way of information they had better take stock of their operational premises and fundamental judgments. Or could this really be the level of ignorance at which China's foreign policy is conducted? Somehow I doubt it.
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Comparisons are usually hazardous because one's knowledge of the items compared is unequal. But this obstacle is to a great extent overcome in The Modernization of Japan and Russia by bringing together a number of authors whose fields of knowledge are about equally divided between the two nations. It has thus been possible to establish a fairly extensive comparison on a chronological pattern which presents the reader with facts, insights, and perspectives reflecting not merely a juxta-position of the two societies but a considered and detailed comparison of them.

The study is divided chronologically into three parts or stages of development. The first is the era which ends roughly in 1860 and deals with the heritage of the past. It is associated with the two succeeding stages structurally through a uniform set of categories such as international context, political structure, economic structure and growth, knowledge and education and others which constitute the subdivisions of each of the three periods. The second stage is entitled transformation and designates the years from approximately 1860 to 1940. Finally, there is the contemporary stage which brings the story of comparative modernization down to the 1970's.

Japan and Russia have been singled out for this comparative study because they were both successful latecomers to the process of modernization. Unlike those nations such as Britain, the United States, and others which experienced modernization earlier and at a more leisurely pace, it was characteristic of the latecomers that they were driven by a concern for national security and therefore by a sense of urgency which in turn arose from the fact that they were impressed by the greater strength of the nations already modernized. Starting from this position of a sense of military inferiority, with the help of the existing models Japan and Russia were able to meet the challenge by marshalling the necessary national capacities for rapid modernization.

The authors point to some specific characteristics which they believe made it possible for these two countries to accomplish such rapid modernization. Among these was a tradition of borrowing from abroad. Borrowing in both cases was largely from a single source, China in the case of Japan and Byzantium in the case of Russia and yet, it is noted, the borrowing was done selectively and at the choice of the borrowers. It is recognized that for several reasons, including the insularity of the country and the fact that Chinese influence continued after Byzantium had fallen to the Turks, Japan was more exclusively indebted to China than Russia was to Byzantium. But the national consciousness of both nations was influenced, though to a very different degree, by the advent of the Mongols. In this way the authors point out not only the similarities but the limitations of the similarities as well as the genuine differences and indicate to some extent the process of absorption of outside influences. Above all, differences are not simply disregarded while giving overemphasis to similarities; within the limits of space both are given due attention.
Institutional similarity was also a factor in the development of these two countries. Although the authors see pre-modern Russia as more highly developed at the national level, comparing the tsardom of Russia with the shogunate of Japan, they take note of the stronger role in government played by the territorial han of Japan as compared with the local government of Russia. By western European comparisons juridical rights of individuals never really existed in either country as a challenge to the governmental power and by the seventeenth century the competing interests of an established church had been overcome in both countries. Moreover, in both nations the populations were overwhelmingly rural and the nations enjoyed self-sufficiency in grain production though both had experienced famine. In both, also, there had been a considerable development of industry though factories in Russia were larger than in the case of Japan. In these and other ways Russia and Japan, as the authors view it, had the institutional and human capacities for adaptation to the faster pace of development which constitutes modernization.

The second stage of the development, the one devoted to the fundamental stages of modernization, spanned the years 1860-1940. Specifically, the authors see this stage introduced formally in Japan by the Meiji Restoration of 1868 and in Russia by the Great Reforms of the 1860's and after. The chief agent in these changes was in each case the central government and this was also the principal architect and instrument for the rapid transformation to the new economic and social order which followed. During this period it was Japan which had the advantages. Her losses in the Sino-Japanese war were made up by the significant victory in the Russo-Japanese war and a partial victory during and after the first world war. Russia had to balance her losses in both these wars against such things as her far greater endowment in natural resources. It should be noted that the comparison of these two nations by no means precludes their consideration as rivals.

The third and final period deals with the contemporary era and begins with these two formerly underdeveloped pre-modern economies having been transformed into advanced productive societies. Even after absorbing the destruction of the second world war, indeed in some ways because of it, these two countries were soon ready to proceed as mature economies. For their postwar rebuilding left them with the most modern productive equipment. Furthermore, even though defeat had somewhat discredited the imperial system of Japan, victory had strengthened the regime of Stalin. In time, however, the more pluralistic regime which emerged in Japan proved to be better suited to the high level of production characteristic of the contemporary era than the more rigid regime of the Soviet Union which had served the country to great advantage during the period of early industrialization and war. In general, however, by the 1970's both nations were economically approaching the level of the most highly modernized societies in the world. By that time not only were Russia and Japan respectively the nations with the second and third highest gross national product in the world but the Japanese growth rate was the highest in the world.

Two questions come to mind when one reads a well-conceived and carefully and conscientiously executed study such as the present. The first has to do with its usefulness in thinking about or dealing with the large number of recently independent nations. The authors have, of course, anticipated such a contingency and have warned against seeing in the Japanese-Russian example an automatic blueprint for other nations. They have also amply made the point that the problem must be seen in chronological perspective in that an appraisal of a nation's capacity for modernization should also take into consideration its pre-modern social, political, economic, and
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