

and supervisory frameworks) in explaining their successful transformations.

In the final part, four chapters are devoted to examining the country's record with respect to what is collectively referred to in the book as the social dimensions covering human resources, poverty, regional development, and the environment. Despite important strides in health and education (for example, in spending), rapid population growth and the lack of a strong population policy are deemed by Alejandro N. Herrin and Ernesto M. Pernia as the major stumbling blocks which must be squarely faced. Arsenio M. Balisacan investigates the nature, pattern, characteristics, and causes of poverty and inequality in the Philippines and emphasizes that the type of economic growth is as important as the rate of growth in attaining any headway. Another kind of inequality, spatial inequality, is the focus of Rosario G. Manasan and Shiladitaya Chatterjee. They examine the persistent disparities among the regions and offer concrete recommendations to address the uneven development. Ian Coxhead and Sisira Jayasuriya conclude the volume with a discussion of the state of the environment pointing out the major threats to sustainable economic development.

These twelve chapters individually and collectively lead to a better understanding of a country that is described in the opening line of the book as "one of the world's development puzzles". As a scholarly piece, there is no question that this collection is a valuable contribution to the literature. Beyond being an academic endeavour however, the volume has practical value as well. It will enable policy-makers, development planners and practitioners, and even aid agencies to gain a better grasp of both the systemic and idiosyncratic problems that need to be addressed. Through careful and critical examination of the Philippine's past economic record, this volume provides an excellent starting point for the design of mutually reinforcing policies and programmes which will hopefully contribute to achieving sustainable, durable, and equitable growth.

RAMONETTE B. SERAFICA
The ASEAN Secretariat, Jakarta

Law and Development in East and Southeast Asia. Edited by Christoph Antons. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003. Pp. 387.

Law and development discourses have and are still punctuated with suspicion, inconsistency, and pomposity. In the main, due to cultural and ideological differences among sovereign nations, a consensual terminology and methodology framework for Rule of Law seems hard to envisage. Max Weber's theory that the success of capitalism in Europe is in part attributed to "formal rational" law, which diffused governmental intervention and accordingly induced a high "calculable" and "predictable" economic environment, has not necessarily been accepted by particularly developing countries, including Asia. Indeed, the Western legal-liberalism paradigm has often been criticized as being "ethnocentric" and "imperialistic" (Trubek and Galanter 1974). To add to this quandary, today's research surrounding law and development is alarmingly dearth, particularly in the Asian context. More importantly, the law and development nexus is yet to be firmly established by both systematic qualitative and quantitative empirical evidence. Several questions remain disturbingly unanswered, among others: Is law an end to itself? Is law a means to an end? Is law a pre-condition to development? Do law and development converge or diverge? The relatively recent studies of Pistor and Wellons (1999) shed some light to such questions, but more in-depth research undertakings that include a multidisciplinary focus are urgently needed.

Fortunately, the law and development-thinking paradigm has resurfaced to importance since the early 1990s to a large extent due to the globalization process and the end of the Cold War. However, once again the motives of the proponents namely from the Western developed world as well as international economic organizations tend to be doubted and suspected. Undeniably, the onset of the Asian crisis in 1997 has certainly brought about fresh impetus to the subject matter.

This edited volume by Antons certainly captures the nuances of law and development thinking along the impact of the Asian crisis in East and

Southeast Asia. In most part, it contains papers that were presented at the International Institute for Asian Studies, in Leiden, the Netherlands, in January 1998. The paper writers are luminaries from various regions and include academics and legal practitioners. Thus the volume brings together rich and discerning multi-faceted perspectives. On the whole the papers are laboriously researched; judiciously analysed and include wide-ranging survey of the literature. Most importantly, the volume addresses the shortcomings of the development law model as seen in most Asian countries in a visible context.

The edited volume contains five main parts. Part One covers “Paradigms of Law and Development in Asia”. At the outset, Antons (Chapter 1) has taken great pains to build an introductory framework that brings out the overarching dynamics of law and development thinking in a pragmatic and comprehensible manner. Next, Yasuda (Chapter 2) diligently analyses the historical patterns and conceptual frameworks of ASEAN legal systems. This includes the inherent strengths and weaknesses of laws with regard to developmental perspectives (political, economic and social). Bishop (Chapter 3) establishes the need for “bureaucratic capacity and political capacity” in order for the Asian-type development law model to truly be successful. To this end, he cites the experience of Northeast Asia. As a broader picture it would have been beneficial to feature the focal differences in cultural and social norms between Northeast and Southeast Asian states. Similarly, Ohnesorge (Chapter 4) using the same logic offers an anti-thesis to the law and development thinking. Nevertheless it is arguable that ongoing globalization and democratization process may not necessarily accord to such a postulation. Further research work is urgently needed in this aspect.

Part Two encompasses “Japan as a Model for Law and Development in Asia”. Baum (Chapter 5) analyses the regulatory framework for the financial sector in Japan and makes pertinent observations on the inherent weaknesses in the traditional paternalistic governance and draws future projection for financial market regulation. Boyd (Chapter 6) embarks on a scholarly approach to

the law–economic history nexus of Japan with generous illustrations. Further he superbly demonstrates the *modus operandi* of “law as instrument of rule” as opposed to “rule of law” in Japan. However, it is not entirely clear if legal informality such as “administrative guidance” is a sustainable option for Japan. These are matters Southeast Asian countries can learn from the Japanese experience. Heath (Chapter 7) presents a descriptive account of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) law in Japan as well as other Asian countries. To some extent, his arguments tend to be lop-sided, namely omission in considering the socio-economic implications arising from the stringent IPR law, a current controversial topic, particularly for developing countries. Antons’ (Chapter 8) analysis on the various fields of law in Japan, Singapore, and Indonesia is insightful as well as skillfully articulated. Still caution should be exercised as some aspects of these laws have been presently modified.

Part Three deals with “Law in a ‘Socialist Market Economy’: The Case of China”. Chen (Chapter 9) takes the reader through the politics and law dynamics in the last three decades in China. Carter (Chapter 10) explores the Singapore infusion of development law and governance to the Suzhou Industrial Park, China, indeed, a successful south-south economic joint venture.

Part Four covers “Southeast Asian Approaches to Law and Development”. Wu Min Aun (Chapter 11) presents a historical and descriptive account of labour relations laws in Malaysia. The inclusion of future legislative policy recommendations would have been worthy. Blakeney (Chapter 12) provides an overview of the technology transfer related laws within ASEAN; and to some degree the essay seems oversimplified, understandably due to space constraints. Still, it is informative and relevant.

Part Five deals with “Law and Development and the Region”. Lutz (Chapter 13) provides an insightful account of the formal commercial dispute settlement mechanism in Asia. It would have been useful to incorporate a greater study on the alternate dispute mechanism too. Finally, Tomasic (Chapter 14) furnishes a subjective examination

of the Rule of Law thinking as espoused by two well-known luminaries (in their respective published books), Lee Kuan Yew and Chris Patten.

On the whole, the edited volume is undeniably a valuable contribution to the current limited law and development literature, particularly in the Asian regional context. Hence, academics, researchers, policy-makers, and tertiary students alike from and outside Asia should find the book stimulating. As alluded to earlier, although there is a greater awareness of the Rule of Law discourse today, huge research gaps still exist. Particularly, research studies based on a comparative model are highly instructive and meaningful. In this respect, strong research collaborations among and between universities, research institutes, and judiciaries

would be a welcome feature and certainly a step in the right direction.

REFERENCES

- Pistor, K. and P. A. Wellons. *The Role of Law and Legal Institutions in Asian Economic Development*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Trubek, David M. and Mark Galanter. "Scholars in Self-estrangement: Some Reflections on the Crisis in Law and Development Studies in the United States". *Wisconsin Law Review* 4 (1974): 1062–102.

RAJENTHRAN ARUMUGAM

Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore