Paul Burkett and Martin Hart-Landsberg’s *Development Crisis and Class Struggle in East Asia (DCCSEA)* is a significant contribution to the analysis of the post-war economic development of East Asia. As a critical examination of mainstream views of East Asian development and the 1997 crisis, they have reopened a debate that is indispensable to Marxist analyses of the region. In my initial review of *DCCSEA*, I argued that the limits of Burkett and Hart-Landsberg’s analysis lay in their inability to articulate the links between the regional development model and the concept of imperialism which they sought to convey in their work. In their response to my review, Burkett and Hart-Landsberg questioned my approach to imperialism and raised certain problems that I will address here.
Premises

I continue to believe that DCCSEA is an important work for understanding the limits to mainstream analysis of East Asian development and the central role of export-led development as a regional capitalist strategy. In their response, Burkett and Hart-Landsberg begin by asserting that their interest in writing the book was ‘how to best explain the experiences of Japan and East Asia considered as a region’. They raised serious concerns that an overly theoretical concept of imperialism would undermine the regional focus of their work. With this in mind, I will explore certain questions their emphasis on regionalism creates. Firstly, how can we understand a regional development strategy (export-led development) that relies on external support (foreign markets and demand) for its fortification without some form of wider international analysis? In other words, if exports are a critical engine of growth for the region, how does this dependence or interrelationship function as a component of regional growth? Secondly, if export-led development relies on regional and international linkages, how does imperialism function in this relationship? How has it changed over time, and what are its current manifestations?

In part, we have the answers to these questions within their own work. The focus on imperialism in my review stemmed from their use of the term throughout DCCSEA. As a starting point, I will follow the ways they have defined imperialism throughout their work, bearing in mind their concerns about the subsumption of historical accuracy to overly abstract theory. I will explore how ‘imperialism’ within their work revolves around imperialism as hegemony and imperialism as intervention. In addition, the differences between US and Japanese imperialism within their work enable me to clarify why I continue (as I did in my review) to argue that we need a more rigorous concept of imperialism if we are to understand the regional dynamics of export-led development. Finally, I believe that Burkett and Hart-Landsberg’s work does what all important works do, it raises questions and points to new directions for others to explore. Specifically, their reintroduction of imperialism into the East Asian development debate has foreshadowed the important discussions about imperialism that will continue to take place. As we have seen in recent issues of this journal and elsewhere, imperialism has become particularly relevant topic of debate, in part due to the collapse of the capitalist alternative that East Asia represented.¹ The unipolar nature of

¹ See, for example, Historical Materialism 10,1.