What does Anthony D’Costa’s book, *Globalization and Economic Nationalism in Asia* (2012), tell us about globalization and economic nationalism? The editor’s main purpose is to investigate the interactions between globalization and economic nationalism in Asian countries—an important subject, especially in the context of contemporary capitalism and the financial crisis that has dogged most of the advanced capitalist countries today.

The book covers the following topics: Chapter 1 presents the capitalism and economic nationalism in Asian countries. Chapter 2 explores the interplay of economic and geopolitical nationalism and regionalism in contemporary East Asia. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 demonstrate the globalization and economic nationalism in India, China, and Japan. Chapter 6 discusses Japan’s use of industrial policy in new emerging sectors such as innovation-driven, energy-efficient commercial aircraft. Chapter 7 demonstrates South Korea’s pursuit of globalization with neo-mercantilist strategies. Chapter 8 presents Singapore’s pragmatic mercantilism in trying to cope with new challenges spurred by economic globalization. Chapter 9 gives a historical account of how China is practicing economic nationalism by promoting national brands and discouraging foreign brands. Chapter 10 discusses the growing nationalism in China and the response of Japanese multinationals in adjusting to the Chinese economic and political environment. Finally, Chapter 11 discusses concluding remarks on looking ahead at economic nationalism.

**GLOBALIZATION AND ECONOMIC NATIONALISM IN ASIA**

In this book, all chapters present globalization and economic nationalism in Asian countries. These countries pursued free markets and free trade policies to grow rapidly and experience widespread social development. Chapter 1 of the book demonstrates capitalism and economic nationalism in Asian countries. It notes that economic nationalism can be found in the areas of classical industrial policy, technonationalism, support for internationalization of national firms, leveraging the diaspora, and financial and currency controls.

This book provides an analysis of economic nationalism in five leading Asian countries: India, China, South Korea, Japan, and Singapore. Each of these countries has adapted its interventions to the requirements of the new international trading and financial regime as well as changing domestic class forces. Econo-
mic nationalism does not mean economic autarky. On the contrary, it is about national unity and thus quite consistent with international economic interaction (Nakano, 2004, pp. 224, 226). Asian countries expected economic nationalism to coexist with globalization as disputes over trade, investments, balance of payments, exchange rate controls, immigration, and intellectual property rights persist. Economic nationalism and development strategies in the early postwar years frequently took distinctive shapes in East Asia. Chapters 3 to 8 of the book individually examine how India, China, Japan, South Korea, and Singapore have used their own brand of economic nationalistic policies to shape their particular developmental trajectories. The chapters examine the primary motivations that lead states to open their economies.

The nature of the Indian economy’s relationship with the global economy, as well as Indian capitalist opinion about it, has changed over the different stages of Indian capitalism. Economic nationalism under globalization has also reinforced the power of Indian big business. Indian enterprises that can succeed and be players in the global economy have come to symbolize “successful” integration. In addition, some foreign exchange earning obligations were imposed in the earlier stages of liberalization. These, it has been argued, contributed to the development of automobile component exports from India (Kumar, 2008).

Since the late 1970s, economic nationalism in China has undergone three phases. These three phases of economic nationalism share the common aim of making China a strong and prosperous country. These three phases emphasize ideology, industrial policies, and industrial practices: Phase I (1978–1991), considering Inviting In; Phase II (1992–2001), considering Gearing with the World; and Phase III (2002–present), considering Going Out.

In terms of globalization, China has moved from “inviting” the outside world to participate in its economic development, to “gearing with the world” in an effort to bring itself on a par with the rest of the world. Further, the current “going out” strategy reveals an increasingly confident China seeking to participate in international economic activities and undertake greater responsibilities in international affairs (Zheng & Tok, 2007).

The Korean government has implemented major economic reforms, such as adopting more realistic exchange rates to boost domestic production and maintain a comfortable balance of payments position, centralizing import controls, and introducing export incentives. “Deepening globalization has become a state mantra for moving beyond crisis, developmentalist state models and lower-technology and lower-labor cost technologies to a modernized, globalized, market-driven and mass-consumption economy” (Lee & Hewison, 2010, p. 184).

From a comparative perspective, Japan is arguably the single most important country in any discussion about the efficacy of economic nationalism. Economic globalization and greater financial liberalization was accompanied not simply by making “more rules,” but by creating several powerful state-backed institutions entrusted with substantial financial resources and a wide range of regulatory authorities that go well beyond what are deemed “prudential regulatory” safeguards. The Mitsubishi Regional Jet (MRJ) project was one of the first strategically targeted Japanese industry policies since World Trade Organization (WTO) was launched and since Japan openly and firmly embraced liberal multilateralism. The formal launch of WTO in 1994 and Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry (METI) policy shift to fully embrace liberal multilateralism and more actively use a market mechanism reduced the role of traditional industrial policy (Dore, 2000; Vogel, 2006).

Since the mid-1960s, the government of Singapore has systematically rolled out the red carpet for the wealthy foreign investor. It reflected the belief that foreign capital would make Singapore a thriving economic engine linked integrally to the world. Economic na-
tionalism is contrasted to economic liberalism. Scholars of nationalism rarely are interested in the economy as an extension of the explanation of the origins and manifestation of the “we feeling” that animate nation building (Pickel, 2005, pp. 3–4).

CONCLUSION
Findings of the book demonstrate how firms’ states have systematically used the processes of globalization to help India, China, Japan, South Korea, and Singapore become globally competitive in such highly innovative and globally competitive industries. Globalization and Economic Nationalism in Asia is certainly a must-read for those interested in understanding the development trajectory of Asian economics and their integration into the global economy. Comprehensively and insightfully written, it offers compelling arguments of how Asian economies have transformed the policies of economic nationalism to harness the benefits of globalization rather than become eclipsed by it.

In my view, the book covers important issues and cases relevant to globalization and economic nationalism in Asian countries. All cases are discussed according to the theoretically and empirically based issues. Thus, I recommend this book to anyone interested in understanding the development trajectory of Asian economies and their integration into the global economy. I believe readers will get important information in this regard and will see what is happening in the region.
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