

dōzoku as a local corporate group is maintained by the superior economic and social status of the main household against the branch households. The degree of effectiveness and of institutionalization of *dōzoku* shows considerable variations according to an individual *dōzoku*, as well as to a given period of an individual *dōzoku*. These mostly depend on the character of the leadership and of the economic base of the main household, and also with the historical and economic situations of a village community.

Unlike a lineage system, the *dōzoku* organization does not cover the whole society: it tends to be found among the population of the upper and middle sector of a village community. And the development of a *dōzoku* seems to be related to a particular historical and economic situation of a community: under a fairly closed and stable economic system, yet provides substantial resources which make possible to accumulate wealth for some members of the community, but restricts the members to have alternative economic means other than to depend on a given limited resources within the community. Though the *dōzoku* institution does not cover the all population, *dōzoku* found in any locality in Japan reveals the common structure. This fact has dictated me to deal with *dōzoku* as one of the most significant institutions for the kinship study in Japan. In my view, the *dōzoku* structure manifests the crucial elements of the underlying native kinship ideology in Japanese society.

A Study of the Industrial Policy of the Indian National
Congress before and after the Independence, 1947.

by Masanori KOGA

Recently the problem of state capitalism has been discussed from the various viewpoints. Generally, the state capitalism of the so-called

underdeveloped countries is appreciated, because it promotes rapidly the independent development of industry. But does the state capitalism of the underdeveloped countries promote the industry always independently? How should it be estimated in relation to the growth of class conflict?

In India, Indian bourgeoisie had grown to a certain extent in the pre-independent days, and has grown rapidly after the independence. We may say their growth has been secured and accelerated by the state capitalism itself, while some conflicts exist between them. We can't deny the dependence on the imperial countries has been deepened through the financial resources for the public and private sector. This paper is a part of a study on such problems.

There were some state enterprises in the pre-independent days, for example railways, irrigation net work, electrical generation and distribution, telephone and telegraph, broad-casting, arm and ammunition, etc. The object of such state enterprises was fundamentally to govern India more efficiently as a colonial state.

In the resolution of industrial conference in 1908 and 1911, Indian bourgeoisie already had demanded that the state should initiate to establish the new industries. It was for the first time in the resolution of the annual session of the Congress in 1929 that the industrial policy of independent India was officially taken up by the party. Two years later in Karachi session, it was decided that the national government should own and control the key industries, public utilities, minerals, inland-water and sea transportation as well as another transportation. National Planning Committee also recommended that the defence, key and public utility should be owned and managed by the state.

Various plans, such as Bombay plan, People's plan and Gandhian plan etc., were published from 1944 to 1948.

Generally speaking, these plans all admitted the necessity of industrial development and the important role of state enterprises, and demanded the growth of the public sector in industry.

But, National Planning Committee's list of industries which ought to be exclusively under the state management has been grievously curtailed, and nationalisation of industries was also postponed after ten years in the Industrial Policy of 1948. It meant that the state was coming into that of industry in which Indian bourgeoisie just did not like to enter because of their poor prospects.

Formation of Revolutionary Thought by Chang Ping-lin
—from the Reform of 1898 to the Revolution of 1911—

by Kuniyasu KONDO

Chang Ping-lin (章炳麟) who cherished a repulse against Western Imperialism as well as the win of freedom and liberty of China came to acknowledge the necessity of anti-Manchus Revolution as a preliminary step to anti-imperialism through the coup d'état of 1898 and the Boxer Outbreak.

His revolutionary thought had a definite shape after criticizing the Reform Movement and the Reformatory Thought by *Liang Ch'i-ch'ao* and *K'ang Yu-wei*. His main mission in the political field had focussed upon the creation of a new type of human being as a nucleus of the Revolutionary Movement differed from the traditional feudal gentry, while attacking fiercely the moralistic degradation of the feudal gentry; the protagonists of the Reform Movement. This new type of human being must belong to a Bōdhisattva-like revolutionary carrying the revolutionary moral.

A salient feature of his revolutionary thought lies in the following fact that he had taken more account of human being or revolutionary moral than the principle or theory of revolution. He grasped the revolution as a problem of awakening independence by individuals. His theoretical foundation was based on Buddhism (the theory of Fahsiang 法相 and the practice of Huayen 華嚴) and Chuang Tsu's C'hi-wu-lun.