

There are abundant works on Korean economic development, especially regarding the post-war period, but this reviewer has only been able to locate a few works on shipbuilding in Korea. The monograph by Gabriel Jonsson is therefore a welcome addition. It starts with an excellent survey of Korean economic development in a historical perspective, and this reviewer enjoyed especially the chapter on the adverse effects of Korean development. There follows a comparison of the global shipbuilding history and the Korean with emphasis on the development of Korean shipbuilding during the 1960s and 1970s, succeeded by a discussion of the technological development of the allied industries and Korea's technological standing compared with the market's leader, Japan. The author argues convincingly against the commonly held notion of Korea lagging far behind Japan in shipbuilding technology. Before the conclusion, the market for the Korean shipbuilding industry is examined, and it is shown that although Korean shipbuilding industry has been mainly export-oriented, the domestic market has been more important than considered previously.

The monograph is well written and organized and sheds light on an area of Korean development not often treated in existing literature.

Carl Jørgen Saxer  
University of Copenhagen

Laurids Lauridsen ed., *Institutions and Industrial Development: Asian Experiences*, International Development Studies, Roskilde University (Occasional Paper No. 16), 1995, 255 pp.

Papers presented at a Nordic researcher training course under the title "Institutional Frameworks for Industrial Development: Asian Experiences" were compiled in an occasional paper issued by International Development Studies at Roskilde University. John Degenbol Martinussen starts off by reviewing the state-market debate in an Asian context. The following two papers by Laurids Lauridsen and Linda Weiss push the reader further into the theoretical quagmire on the right comprehension of the Asian state (get the theory right or wrong). In a very inspiring article Robert Wade digs into the historical process leading up to the publication of the now-famous World Bank report "The East Asian Miracle". The rest of the compendium

concentrates on case-studies. Articles on India are written by John Degnbol Martinussen "Institutional Framework for Industrial Development", and Nirmale Banerjee "Labour, Institutions and the New Economic Order in India". One article deals with the role of the state in China by Clemens Stubbe Østergaard and finally the occasional paper includes an article on industrialization in Thailand by Laurids Lauridsen.

It seems as if all the corners of the state-market debate in Asia are covered within a political science framework in this occasional paper. Notwithstanding the important theoretical deliberations, the title of the compendium is confusing. The overall theme is the state-market linkages, so why not call it so, instead of such a boring title as Institutions and Industrial Development?

Despite the fact that this occasional paper represents an interesting contribution to the debate on the high-performing Asian economies, there are some shortcomings in the compendium. In almost all seminars (training course in this case) scholars present papers covering their specific interest not knowing the issues which their colleagues are covering. When assembled together in an occasional paper, the clarity and logical structure of the compendium do not always prevail. It is not an easy task for the organizers to publish a number of seminar papers which only sporadically link up with one another. However, some comments on the choice of case-studies would have assisted the reader. Why does the compendium contain two papers on India, one on China and only one on Thailand, when all the theoretical papers relate to the development in East Asia?

"How do we understand the developmental state in conceptual terms?" is one of the cornerstones in the occasional paper. Both Laurids Lauridsen and Linda Weiss enter the debate with two elucidating papers. Nevertheless, one cannot help but get confused by the number of different theories the papers introduce. Laurids Lauridsen enumerates at least five different theories: neo-classical; developmental state - the strong version; the developmental state - the soft version; the developmental state - the softer version; and finally the demise of the developmental state. He himself advocates yet another version, named "beyond the developmental state"! Linda Weiss advances three theories (among which two neo-classical) and then her own (governed interdependence). In Lauridsen's paper Weiss's proper theory about governed interdependence is grouped

