The final section, written by the late Shimada Toshihiko and introduced and translated by Akira Iriye, explains the process through which an initially hesitant Tokyo political establishment moved towards full support of the concept of a separate, nominally independent Manchurian state. That opposition to this collapsed as rapidly as it did testifies to the broad Japanese disenchantment with "weak" diplomacy, as well as to the heady appeal of a successful military adventure.

Japanese historians have a deserved reputation for reconstructing events in great detail and in this strength lies the primary value of this translation to Western scholars. Although the authors have their points of view—for example, as Tiedemann notes, Kobayashi tends to view events through the eyes of the pro-treaty elements—there is little in the way of broad interpretation. The translators' introductions nicely remedy this deficiency, placing events in historical context and raising important questions.

Iriye, for instance, points out the necessity of comparative studies to help "delineate what was 'Japanese' in the Japanese army, what was common to societies as a similar stage of economic development and modernization, and what was typical of all human responses." (p. 240). Quite true, but a reading of this book coupled with some contemplation of more recent events is sufficient to inspire some thoughts on this subject. There are, for example, enough readily apparent parallels between the Japanese response to the London Treaty and the contemporary opposition to arms limitations pacts; between the actions of officers like Doihara Kenji and those of CIA operatives in Iran, Guatemala, and elsewhere; and between the Japanese "quagmire" in China and the U.S. entanglement in Indochina to give pause to any historian inclined to explain events on the basis of Japanese "uniqueness."
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The formation of a new international division of labor has come to represent threat or promise to various political economists studying third world development and underdevelopment. As one of the principal sites for selective global economic integration, Southeast Asia is somewhat of a test case and role model for other third world economies. For this reason Richard Higgott's and Richard Robison's edited Southeast Asia: Essays in the Political Economy of Structural Change, which includes both threat and promise approaches, is a timely contribution to this debate. Their book, with introduction plus 11 essays, is broken down into sections on theory, history, development strategies and the role of the state. Despite the slightly misleading title, as it actually covers only the original five ASEAN countries, the book attempts to develop a broad contextual understanding of the economic dynamics of the region.

Although historically fractured by heterogeneous cultures and political encounters, what unites the ASEAN region, apart from somewhat similar colonial experiences, is their drive to undertake capitalist "takeoff" by absorbing advanced technologies from the OECD bloc and to become modern industrialized societies. The essays cover a number of theoretical and empirical issues related to these industrialization efforts, and a few of them break ground in explaining the consequences of national and transnational capital transfers and effects of state activity. The introduction and

first chapter establish the point of departure of the book by discussing the failure of mainstream theories to address relationships among such structural factors as class, state, and conflicts in the capital accumulation process with respect to peripheral capitalist potential and contradictions.

For too long, the editors argue, popular understanding of the third world has been distorted by "orientalist" approaches that promote exaggerated culturalist stereotypes about the third world and which have over time misrepresented the conflictual nature of societies, rendering instead a caravan of glorified monarchs, priests and princes as the material of the historical imagination. Early postwar literature on "development" was dominated by American "modernization" ideologues who rationalized emulation of the American "model" in ethnocentric and class biased social science prescriptions, a period soon followed by the hegemony of the neoclassical economic "technocrats" even more pretentious in their scientistic claims. As four of the book contributors infer, authoritarian power in the ASEAN region since the 1960s has taken its cues from the western institutional developmentalists and as in the case of Marcos and Suharto been richly rewarded for adopting much of orthodox growth theory and the counsel of the World Bank and IMF.

In her essay on class conflict in the region, Carol Warren refutes the "static" wisdom of Geertz' "involution" thesis and argues alternatively that intensifying capitalism in Indonesian agriculture and the Philippine plantation system retained precapitalist features (e.g., communal and personal dependency) while also breaking down earlier subsistence land uses and resulting in increasing landlessness and wage labor relations. Agribusiness programs, particularly the "Green Revolution," further served to intensify the differential status of poor and rich farmers by allowing the former little if any entry through embedded technical, financial or political gateways. This has led to transnational vertical integration in the lucrative value added areas of food processing and marketing and to peasant displacement and impoverishment. Warren draws attention to other interpretations of pre-capitalist peasant economies that see it driven, in contrast to Geertz' view of Javanese peasant retrograde insularity, toward rational social responses to exploitative pressures from outside. In the current period the foreign corporate appropriation of agricultural land value has been proceeding apace, bringing about capitalization of ASEAN's rural areas, with marginal compensations in the form of World Bank (circa McNamara) "basic needs" projects (subsequently rejected by McNamara's successors).

In the section on development strategies, Richard Leaver takes issue with the dependency thesis of the instrumentalized state in the service of metropolitan capitalism. He insists, rather, that third world states chose import substitution (protected domestic capital accumulation) in competition with foreign investment and that foreign capital responded to this challenge reluctantly rather than through calculated anticipation of profit. Leaver goes on to explain the failures of import substitution and why free market principles and export oriented industrialization are more appropriate toward third world capital accumulation and development. With a different perspective, Garry Rodan writing on Singapore's growth economy also sees the role of the state as strategic. He points out the Lee government's role as corporate investor, pro-investment policy maker, labor trainer and manager, and infrastructural developer as central to that country's relatively successful absorption of advanced technology and integration into the world economy. At the same time, Rodan stresses, Singapore's experience is rooted in its own historical and social evolution, and its export practices are therefore not automatically transferable. Significant wage increases have been