is due to such attitude maintained by an India study group of the USSR as to fill a kind of vacuum state prevalent in the study of Indian history both in and out of Soviet Russia.

This book consists of seven parts: the first through the fourth deal with the inter-war period, while Part V describes World War II and India. Part VI covers the period extending from the end of World War II to India's political independence, and the last Part (VII) pursues the political as well as economic process since 1945. Excepting Part VI, each part contains political analysis on the one hand, and economic analysis on the other, each by a different scholar.

As for a number of positive significances this book has in the historical study of modern and contemporary India, the commentator will reserve his remarks to the concluding portion of his comment. To begin with, it is preferable to touch upon some of the problematic or irritating points raised in this book.

Firstly, there hardly exists any disagreement in their synchronizing the mass anti-imperialist movement lead by Mahatma Gandhi with the starting-line of the contemporary history of India, but the very aspect that the Russian Revolution in 1917 could claim for its due importance and significance upon the Indian people primarily because it worked upon the ideas and action of Gandhi through the mediation of the ideal, concept, or promise of "Self-Determination" upheld by Wilson's Fourteen Points, is very much blurred in the present book. It is already an established view among historians today in Japan that the Fourteen Points adhered to by Wilson at the beginning of 1918 were deceitful draperies to camouflage the wistful desire of "Self-Defense" on the part of Western Powers which had under their control millions of colonial and semi-colonial nations susceptible to infection by the October Revolution. Together with Sun Yat-sen of China, Gandhi of India harboured such big expectations towards the ideal hoisted by Wilson that when he came to realize that the promise of Wilson was dishonoured by the signing of Versailles Treaties and Sèvres Treaty, Gandhi in fact directed very severe criticism towards Wilson through the *Young India*, his organ-magazine. It is deemed necessary to bring the truth home that the co-relationships between

the October Revolution and the national independence movement in India came to develop via Wilson's Fourteen Points.

Secondly, about the year of the foundation of the Communist Party of India. In this book it is maintained that a group of Indian Communists was organized abroad at the beginning of 1920's and, after overcoming various oppressions by the imperialistic British raj, the Communist Party of India was formally founded in 1926 (pp. 154-156). However, the CPI recently published in its organ-magazine, *New Age*, that the foundation day of the Party was December 28, 1925.¹ Irresponsible or speculative determination of the year of foundation of CPI is prevalent in the relevant books of the West, and it is understood to be of no mean academic value to arrive at the most authentic timing of the foundation of CPI and to study the reasons why such confusion had to take place, if possible, with reliable data to evidence such disagreement.

Thirdly, some remarks are called for as to the national question. Modern or contemporary India is defined in this study as an integrated body of multi-national composition and its analysis goes that the Indian nation consists of different nationalities, such as the Bengali, Maratha, Malayali, etc., while giving importance to the national struggles by each nationality in realization of the linguistic State. Though it is beyond doubt that two concepts of *Нация* (Nachiya, Nation) and *Народность* (Narodnosch, Nationality) are being applied to modern India, with the theory of developmental stages at its back which says that, from the historical viewpoint, a nationality is more backward than a nation. The commentator himself considers that the modern India is an integral body of multi-national formation and, particularly since 1947, it is a multi-nation State in the making. Properly evaluating the viewpoint or standpoint of this study as far as the above argument is concerned, he cannot hurriedly agree with the standpoint of this study which defines Bengali, Gujurati, Punjabi and others as so many different nationalities. In April, 1923, on the occasion of the 12th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Stalin made a surprising report that "in India there exist more than 800 nationalities."² Admitting the existence of a decisive difference between the definition made by Stalin and the definition adopted in this study, readers cannot easily follow this shift of the concept. Provided that the theoretical development has been made in this direction among the Russian scholars, it must be made clear the concept concerning nationality and also is wise to avoid the use of terminology in a rather vague way. In the commentator's opinion, Bengali, Maharashtraiya, Malayali and more than ten such sub-national or linguistic nations consist of the inner elements of the multi-national framework of contemporary India. Of course, he does not deny the fact that contemporary India has within itself a couple of nationalities such as Santali in the North and the Toda in the South. In his mind, however, sub-nation which inherits the common mother-tongue of Marathi is to be described as Marathi or Maharashtraiya, because Maratha generally stands for a specific caste-group immediately below Brahman in social position,

specializing in the martial and agricultural professions within Maharashtra.

Fourthly, about the evaluation of Jawaharlal Nehru, the national leader and the first Prime Minister of India. In this book, Nehru himself is evaluated not independently of the Government of India with the National Congress as the Government Party. Disintegration of the colonial system and succeeding advancement of the newly emerging nation-States has been dramatic enough since World War II. But such development does not necessarily mean that State power lost all of a sudden its essential nature as the apparatus for oppression and its mechanism of class-subjugation and the suffocation of national aspirations. The distance between the national leader of a newly emerging State and the State power in his hand ultimately corresponds to the transition of the class-relationships within the country and, therefore, depends on the historical conditions ruling in the specific nation-State. As long as no differentiation is made between the ideas and action of the leader himself on the one hand, and the mechanism of the power-apparatus on the other, the same unwarranted argument will follow that the parliamentary democratic system of the bourgeoisie State by itself guarantees the full life and expression of the parliamentary democratic idea in that country.

Fifth is the agricultural and peasant problem in India since 1947. Unfortunately, there is no crystal-clear definition of the characteristics of the agricultural and peasant problem which consists of the basic entity of contemporary India and, in particular, that of rent in the post-independence stage. Did the land-reform undertaken by the Congress Government since the first-half of the 1950's root out the colonial and semi-feudal exploitative relationships from India? Or, was its concrete form in terms of semi-feudal rent prior to 1947 completely done away with? Is it simply that "the influence of the feudal landlord class has been undermined" and "an impetus has been given to the development of capitalism in agriculture (with all its concurrent phenomena)"? (p.466) Nobody will deny that the land-reform effected by the Congress Government expelled the intermediary class and in some States in northern India the actual tillers (tenants) are now in contractual relationships with the State. But, from an all-India viewpoint, this is still an exceptional case and the overwhelming majority of actual producers are still standing directly against the landlord class, and the rent which embodies the agricultural productive relationships is still categorically a semi-feudal rent. This is the understanding of the commentator. In this connexion, it is to be seriously taken note of that the platform of the CPI³ and even that of the rightwing Communist Party⁴ in India, advocates the annihilation of semi-feudal vestiges from India as the first and foremost task for Indian Communists.

Lastly, the original text of this book was the Russian edition published at Moscow in 1959. In the process of its translation into English in 1964 a number of corrections and deletions were made, but without any mention of them. Minute or detailed foot-noting concerning the corrected parts must

surely be accepted as common-sense by the authors, as well as by the editors of any academic publication. Moreover, the study in this book falls short at 1955 and, admitting that the study of contemporary history has as its fundamental task the presentation of historical perspectives on the footing of the analysis of current situations, readers will have to regret that this English edition does not have any additional part covering the period of almost ten years since 1955. The commentator again wonders why in 1964 the original Russian text could have been translated only into English, and where is the positive significance of such undertakings. If this book is really meant for the contemporary Indians, it should have first appeared in a Hindi edition as Hindi, being the official language of India, enjoys the biggest literary population today. People may sarcastically take this English translation of a Russian text as a kind of mild insult to the Indian people. Of course, the ultimate responsibility will fall on other people's heads rather than on the authors' but, simultaneously, this reveals the serious nature of the political significance given to the linguistic problem in India.

In spite and irrespective of some doubts and problems mentioned in the above, this book stands as a pioneer's attempt to describe contemporary India in the form of a history, and does surpass in a beautiful manner a series of Indian studies made by members of the Marxist camp such as Rajani Palme Dutt. In this sense, this is an elaborated work very brilliant in its achievement, really worth-while for the full attention of all the students of contemporary India throughout the world. Flexible and resilient analysis and description of the historical facts revealed in this book show surprising change or development from those of Russian works on India a decade ago. For instance, the Akali Movement of the Sikhs, the activities of the Workers and Peasant Party, the organization of All-India Kisan Sabhs, and the upsurge of anti-imperialist, anti-feudal struggles on the eve of the Indian independence, etc., are extremely elastically and resiliently dealt with, and the sound and empirical attitude as such has been steadily maintained all through the study in this book. The documents and materials in the Hindi language and other Indian tongues are very extensively made use of. It is quite refreshing and relieving to the general readers to find that the unhappy practice of quoting—sometimes almost unnecessarily—the remarks of Lenin or Stalin at every and each turn of page is now completely gone in this book. (*Heiji Nakamura*)

NOTES

- 1 GPI Central Secretariat's Statement, "Foundation Day of Communist Party of India," *New Age Weekly*, Vol. XI, No. 23 (June 9, 1963), p. 16.
- 2 Dhirendranath Sen, *Revolution by Consent?*, Calcutta, Vidyodaya Library Private Ltd. 1947, p. 189.
- 3 *Programme of the Communist Party of India Adopted by the Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of India*, Calcutta, October 31-November 7, 1964, p. 43.
- 4 *The Programme of the Communist Party of India as Adopted by the Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of India*, Bombay, December 13-23, 1964, published in New Delhi, 1965, p. 25.