he at least presents an internally consistent set of data. But not Allinson. He in fact, accepts the Waseda University’s study of Kariya power structure, which was based upon Hunter’s reputational technique, as an accurate portrait of the community power structure. How can he do that when the two approaches are irreconcilable without explanation to support his daring position? I failed to see any resemblance to Dahl’s study of community power structure in this book. Instead, Allinson focuses on how some political figures rose to their positions and the role of Toyota Motors in Kariya.

His analysis appears to be only a series of speculations made without any supportive systematic, empirical evidence or model. For example, it is impossible to tell whether he is reporting an observation of events, reporting on what some people said, or speculating because of blurring by his fuzzy writing (See pp. 129-130 and p. 190). For example, he offers an explanation for workers’ docility on page 129. In the first place, from whose point of view are they “docile?” What are the sources to support his explanations? The author’s problem is that he does not recognize his own biases which inevitably creep into his writing.

Finally, he does not appear to make any substantive contribution to Japan Studies and Urban Studies. His most “significant” conclusion, which appears in the last paragraph of the book, is that “modern societies are not converging.” Cultural and environmental variable produce different societies and politics in industrial societies. One needs not read this book to know that not all industrial societies are alike. His promise to study “all social groups” fell far short of the promised. The book is filled with the descriptions of Toyota’s role in Kariya’s development and of socially prominent people. He claims that the source of entries in Table 16 on page 198 to be from pp. 350-351 of the Shakaikagakutokyu (June 1965) when, in fact, they are taken from Table 13 on page 349 of the same journal. Furthermore, Professor Akimoto’s first name is Ritsuo and not Ritsutaro.

In short, the book does not have much to offer in terms of substance unless one happens to be interested in how Toyota influenced the government of Kariya, barren as is its theoretical contribution, and flatusent in its methodological orientation. Therefore, one has no choice but to conclude that the book is nothing but a flash in the pan at best, if not outright harmful to students in the field of Japan studies or that of urban studies.

University of Hawaii
Honolulu, U.S.A.


Japan ruled as a colonial power in East Asia for half a century, beginning with the takeover of Taiwan (Formosa) in 1895. Yet relatively few scholarly studies have dealt with Japanese colonialism. Major colonial efforts in Taiwan, Korea, and Manchuria, undertaken by the first Asian state to carve out a colonial empire in modern times, thus remain little known in comparison to ventures carried out by western colonial powers elsewhere in Asia and Africa. E. Patricia Tsurumi has attempted to remedy this oversight by writing a pioneering account of Japanese colonial education in Taiwan. As
stated in her preface, she endeavors to help tell the story of Japan as a colonial power and to contribute to the study of comparative colonialism.

The basic portion of Professor Tsurumi's study of colonial education is contained in the first five chapters. Here the institutional development of the Japanese educational system in Taiwan is carefully treated in conjunction with colonial policies, key Japanese authorities, and major issues that influenced this development. The first chapter reveals that Meiji leaders, after acquiring this first colony, began to construct a colonial school system patterned after the Meiji model. Elementary education, designed to enlighten, discipline, indoctrinate, and provide practical training, was introduced and gradually extended in Taiwan while, in contrast, forms of secondary and higher education was restricted within the colony as in the home country.

Chapter Two presents an excellent account of the groundwork for colonial education laid in Taiwan over the first ten years of Japanese rule. The educational policies and achievements of this period were primarily the products of two influential civil authorities, Izawa Shūji, who served as Taiwan's ranking educational official under the first three governors-general, and Gotō Shimpei, the chief of civil affairs serving Kodama Gentarō, the colony's effective fourth governor-general (1896-1906). Izawa initially founded an ill-fated Japanese language school then, in 1896, opened a number of Japanese language institutes. Gotō, during his eight-year period of service, developed a larger and many-faceted educational system comprised of common schools (kōgakkō) for Taiwanese youths and primary schools for the children of Japanese residents, as well as limited normal and middle school facilities and a medical school. These two figures did not entirely agree as to policy. Izawa stressed more equal treatment of Taiwanese, certain that their assimilation with the Japanese would inevitably take place. Gotō, less confident about the chances of successful assimilation, developed educational tracks that more sharply separated Taiwanese from Japanese students and fostered inequality on all levels of public schooling. In effect, he geared Taiwan's educational policy to the economic needs and lifestyle of the new colony where practices of discrimination and segregation had been readily adopted by the resident Japanese ruling class.

The administrations of the next two governors-general (1906-18) built upon the foundations laid by Kodama and Gotō, as described in Chapter Three. The common school system was expanded and upgraded. However, Japanese language and ethics continued to be stressed, and major revisions of the curriculum evidenced a consistent colonial policy to impart vocational training to Taiwanese students. The limited normal and medical school facilities constituted the "two main safety valves" in Taiwan by which a small number of educated Taiwanese might rapidly advance themselves socially. Frustrated by the narrow educational opportunities available to them, Taiwanese in increasing numbers went to Japan to seek education under less discriminatory conditions. Meanwhile, the island's Chinese private schools, the shōbō, continued to compete with the Japanese common schools and offer a more traditional type of schooling to Taiwanese youths, despite strict government controls and declining enrollments.

Chapter Four deals with the 1918-23 period when colonial policy statements underwent considerable change. During these years both Akashi Motojirō, the last of Taiwan's early military governors-general, and Den Kenjirō, the island's first civilian governor-general, espoused assimilation policies in order to prepare the colony for closer integration with the home country. Akashi was responsible for the education rescript of 1919 which upgraded all existing post-primarily facilities in Taiwan and added several new ones. His reform increased Taiwanese educational opportunities,