1972 and 1.8 million acres to 13,143 persons under the Land Reforms Ordinance of 1977 as amended in 1982. That constitutes only a small part of the total farm area in Pakistan and a small proportion of all tenants. What was the total redistribution of land since 1947? How much land currently is farmed under various types of tenure arrangements?

The authors have done an excellent job of capturing the flavor of the rich and spirited debate over land reform. But as expected with limited time, space, data, and other resources, the authors leave many land reform questions unresolved. My value judgments tend to coincide with those of the editors who favor the side of landlords and equity in the perennial tenant-landlord and equity-efficiency quandary. However, anyone making an informed judgment on such matters needs to know more precisely what the trade-offs are.

* How do efficiency (cost per unit of output), conservation of resources, and other measures of performance compare by tenure arrangement?
* Are there economies or diseconomies of farm size as measured by resource costs per unit of output for various sizes and types of farms? How would breaking up of large units into smaller units affect productivity and output in Pakistan? A related issue is historically how has output per unit of land changed on land that has been redistributed? Farm surveys before and after redistribution would help to answer that question.
* Does security of tenure enhance or reduce incentives for tenants to use land productively?
* Could a system of progressive taxation of land and/or irrigation water and with an overall higher rate for absentee landlord farms bring significant progress toward a peasant proprietorship without undue social unrest and inefficiency? Would the incidence of taxes rest with tenants or landlords?
* Are cash rents higher or lower than share rents on the average? In the United States, cash rents tend to be lower on the average than share rents because landlords are willing to sacrifice some rent to receive a more stable income from land.

The editors have prepared a worthwhile book which cannot be expected to answer all questions. Some must be reserved for later studies.

Luther Tweeten

The Ohio State University,
U.S.A.
at the First ASEAN Economic Congress held in Kuala Lumpur from March 13–22, 1987. Of the four major parts into which the book is divided the first part, is the largest, with seventeen papers on the overall theme of the problems and prospects of ASEAN co-operation in various fields. The other three parts of the book are devoted to the analysis of the experiences of European economic integration, of the European Free Trade Association and of economic co-operation between Australia and New Zealand and discuss the possible lessons for ASEAN that can be drawn from these experiences.

This book is not just a descriptive account of the progress achieved by ASEAN but is an attempt to recount and explain developments in ASEAN co-operation with useful practical suggestions for promoting the process of economic integration of ASEAN countries. Unlike many collections of conference papers, the quality of most of the papers is high and they deal with a topic which is rich and has considerable importance not only for the ASEAN community but also for other developing countries embarked on the road of regionalism, for whom ASEAN is a role model and which, like ASEAN countries, are separated by heterogenous cultures and political traditions.

In the first part of the book there are five papers on the issue of trade co-operation in ASEAN, and another twelve that look into the problems and prospects of co-operation in specific fields including industry, money and banking, commodities, energy, minerals, food and agriculture, forestry, transportation, tourism and education. Several of these papers have direct policy relevance and offer material which is informative and lucid. The book starts off well with a paper by S. Meyanthan and I. Haron, which deals with the trends and problems of intra-ASEAN trade. The authors show that the volume of this trade increased from 14 percent of the total ASEAN trade in 1973 to 21 percent in 1983. This, the authors claim, is the most impressive percentage increase as compared with the performance of other Third World regional groupings. They also note that exports of mineral fuels (SITC 3) accounted for 63 percent of the total ASEAN trade in 1982, and that during the period 1978–86 there was a decline of around 7 percent in the average tariff rates in ASEAN. The paper, however, does not look into the important questions of the impact of trade liberalizing measures on intra-ASEAN trade flows and of whether the increase in intra-regional trade has been due to trade-diversion or trade-creation. A study done at the PIDE (published in the Winter 1986 issue of this journal), which used an iterative statistical model to measure relative trade gains and losses arising from ASEAN co-operation, showed that while there is little evidence that intra-area trade had intensified during the period 1970–1984, regional trading patterns had been altered in varying degrees. However, given that only a small proportion of non-sensitive items of export have been affected because of the preferential trading arrangements, it can be expected that further trade liberalization within the region will lead to greater regional trade.

The paper by R. Pomfret, makes a similar point. It argues that as in the case of tariff preferences in EC-Mediterranean trade, which significantly added to the exports from the beneficiary countries, intra-ASEAN trade could benefit from trade liberalization as ASEAN countries have export supply elasticities as large as those of the semi-industrialized Mediterranean countries. The author is, however, careful to point out that the net economic effect of tariff preferences may become negative in case of trade diversion and even from costs of administering complex preferential trading arrangements. R. J. Langhammer's paper effectively argues that because of the small volume of intra-ASEAN trade there can be no reliable forecasts about the direction of change of the sectoral and regional composition of this trade arising from reduction in protection rates and that this uncertainty is an important reason that the ASEAN Preferential Trading Arrangements have been so selective and ineffective.

The weaknesses in the present approach towards trade liberalization are brought out in the two papers by O.G. Tin and G. Tan. They show that the main obstacle to the extension of tariff preferences is the "cumbersome product-by-product negotiating procedure." To overcome the limitations of this procedure it is suggested that efforts should be made to liberalize non-tariff barriers to regional trade so as to complement the existing tariff reduction approach.

In another paper, an interesting proposal is made by H.C. Rieger, who rejects "defeatist, naive and purist" approaches to regional integration in favour of a rational approach, which disregards the standard models provided by neo-classical economics and adopts an eclectic approach acceptable to all ASEAN countries. Rieger proposes a so-called "ASEAN Trading System," which combines a "customs union of the larger countries with a free trade area comprising this customs union and the other ASEAN countries." The author arrives at this conclusion by a process of elimination. A customs union of the ASEAN countries is ruled out because of the disparity in tariff rates of the member countries and the obvious resistance this would have from Singapore and Brunei. A free trade area is similarly ruled out because of the problems of administering rules of origin and of setting domestic content requirements, which would be essential for such a scheme to succeed. The only feasible and viable alternative left is a combination of the two applied within the ASEAN framework. Overall, this is an interesting proposal, which seems to be the only way out of the present impasse and merits close attention of the ASEAN countries.

The papers on the experiences of other regional co-operation schemes have useful points to make but they all recognize the difficulty of transposing these experiences to the ASEAN region, because of the special characteristics and peculiarities of the ASEAN countries and the differences in preferences and levels of development of the various regions. The approach of economic integration in Europe is far less compromising as compared with the one that has been followed to date by
ASEAN. As a result, the former approach has been successful in removing intra-community tariffs, which have contributed to the increase in specialization and have promoted efficiency and innovation.

The papers conclude that among the most important lessons that ASEAN can draw from the experiences of the other regional groupings are: First, there must be a timetable for each stage of the integration process; second, economic co-operation is more useful when the participants' economies are competitive and not complementary; third, a common commercial policy is essential to provide a uniform basis to the integration process; fourth, industrial standardization and harmonization of technical regulations are necessary for effective industrial co-operation and fifth, ASEAN policy-makers need to be less risk-averting and less concerned with distribution issues.
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