

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Economic Growth in Asia, by Oshima

Review Author: Henry Schwalbenberg

Philippine Studies vol. 38, no. 1 (1990): 129–130

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

people behind him, defeat the Democratas at the polls and force his own party to tow the Quezon line. Quezon found that issue in the Conley Case.

The facts of the Conley Case are well-known. So is the fact that Quezon orchestrated the mass resignation of the Cabinet to force a showdown with Wood. However, as Onorato so convincingly proves, the issue at hand was not one of constitutional interpretation but political survival. As the events of 1923 came to a close, Quezon had the Filipino masses behind him, his candidate had defeated the Democratas in the special polls and he had sent a clear message to his party that he was in control. Quezon emerged victorious. And although Wood would continually be attacked by the Philippine Legislature until his death in 1927, Wood was not the loser in this battle. The real loser was Philippine independence.

Onorato's work is a must for each student of Philippine colonial politics in general, and Manuel L. Quezon in particular. From 1922 to the end of American colonial rule, Philippine politics was controlled by one man: Quezon. And it may shock the reader to discover that Quezon would go to the extent of risking even the stability of the entire government to pursue his own political ends. The Cabinet Crisis was one such case.

Onorato's work is a fine historical piece, and it is unfortunate that typographical errors fill its pages. This is not merely a case of misspelled word here and there, although there are a number of these too (e.g., on p. 27, "pesos" for "peso"; on p. 55, "hotile" for "hostile"; on p. 61 "tull" for "full"; on p. 71 "statues" for "statutes"). Rather, whole words are left out (e.g., see the *La Vanguardia* excerpt on p. 31, the last three lines of paragraph 1 on p. 32, and line 9 of p. 46). This carelessness obviously interferes with the reader's understanding and appreciation of Onorato's work.

We look forward to more works by Onorato, and hope that his chosen publisher may be more careful next time.

Josefina Dalupan Hofileña
Department of History and Political Science
Ateneo de Manila University

ECONOMIC GROWTH IN MONSOON ASIA: A COMPARATIVE SURVEY. By Harry T. Oshima. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1987. 371 pages.

Confucianist scholars argue that Mencius was no mere transmitter of the ideas of the great teacher Confucius. Rather, they argue that Mencius was a great teacher in his own right who brought Confucian thought to a new height with his insistence on the perfectability of the human person. Perhaps Professor Oshima merits similar acclaim. He has taken the ideas of his former mentor, the Nobel laureate Simon Kuznets, and applied them to explain the challenges of economic growth in monsoon Asia. In doing so Oshima has not only applied Kuznets' ideas to Asia, but expanded upon them. In particular, Oshima force-

fully argues that authoritarian political structures are detrimental to economic growth in Asia.

Oshima's book is divided into three parts. The first part presents his analytical framework. The second part compares the growth experiences of various Asian economies, and the third part dwells on the implications for the future prospects of economic growth in Asia.

The book's analytical framework is clearly anchored in the tradition of Simon Kuznets, namely that "growth is largely the outcome of the interplay of technological and institutional changes (p. 5)." In particular, Oshima studies the social institutions and technologies required for rice production in monsoon Asia. Clearly for Oshima, a scholar must go beyond the confines of traditional economics to understand the forces underlying economic growth. Hence, his concerns about the inter-relationships between the economics of the rice paddy and the social and political structures inherent in such a culture.

The second part of Oshima's book is concerned with comparing actual growth experiences in monsoon Asia. Readers of *Philippine Studies* will most likely be interested in chapter seven entitled, "Thailand Catches Up with the Philippines." In this chapter Oshima gives a short historical background of the two countries, their records of postwar growth, a description of the development of their agricultural, industrial, and service sectors, as well as a discussion of income distribution and population growth. Oshima concludes that the story of the Philippines might have been very different had it helped its peasant agriculture and labor-intensive industries to develop. But such efforts were frustrated by a social structure controlled by powerful oligarchs. Yet, concludes Oshima, the potential is still there after decades of neglect.

Finally, in the third part of his book, Oshima considers the implications of his studies. Here he goes beyond the earlier work of his great teacher. Authoritarianism must be dismantled and replaced with participatory political systems. Political systems that generate leaders like Marcos and his cronies, Suharto and his generals, the Ne Win's of Burma, as well as the tragedies of Mao's Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution, are fundamental to explaining the extent of poverty and human degradation in Asia today.

Henry M. Schwalbenberg
Department of Economics
Fordham University