

gain a coherent intellectual framework for grappling with the particulars of individual cultures and civilizations.

Proportionately, the pre-human narrative makes up less than one-third of the text, with the remainder telling the human story. The final two-thirds give much more detailed attention to the emergence of agriculture, and the major civilizations around the globe that arose as a result. In such a grand-scale narrative, this might strike some as giving human beings too important a role in the universe. Certainly the space given to human beings contrasts with other recent big history books, many of which deal with the appearance of our species largely as a single event, discussing agriculture and industrialization as parts of general cultural and technological progression. However, the large proportion of this book devoted to humanity and the rise of civilization addresses the real needs of the instructors who could benefit from a textbook such as this. At many schools, instructors are currently teaching big history by enlarging the scope of existing courses under traditional titles such as “world history” or “global studies.” The flexible design of *Big History: Between Nothing and Everything* accommodates this situation well, providing instructors with precisely what they need to incorporate a big history approach into an existing curriculum.

The full apparatus of a textbook is in place: pre-reading questions, clear sub-headings, a wealth of colorful maps and illustrations; graphs and tables; and end-of-chapter summaries and review questions. The book is written in a clear, brisk style that explains clearly and accurately, without oversimplifying, in language suitable for both high school and college students. *Big History: Between Nothing and Everything* succeeds both as inspiring reading, and as a practical tool in the classroom.

### ***Labour-Intensive Industrialization in Global History***

By Gareth AUSTIN and Kaoru SUGIHARA  
 New York: Routledge, 2013. xiv + 310 pp.  
 ISBN: 978-0415455527 (Hardcover)

Reviewed by Atsuko MUNEMURA  
Kansai University, Osaka, Japan

doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12773/arwh.2014.2.2.269>

About 30 years have passed since several young developing countries emerged in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Recently, more and more studies have put attention on criticisms, particularly from Asian economic historians, of the Euro centrism in industrialization in the 19th and the 20th centuries. This book contributed to answering one general question they ask enthusiastically: Why do such young developing countries without abundant capital succeed in labour intensive industries? (World Bank, [1991] *World Development Report: the Challenge of Development*, <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/1991/06/17387606/world-development-report-1991-challenge-development>], p. 90, [2014/02/06 accessed]). Because of recent economic discussions between developing countries, especially in Africa (Masaki Toyomu, “Sekaikeizai no Hennyou to Africa no Keizaihatten [Economic Development of Africa and the Transformation of World Economy]” in Kawabata Masahisa and Ochiai Tatsuhiko, *Africa to Sekai* [Africa and the World], Kouyou-Syobou, 2012)), this book is both economic and historical study from the perspective of Global History which proposes an industrialization model for these developing countries’ futures.

The core question of this book is “why did non-European countries succeed in Europe-originated industrialization?” Two editors, Sugihara and Austin, who have long engaged in studying Global History from the perspective of economic studies of the Third World, challenge the stereotype of Europe-originated industrialization. For this purpose, they redefine the origin of industrialization, comparing many local cases in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Showing the typology of industrialization in these regions, they propose an antithesis of the Third-World’s big question in the past: why European countries grew rich and the others did not?

The labour intensive industrialization in this book seems to

be the counterpart concept of capital intensive industrialization, and a government or entrepreneur can choose which path fits to local factors, such as the quantity of minerals or their pattern of consumption. Because factor bias decides the factor price dependent on factor endowment, a government or entrepreneur selects which path is more economical in that situation, and decides how much labour and what skill is needed. According to Sugihara, only the factor price of labour fluctuates influenced by quality or its improvement from three productive factors, namely capital, labour and land. Based on this theoretical frame work, each case study analyzed how the factor of labour works as the central mechanism of industrialization, not as the mediation of capital intensive industrialization.

The editors, Sugihara and Austin provided 12 chapters which dealt with case studies in East Asia, South-east Asia, South Asia, Latin America, Africa and Europe, and showed many kinds of the labour intensive industrialization models. In summary, this book includes the Industrious Revolution theory, the Proto Industrialization theory, the Human Capital theory, the Developmentalism theory, the “Labour and Capital saving” Industrialization theory, and the Late Industrialization theory. Each author defined the term of “labour intensive” alongside the contexts of their own themes, and actually, there are a lot of forms of labour intensive industrialization. Especially, there is a gap between Sugihara (Chapter 2) and Saito (Chapter 4), Roi (Chapter 5) and Pomerantz (Chapter 6) in what improved the quality of labour: Sugihara considered it the role of education and the others argued for the work of transmission of skill in a productive unit or their community. It is supposed that Sugihara defined labour intensive as the quality improvable at one level, and the others consider it in the mixed matrix of quality and quantity of labour.

Therefore, there is a difference in the definition of “labour intensive” between those who argue that this term is the antonym of the capital intensive and those who argues that there are some types of labour intensiveness. This difference makes a reader confused especially in that this type of industrialization can be recognized as a consistent model of industrialization, or

otherwise, as a process of “developmental stages.” The editor Austin explained that the labour intensive path is to converge to “One path” eventually. Because of this, it is unclear how much the labour intensive path is different from the capital intensive path in spite of their criticisms toward the concept of the Euro-origin industrialization: his problem left questions concerning both economics and history. In terms of economics, by introducing the concept of labour intensive industrialization, what was changed in the relation between capital and labour in the classical economic theory? And in terms of history, what did this concept renew in the theoretical periodization which historians have premised in the Euro-centric concept of the development of capitalistic market and industrialization so far?

In spite of such confusion in the definition, this comparative study admirably made it clear what is the most efficient way a local government or entrepreneur consider in order to introduce the Europe-origin modern technologies. Interestingly, almost all of the authors were commonly interested in similar small scale production units: it was the unique local production system appropriate to limits on land, population, and capital available that allowed modern technology to penetrate all over the world. A author found these units in the “chin-ori system” of the cottage industry which had been managed by a few female semi-skilled workers in the Japanese Edo era, and another found those in “workshop systems” which had been composed by several male semi-skilled workers in 1930s of Japan and each colonial period of India and Africa. Its medium size can be recognized as the most appropriate one suitable to modify machinery with wood flames or odds and ends in a milieu which lacked abundant capital for introducing a mass production system.

Also, this book clearly emphasized the continuity from pre-modern to modern in order to explain the emergence of a local capitalistic market. They referred to the Proto Industrialization theory and the Industrious Revolution theory, in order to consider the development of Smithian Growth in AA regions, criticizing the Euro-centric misinterpretations the Institutionalists have made so far. In particular Pomerantz (Chapter 6) explained that both the agricultural and industrial

goods market developed at the same time, which is far different from the proletarianization theory Marxists argue for.

According to De Vries (Chapter 3), the converging development of the agricultural and industrial goods markets is characteristic in Asia, not Europe where the two diverged through the expansion of Smithian Growth. Though some can criticize his argument in that the Consumption Revolution emerged in Europe while the “Industrious” Revolution emerged in Asia in the process of both Smithian Growths, all the authors of this book agreed that convergence was the characteristic path in the Non-European regions. Especially, Tanimoto (Chapter 5), who admirably utilized “life course analysis” in his urbanization theory, depicted that more and more “second sons” of farming households had moved from rural areas to cities in 1930s, and got training in order to acquire their own workshops in the growing industrial cluster up until the Second World War.

While this book shows the reader the local unique conditions of industrialization through the detailed explanations on each productive unit, it leaves out 3 questions commonly concerned with the big problem: what the character of the non-European industrialization path is. First, as mentioned above, can labour intensive industrialization be recognized as a permanently independent model of two paths, or otherwise one of some stages of industrialization? Especially Austin denied the possibility of putting this model into the Gershencron Model, but he regards the labour intensive industrialization as converging with the “somewhat one path”. Because of this, this model did not answer another question: will the industrialization in AA/LA regions assimilate to the European model of industrialization eventually, or not?

Secondly, do the editors consider the geographical condition important to achieve some types of industrialization, or not? In terms of East Asian cases, according to Sugihara, it was the Cold War which caused the large crossing of exchange of capital, materials and consumption from the Atlantic Ocean to Pacific Ocean dynamically, which led the chance of development of new technologies, and location of more and more factories in East and South-east Asian coastal countries (Chapter 2). If so, can the

other developing countries not affected by this premise achieve the labour intensive industrialization as well, or not? Editor Austin commented about the geographical problem on whether this type of industrialization can be applied to every region or not (Chapter 12), in which case he doesn't consider labour intensive industrialization as a cure-all for every developing country. So this book can be regarded as a starting point for economists to explore the "third path" of industrialization.

Finally, this book left a question about the historical methodology: what unit will Global History use in the future in order to develop comparative histories? In this book, there are a lot of types of analytical units: the Pacific Ocean basin countries, continent, nation, specific regions of a nation. Especially this book uses an analytical unit of a nation in spite of the today's research trends that are critical to the so-called "one nation approach", which supposedly reflects the fact that more and more Asian and African developing countries are becoming interested in the discussion of Developmentalism (or the development of dictatorship). However, what do the relationships between regional markets and the nation, between the nation and industry have to do with a unified global market? Adding to Austin's comments that renewing or increasing business studies will liven up this discussion of labour intensive industrialization, these have to clarify the relationship between globalization and Developmentalism.

This book can be expected to lead academic interchanges between economists and historians in order to consider potential development on a global scale. Though the sophistication of a comparable unit is needed in order to examine whether the term of "developed" matches the concept of Europe or not, they contributed to opening discussions about the possibility to utilize the local point of view into the comparative histories that the discipline of Global History has promoted for 20 years.