

Theorizing Economic Geographies of Asia

Henry Wai-chung Yeung

Department of Geography, National University of Singapore

(Email: geoywc@nus.edu.sg;

Homepage: <http://courses.nus.edu.sg/course/geoywc/henry.htm>)

and

George C.S. Lin

Department of Geography, University of Hong Kong

(Email: GCSLIN@hkucc.hku.hk)

A Paper Presented at the Canadian Association of Geographers Annual Conference,

Toronto, Canada, 29 May – 1 June 2002.

Acknowledgement

Henry Yeung would like to thank Philip Kelly and Glen Norcliffe for their kind invitation to attend this conference. This paper originates from a special session in the 98th Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers, Los Angeles, 19 - 23 March 2002, and will be published as an introduction to a special issue on “Economic Geographies of Asia” in *Economic Geography*, Vol.79(3), 2003. We would like to thank Fulong Wu for co-organizing the session and all paper presenters for their participation and subsequent submission. We have received very useful comments from XXX. None of these institutions and individuals, however, should be responsible for any shortcomings of this paper.

14 May 2002

Theorizing Economic Geographies of Asia

Abstract:

The economic geographies of Asia are highly fascinating, not least because Asia has increasingly emerged as a significant economic player in all three spheres of global competition: production, consumption, and circulation. This dynamic mosaic of economic landscapes in Asia is further complicated during and after the recent 1997/1998 economic crisis. While some aspects of these economic geographies of Asia have already received research attention, many complex economic-geographical processes in Asia have been under-theorized in the literature. This agenda-setting paper makes two critical observations. First, the theorization of dynamic economic changes in Asia needs to be more critical in adopting economic-geographical theories developed elsewhere in the Anglo-American context. The “Asian” case may pose as a significant challenge to existing theories in economic geography. Second, certain geographical processes in Asia may require fundamentally new approach to theorization that potentially can contribute to broader theory development in economic geography. The economic dynamism of Asia may provide a very useful site for theory development and empirical understanding in contemporary economic geography. To support our arguments and observations, we discuss the situatedness of economic geography theories and offer some constructive suggestions for an intellectual agenda towards new theories in economic geography.

Keywords: economic geography, Asia, theory, epistemology, intellectual agenda

For a long time, we have almost taken for granted in economic geography that theories emerging from geographical studies of Silicon Valley or the City of London are naturalized unequivocally as what might be termed “mainstream economic geography”. One needs only to glance through recent major collections in economic geography (e.g. Bryson et al., 1999; Clark et al., 2000; Sheppard and Barnes, 2000) to reiterate the point that an overwhelming majority of the chapters tend to address theoretical issues specific to a handful of advanced industrialized economies (see Yeung, 2002a). This heavy concentration of economic-geographic theories in relation to their sites of production and dissemination has certainly shaped the directions of economic geography research in *all* countries and/or regions, albeit each at different pace of diffusion and adoption. Economic geography studies of other localities, however, not only tend to follow the “templates” institutionalized and legitimized by this “mainstream” economic geography, but also earn a rather strange status as some kind of “regional geography”. In this vein, geographical research into industrial location in China

and export-processing zones in Malaysia is often labeled as “Asian geography”, studies of the informal sector in Africa as “African geography”, and investigations into gender relations in Latin American labor markets as “Latin American geography”. Potter (2001: 423; original italics) has vividly described this phenomenon:

... those who work outside the Euro-North American orbit are excluded, or at best marginalized, from the specialisms which see themselves making up the *core* of the discipline of *Geography*. Quite simply, they are regarded as “ists” of the Latin American, Caribbean, African or Asian variety. If they endeavour to be comprehensive in their consideration of other regions of the globe, then they may qualify as the ultimate “ists”: as full-blown “developmentalists”!

Such geographical specificity in constructing both leading theories in economic geography and the “other geographies” or “distant geographies” perhaps should not surprise us too much in light of the institutionalization of geography as an academic discipline (see Johnston, 1997; Barnes, 2000; Scott, 2000). Few economic geographers have ventured to contextualize this specificity in the epistemology of economic geography and offered suggestions for what may be done to redress it (see Yeung, 2001a; Olds and Poon, 2002; Smith, 2002). In this article, we focus on a particular historical-geographical moment – the rise of Asia – and outline our vision for theory development in economic geography emanating from geographers working on the dynamic economic transformations of Asia. We term this effort “theorizing economic geographies of Asia”. The plurality of the term represents a deliberate attempt to theorize the diverse experiences and trajectories of economic transformations in Asia. There is thus no one single economic geography of Asia; but rather multiple pathways and diversities. By the same token, there should be many models and theories of these transformations in economic geography (see also Hart, 1998; Ettliger, 1999; 2001).

We are particularly driven by two concurrent trends – one intellectual and another empirical – that we believe will powerfully shape the future of economic geography. On the intellectual front, our efforts and that of our contributors echo the recent institutional turn in

economic geography from nationalistic economic geography to *global economic geographies*. Traditional economic geography has been mainly concerned with explaining patterns and processes within national space-economies. When such work is done within the Anglo-American countries, the ensuing models and theories are deemed universally true and applicable. More recently, however, an increasing number of economic geographers have begun to address seriously the situatedness of our theories and knowledge of the global economy. This new kind of economic geography has become much more inclusive and open to ideas and opinions conceived outside a few dominant cores. This turn clearly supports Taylor's (1996) broader call for abandoning the "embedded statism" in the social sciences to open up to new spaces of global economic geographies. Interestingly, this opening up in geography has been well recognized by scholars from other social scientific disciplines. For example, political theorist Martin Shaw (2000: 73-74; original italics) argued in the context of geography's role in globalization debates that:

The disciplines of anthropology, geography and international relations have shown greater openness to *global* understanding than economics, politics and sociology, the historically defining fields of social science. Interestingly, the former are all fields in which historically the national-international nexus was formerly not just a methodological bias, but more or less *explicitly* constitutive. The openness of both social anthropology and geography to globalization debates follows their abandonment of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century nationalist and imperialist constructions of their subjects. These subjects underwent theoretical and ideological transformations earlier in the post-war period, which have prepared the way for the recognition of globalization.

In redressing the geographical specificity in mainstream economic geography theories, we aim to develop what Slater (1999: 67) called "reverse discourses" in order for non-Western work to "theorize back" at the West. These discourses should comprise "counterposed imaginations and visions emanating from different sites of experience and subjectivity". Similarly, Appadurai (1999: 237) argued for a conversation about and an imagination of research "to which scholars from other societies and traditions of inquiry could bring their

own ideas about what counts as new knowledge and about what communities of judgement and accountability they might judge to be central in the pursuit of such knowledge”.

This last point relates to the second concurrent trend in the *empirical realm* that has made the economic geographies of Asia highly fascinating. Asia has increasingly emerged as a significant economic player in all three spheres of global competition: production, consumption, and circulation. This dynamic mosaic of economic landscapes in Asia is further complicated during and after the recent 1997/1998 economic crisis. While some aspects of these economic geographies of Asia have already received research attention, many complex economic-geographical processes in Asia have been under-theorized in the geographic literature that leads to two possibilities. First, the theorization of dynamic economic changes in Asia needs to be more critical in adopting economic-geographical theories developed elsewhere in the Anglo-American context. The “Asian” case can pose as a significant challenge to existing theories in mainstream economic geography. Second, certain geographical processes in Asia require fundamentally new approach to theorization that potentially can contribute to broader theory development in economic geography. The economic dynamism of Asia today provides a very useful site for theory development and empirical understanding in contemporary economic geography.

In the remaining sections of this article, we discuss the situatedness of mainstream economic geography theories (Section 2) and show how Asia has been theorized in mainstream economic geography (Section 3). The final section examines how we may move from straightforward applications of “Western” theories in mainstream economic geography to critical interrogation of these theories, and development of new theories through carefully grounded empirical research. We also offer some constructive suggestions for an intellectual agenda towards new theories in economic geography.

Geographies of Economic Geography: The Situatedness of Theories

We have now been well told by historians of economic geography that dominant theories always emerged from particular historical and geographical contexts (see Barnes, 1996; Scott, 2000). From locational models to spatial divisions of labor, and from flexible specialization to local embeddedness, leading theories of economic geography have their peculiar histories and geographies. Their histories are very much outcomes of conscious efforts made by economic geographers in the context of creative tensions among different “paradigms”. For example, the quantitative revolution in economic geography might not have happened if Brian Berry wasn’t convinced by the theoretical sensibility of August Lösch’s (1954) *The Economics of Location* and wanted to challenge the then “atheoretical” kind of descriptive economic geography (Barnes, 2001a). Or if the revolution had to happen due to other causal forces, it might have taken a very different shape and trajectory without Berry. The geographies of economic geography theories are equally interesting. While the quantitative revolution in economic geography can be described as a mostly American-centered phenomenon (with a few exceptions in England – Peter Haggett and Alan Wilson), the recent “cultural turn” must be accredited to economic geographers based in Britain. Economic geography theories are therefore situated not just because of their peculiar moments in the discipline’s historical trajectories and discursive formations. More importantly, they are grounded in specific material geographies and institutional foundations that profoundly shape the kind of economic-geographical research and theories (see Barnes and Curry, 1983; Sidaway, 1997; Thrift and Walling, 2000; Barnes, 2001b).

In this and next sections, we attempt to respond to two related questions in order to explore further the situatedness of dominant theories in economic geography. First, why are economic geography theories, from the quantitative revolution and Marxism to flexible specialization and the recent “cultural turn”, so dominant that some of them appear as

universal theories for economic geography? Second, why have theoretical insights emerging from area studies and regional geography failed so far to capture the imaginations of mainstream economic geography? We observe that there is a noticeable gap between the obsession of mainstream economic geographers with the *universalization* of their Western-based theories and preoccupation of regional geographers by the task of meticulously sorting out the *geographical specificities* of particular countries or regions. We argue that this gap has been the consequence of historically specific circumstances including the legacy of earlier colonialism or what Hudson (1977: 12) referred to as the interests of European and American “imperialism” in world commerce and territorial acquisition (see also Barnes, 2001c: 530), provincialism during and after the Vietnam War, linguistic and cultural barriers, and an intellectual environment dominated by the Enlightenment school of thought until recently. The persistence of this gap has led to what may be termed “the tragedy of commons” in economic geography – theories derived from specific historical geographies become universal among the former group of economic geographers, and descriptive specificities of regional geographies have little generality to offer to geographical studies in other countries and/or regions. We believe that such “tragedy of commons” has severely hindered the growth of “new economic geographies” and that the ongoing transformation of both the global economy and Geography as a discipline has presented unprecedented opportunities to economic geographers worldwide for the common pursuits of “global economic geographies” in which Asia has played an indispensable part.

In Table 1, we summarize several leading theoretical perspectives in mainstream economic geography that rose to prominence during the past two decades or so. We do not intend to construct this table to “fit” different economic geography theories (and their proponents) into specific boxes. The table should rather be read as a heuristic device for the purpose of this article. Neither do we expect the table to be complete and all-inclusive. We

regret if certain key histories of (mainstream) economic geography have been “written out” of this table and the text. At the risk of some gross generalizations, we want to make the point that none of the major proponents of these economic geography theories originates from outside the Anglo-American countries. Neither do most of them conduct their empirical research outside these advanced industrialized economies. This sweeping generalization points to the geographical specificities of these so-called “leading” or “dominant” economic geography theories – they were/are/have been really leading and dominant among English-speaking economic geographers (see also Olds and Poon, 2002). Take location theory as an example, it originates from what Barnes (2001a: 546) termed “epistemological theorizing” that assumes “that spatial economic phenomena could be expressed in an explicitly abstract, formal, and rationalist vocabulary and directly connected to the empirical world”. This assumption allows for location theory to be universally generalizable from one geographic site to another. We should therefore expect it to be well applied in the research into economic geography of Asia. The reality, however, seems to work on the contrary. With the exception of William Skinner’s influential work on marketing and social structure in rural China (Skinner, 1964, 1965a, and 1965b; see Cartier, 2002 for a critique), much of economic geography research in Asia during the 1960s and the 1970s remained descriptive and aligned much closer to area studies and regional geography (Spencer, 1954 and 1973; Spate and Learmonth, 1967; Ginsburg and Brush, 1958; McGee, 1967; Dewyer, 1972; Wheatley, 1971; Murphey, 1953 and 1977; McGee and Yeung, 1977).

Table 1 here

Subsequent critique of location theory and its variant in behavioral locational model by such radical economic geographers as Walker and Storper (1981) and Massey (1984) led to the development of alternative theorization of how to explain spatial economic phenomena. Based upon empirical studies of (de)industrialization in the UK and the USA, Massey (1984)

and Storper and Walker (1989) arrived at their respective Marxian theories of spatial divisions of labor and spatial switching by capital (see Table 1). Both theories attempted to explain why (de)industrialization occurred in some but not all regions in Britain and the US. The objective of the project was to specify the interdependent links between social processes of capitalist production and the spatial structures and distribution of industry, work, and classes. Based on her empirical studies of employment patterns in the UK during the 1960s and the 1970s, Massey (1984) argued that space is linked to society and vice versa through the process of industrial restructuring. The notion of a “spatial division of labor” became the central concern of this line of research that empirically found successive waves or, in Massey’s infamous geological metaphor, “layers” of investment attracted to locations offering adequate opportunities for profitable production. The opposite process of divestment would be set in motion in locations in which these opportunities have been exhausted. At any one point in time, the prevailing balance between these different rounds of investment and divestment is reflected in a particular form and pattern of geographical inequality. This geography is itself transformed in turn as new waves of investment respond to the potential it offers for continued capital accumulation (Massey and Meegan, 1989). In the long run, restructuring simply means industrial evolution, i.e. alterations in product mix and organizational structures. If the change is dramatic enough, industrial revolution may occur, i.e. the transformation to a new stage of development and mode of production. What this means for economic geography is not only a different landscape to describe, but also a new spatial logic of industrial location to comprehend.

While these theoretical perspectives on spatial divisions of labor had generated much heated and exciting debates in subsequent studies of industrial restructuring and specific localities, most of these studies remained grounded in the industrial landscapes of the Anglo-American countries. Given their prominence in mainstream economic geography of the

1980s, we would expect these perspectives to be “universally” applied to other research and empirical contexts. To our best knowledge, however, we have not seen significant diffusion of these economic geography theories to geographic studies of other regions and countries experiencing concurrently dramatic processes of industrialization and economic restructuring. This observation is certainly applicable to studies of economic geography of Asia, although it is equally interesting to note that some Asian economies experienced unprecedented processes of industrialization during *exactly* the same historical periods of the 1970s and the 1980s. We will outline in the next section what theoretical insights emerged from other social scientific studies of industrialization in Asia.

Into the 1990s, mainstream economic geography had certainly been experiencing a kind of “intellectual renaissance” through which a plethora of complementary theoretical perspectives were proposed – flexible specialization, networks and embeddedness, agglomerations and clusters, and regulation and governance. As summarized in Table 1, these perspectives were concerned with why certain territorial ensembles – whether regions or new industrial spaces – have emerged as the motors of growth in a particular country. It is no historical coincidence that during the late 1980s and the 1990s, several regions in the US and some European economies had emerged as the leading engines of growth in the global economy. These economic geography theories vividly mirrored the historical and geographical specificities of the global space-economy. Based on his empirical analysis of the growth of high-tech industries in California and elsewhere in Italy and France, Scott (1988) argued that a major shift was underway in contemporary capitalist industries – away from mass production of the Fordist kind towards flexible specialization and customization of production. These highly geographically-specific observations led Scott (1988: 4; original italics) to conclude that “a series of *new industrial spaces* had come into existence and were beginning to form important alternative centers of capitalist accumulation based on a strong

social division of labor, proliferations of small to medium-sized industrial establishments, and the marked reagglomeration of production”. While Scott’s conclusions were not entirely new *vis-à-vis* Piore and Sabel’s (1984) earlier study of the Second Industrial Divide, his arguments for the rise of new industrial spaces did make a major impact on research in economic geography up to the mid 1990s (Gertler, 1988; 1992; Amin and Robins, 1990a; Amin and Thrift, 1992; Storper and Scott, 1992; see a review in Yeung, 1994).

New theoretical insights were also required to explain the geographical organization of production through firms and networks in these so-called “new industrial spaces”. Geographic agglomeration, proximity, processes of tacit knowledge and learning, and cooperative networks were conceptual categories proposed within this genre of theoretical and empirical research that has come to dominate much of Anglo-American economic geography since the late 1980s. More recent theoretical work on “relational assets”, agglomeration economies, and institutional governance in the UK and the US again reinforces the emergence of the “regional world” of production as the dominant research theme in mainstream economic geography (see Yeung, 2000). This emergence, however, must again be situated in its peculiar historical and geographical contexts. Historically, flexible production methods and agglomeration economies have been in existence for centuries, as found in craft industries and so on. The rise of these production methods and geographical economies to intellectual prominence within Anglo-American economic geography must have something to do with the “crisis of Fordism” during which an earlier wave of mass production methods and economies of scale could no longer afford a competitive edge to incumbent firms and corporations in advanced industrialized economies. This crisis, nevertheless, can also be understood from the historical perspective of the immense Japanese challenge to Anglo-American industrial might during the late 1970s and the 1980s (see the next section). These new economic geography theories thus emerged as an unintended response to historical

urgency – to explain the downfall of Fordist firms and industries and the rise of new propulsive industries (e.g. in Silicon Valley and elsewhere). An important question remains that why these important and innovative theories in economic geography did not emerge from research into the competitors – Japan and the newly industrialized economies in East Asia? We shall return to this question in the next section.

The geographic context of these theories in economic geography is equally intriguing. Two observations are critical here. First, most theoretical work was based in empirical studies of a few selected regions in advanced industrialized economies in the US (e.g. Silicon Valley and Route 128) and Europe (e.g. the M4 corridor and Cambridge, UK, Third Italy, Baden-Württemberg in Germany, and the Scientific City in France). This “spatial selectivity” of empirical cases places an upper limit on the applicability of these theories even to the same industry in different regions of the same country, let alone same or different industries in countries with contrasting forms of capitalisms (Clegg and Redding, 1990; Whitley, 1992; 1999; Walder, 1995; Berger and Dore, 1996; Stark, 1996; Stark and Bruszt, 2001). Second, most leading proponents of these economic geography theories come from a few prestigious research departments in the US and the UK. This geographical situatedness of authorship does not automatically invalidate the general applicability of their theories. But it does explain why certain theories emerge and become influential through more intensive interactions among likeminded scholars and research activities (and funding!) in these institutions. Their applicability to other geographic contexts remains to be interrogated and validated through carefully designed empirical research.

This situatedness of economic geography theories is perhaps best illustrated in the recent “cultural turn” in economic geography towards a kind of “new economic geographies” that is much more reflexive and open in its nature and subject matter (Thrift and Olds, 1996; Lee and Wills, 1997; Amin and Thrift, 2000; cf. Peck and Wills, 2001). Indeed, Thrift and

Olds (1996: 313) argued that we need to “make a space for new kinds of economic geography that can supplement or even replace the older forms of economic geography”. In this process, we must appreciate how to “contextualize rather than to undermine the economic, by locating it within the cultural, social and political relations through which it takes on meaning and direction” (Wills and Lee, 1997: xvii). According to Barnes (2001a: 551), this mode of “hermeneutic theorizing” differs significantly from the “epistemological theorizing” as manifested in the quantitative revolution because it “[1] rejects fixed and final foundations... [2] promotes experimentation and engagement with radically different vocabularies, pressing them as far as they will go... [3] cultivates critical self-awareness of social and historical location and recognizes its influence on knowledge... [4] is interested in keeping the conversation going”. Precisely because of this inherent reflexivity and openness in the new economic geographies, it becomes very difficult to summarize its diverse strands of theories and empirical findings. At their very least, new economic geographers have refigured the “economic” through an excursion into the “cultural” and the “political”. As Barnes (1999: 17) noted, the basic explanatory categories become “social power, cultural identity and institutional situatedness rather than economic ownership, universal definitions and individual agency”. Several features of new economic geographies include understanding the social embeddedness of economic action, mapping shifting identities of economic actors, and exploring the role of context in explaining economic behavior (see a review in Barnes, 2001a; Yeung, 2001b).

While mainstream economic geography has in recent years shown encouraging trends toward more inclusiveness and openness in its subject matter and approaches, it remains largely constrained by its small – albeit arguably “central” – geographic confinement to the existing Anglo-American centers, and incomplete understanding of the global stretch of the spheres of production, consumption, and circulation. Despite the highly lauded rhetoric of

globalization, much of the theorization in economic geography ranging from labor market flexibility to post-industrialism and the New Economy has been based predominately on the experience of Western Europe and North America. From a historical point of view, there is nothing wrong for American geographers to theorize the economic geography of the US for American interests and likewise Chinese geographers to do their own part for the socialist government. However, we are now living in a globalizing world in which anything happens in New York or Chicago is intrinsically related to developments in not only banks in London or Tokyo, but also computer chip makers in Dongguan, China, or semi-conductor factories in Penang, Malaysia. Any model or theory explaining the changing economic landscapes in North America and Western Europe must necessarily be limited and incomplete in the absence of an in-depth understanding of *both* the internal logics of economic geographies of other world regions, and their external relations and linkages with major regions elsewhere. The indispensable role of Asia as the largest producer and consumer in this globalizing world-economy necessitates the anxiety and urgency for understanding better the changing economic geographies of Asia and their implications for theorizing global economic geographies.

To sum up, mainstream economic geography developed in the Anglo-American countries has itself experienced tremendous internal transformations and metamorphism during the past four decades. Its theoretical core has moved from universalizing location theory during the quantitative revolution to geographically specific theories of territorial development during the 1980s and the 1990s, and recently to the more reflexive “cultural turn” that presumably champions the heightened sensitivity to the positionality of knowledge and theories and the context in which these theories emerge. This intellectual and unprecedented movement in the epistemology of economic geography provides an exciting opportunity for us to reconsider what economic geography theories might be if we situate

these theories in specific regions beyond the Anglo-American countries. In this way, we may be able to construct some kind of genuine “global economic geographies” that are attuned to the historical and geographical specificities of our theories on the one hand, and are capable of producing a much broader understanding of dramatic economic transformations in the new millennium on the other. Before we theorize the economic geographies of Asia, it is important for us to situate the region in the emerging global economic geographies.

Situating Asia in Global Economic Geographies

To begin, we argue that if we look seriously beyond North America and Western Europe, we can undoubtedly find innovative and strong theoretical insights from empirical studies of other regions. These theoretical insights are no less historically and geographically specific than those championed in mainstream economic geography. This situated nature of theoretical insights gathered from intensive studies of specific countries and/or regions should not be surprising if we take theories as hermeneutics or discursive formations that must be firmly grounded in material realities. These realities, however, differ from one historical moment to another, and from one geographical setting to another. For example, whereas studies of Latin America have given rise to the infamous dependency theory, social scientific studies of Asia have similarly generated many important theoretical insights, some of which have been followed up in the recent economic geography literature:

- (1) the flying geese hypothesis (Hart-Landsberg and Burkett, 1998; Edgington and Hayter, 2000);
- (2) the new international division of labor (Frobel et al., 1980; Henderson, 1986a; 1986b; 1989);
- (3) the developmental state (Henderson, 1993; Douglas, 1994; Clark and Kim, 1995; Brohman, 1996; Park, 1998; Yeung, 1999; Woo-Cumings, 1999);

- (4) social capital (Smart and Smart, 1991; Leung, 1993; Yang, 1994; Hsing, 1998; Yeung, 1998c; Olds, 2001a); and more recently
- (5) transnationalism (Mitchell, 1995; Olds and Yeung, 1999; Ley, 1999; Hsu and Saxenian, 2001; Yeoh and Chang, 2001; Zhou and Tseng, 2001; Lin, 2002a; Ma and Cartier, 2002).

It is important, however, to note that in stark contrast to such theories as spatial divisions of labor and flexible specialization, these theoretical interrogations grounded in Asia have not yet made a significant impact on the development of mainstream economic geography described in the previous section (cf. Lee and Wills, 1997; Bryson et al., 1999; Clark et al., 2000; Sheppard and Barnes, 2000). This phenomenon of the economic geography of Asia lagging far behind mainstream Anglo-American economic geography can be aptly described by the “flying geese” metaphor. In Akamatsu’s (1962) original version of the flying geese model that purported to describe Japan’s industrialization in the world economy, Japan was seen as the leading goose whose technological innovations would eventually be “trickled down” through regional production and investment activities to other following geese in Asia (e.g. the newly industrialized economies) such that a pattern of flying geese would be observed. What has actually happened to East Asian industrialization, however, does not quite follow the flying geese pattern. Contrary to the predictions of the flying geese model, there is little evidence of a real “catching up” process cascading through the various economies of Asia. Rather, the situation is one in which “Japan is actually flying further and further ahead of the regional flock. The division of labour in Asia, based on the technological capacity of each nation, is becoming more - not less - vertical” (Hatch and Yamamura, 1996: 28; see also Bernard and Ravenhill, 1995; Dicken and Yeung, 1999).

By the same token, we argue that mainstream economic geography – as the “leading goose” in the intellectual development of economic geography – is flying further ahead of the “regional flock” (by “regional”, we really mean geographically-specific economic geography

alternatively perceived as regional geography by the mainstream). In this division of labor in economic geography, mainstream economic geography produces the “right” kind of theories emanating from specific cases in the Anglo-American countries that remain to be tested as universal principles equally applicable to other more marginal regions of the global economy. We fail to heed Appadurai’s (1999: 230) telling warning, in the context of area studies, that “the more marginal regions of the world are not simply producers of data for the theory mills of the North”. How then does this highly unequal division of labor in economic geography research emerge? We analyze this phenomenon in relation to three groups of geographers: (1) those engaging in mainstream enquiry, (2) those in area studies, and (3) those interrogated mainstream theories based on the Asian experience.

Historically, Asia has never really attracted serious attention in *mainstream economic geography*, despite the discipline’s celebrated interest in spatial differentiation and uneven development. Even if it did, Asia was treated as “the others in the Far East”, previously a market to be opened up by colonialism now posing challenge to the industrial might in Europe and North America (see Amsden, 2001). This tendency towards what Said (1978) termed Orientalism is no less significant in economic geography than in humanities and other social sciences. The biggest difference, however, rests with the fact that Asia has been well studied by other social sciences that are interested in economic development. Meanwhile, the empirical landscape of Asia has undergone dramatic transformations since the 1970s when Japan began to emerge as the leading competitor and alternative to the Anglo-American model of industrial capitalism. Ezra Vogel’s (1979) influential book *Japan as Number One* became widely circulated in major intellectual and policy circles (that are often based in Washington or the two Cambridges – one in England and the other in New England). Coupled with the emergence of Asian newly industrialized economies and the 1973 oil crisis, the rise of Japan started to trigger off what has later been conceptualized as flexibility, post-Fordism,

and globalization. Interestingly, those social scientists who started to realize the indispensable role of Japan and Asia in their theorization of global economic change came largely from area studies (Vogel, 1991; Frank, 1998), political science (Johnson, 1982; Amsden, 1989; Haggard, 1990; Wade, 1990; Evans, 1995; Katzenstein and Shiraishi, 1996), and economic sociology (Hamilton and Biggart, 1988; Henderson, 1989; Gereffi and Wyman, 1990; Redding, 1990).

More specifically, Japan was significantly featured in Piore and Sabel's (1984) *The Second Industrial Divide* and Womack et al.'s (1990) *The Machines That Changed the World*. Both MIT (Cambridge, MA) products have fundamentally shaped the subsequent debates about America's (and by definition the world's) industrial future. During the same period of the 1980s and the early 1990s, flexible specialization had attracted serious attention from such economic geographers as Allen Scott, Michael Storper, Meric Gertler, Ash Amin and so on (see Table 1). But as described earlier, much of this work was inspired by empirical studies in California, Third Italy, and other European regions, with limited applicability to the Asian context (see Patchell, 1993a; 1993b; Eng, 1997a). In comparison with other major social sciences and with few exceptions (e.g. Florida and Kenny, 1990; Dicken, 1992a; Angel, 1994), mainstream economic geography has certainly "missed the boat" to exert its intellectual influence in major policy debates in the US and Europe about the imminent economic challenge from Asia and elsewhere (cf. Reich, 1991; Tyson, 1993; World Bank, 1993).

Vogel's *Japan as Number One* influential warning, nevertheless, was a short-lived one. With the downturn of the Japanese economy since the early 1990s and later the Asian financial crisis during 1997/1998, few people now take seriously the Asian miracles and the dawn of the Asian Century. In deconstructing the myth of the Asian miracles and the recent Asian economic crisis, mainstream economic geographers once again fail to take on an

intellectual leadership in the broader social sciences. Curiously, it is the economists and their political science counterparts who have spearheaded the debates about the downfall of Japan, the Asian economic crisis (Krugman, 1994; 1998; Radelet and Sachs, 1998; Wade and Veneroso, 1998), and the alleged rise of China as a threat (Vogel, 1989; Goodhart and Xu, 1996; Brown, 2000; Gertz, 2000). Asking “Where have all the geographers gone?”, Kelly et al. (2001: x-xi) noted the visible absence of economic geographers in debates on the origins and impact of the Asian economic crisis. In view of these dynamic transformations in the economic geography of Asia, textbooks on world economic geography may be compelled to be rewritten in order to reflect the changing trajectories of the Asian NIEs and the notion of the Asian miracles or the Pacific century.

If mainstream economic geography cannot offer much to our understanding of the complex economic landscapes of Asia (other than making available situated theories for “testing” and applications elsewhere), can we turn to *area studies specialists* who might offer such understanding from a more grounded perspective? Asia has long been studied by human and economic geographers who are interested in a detailed description of the land and the people outside of Europe and North America. These geographers include indigenous scholars living in the regions and Western scholars interested in Asia. The former has a sizable population no less than their counterpart in Western Europe and North America. Unfortunately, indigenous geographers in Asian countries have never been able to make any significant impact on mainstream enquiry in economic geography because of the linguistic and cultural barriers as well as their different methodological traditions that have seriously hindered meaningful scholarly exchanges with mainstream economic geographers. On the other hand, Western scholars interested in Asia have always been in the minority group preoccupied by an conscious or unconscious obligation to sort out the facts right about a mysterious region in the “Far East” for the occasional curiosity of Western academics and

constant colonial strategic as well as economic interests in one of the most populous regions of the world. With the exception of perhaps the flying geese model, studies of the economic geography of Japan have never occupied any prime position equivalent to the global significance of its national economy. Studies of China and India whose combined population contributes nearly half of the humankind have never generated any research output proportional to their population size (see also Potter, 2001). A systematic search of articles published in the top ten international journals in human geography during the years of 1971-2000 has revealed that only 66 articles, less than one percent of the grant total, dealt with the geography of China (Lin, 2002b). Most of these studies are empirical in nature that “had shallow roots, received little nourishment and predictably bore few and unappetizing fruits” (Leeming, 1980: 218). It is only in recent years that geographers interested in China have started to venture into the formulation of some “contextually sensitive theories” (Fan et al., 2002).

A final but relatively small group of geographers have managed to develop original theoretical insights from their grounded studies of the Asian experience. Through the work of these geographers, some kind of *grounded theories* emerges that prove to be influential in certain subfields of human geography and, to a lesser extent, economic geography. One of the most prominent examples of such grounded theories is Terry McGee’s (1967; 1971) theory of the Southeast Asian city (see also Armstrong and McGee, 1985). In this morphological model of the internal structure of the city, McGee argued that different urban-economic activities have different spatial requirements and locational characteristics. For example, the informal sector tends to be located in the inner ring of the city. McGee’s model has subsequently been well applied to the geographical study of other Third World cities. More crucially, it is a model that originates from empirical studies of such cities; it is not a model that is developed from studying the internal structures of advanced industrialized countries and then applied in

a universal manner to Third World cities (akin to “epistemological theorizing” described above). Despite its generality in studies of urbanization and urban economic activities, McGee’s model has regrettably made only limited impact on mainstream economic geography of the 1970s and the 1980s that was very much preoccupied with radical Marxism and post-Fordism.

More recently, geographical studies of *transnational business activities* and *transnationalism* represent a modest attempt to bring grounded theories of economic geographies of Asia back into mainstream economic geography (Leung, 1993; Mitchell, 1995; Yeung, 1997; Zhou, 1998; Hsu and Saxenian, 2001; Olds, 2001a). In particular, this body of economic geography literature managed to blend into its theoretical framework two important ingredients – a special blend that is well grounded in the Asian context. First, this literature brings into its analytical forefront the conceptual lenses of *networks* and *embeddedness*. While these conceptual categories did not originate from economic-geographical studies of Asia, it is equally important to note that mainstream economic geographers did not develop them either. Indeed, these conceptual categories were first proposed by economic sociologists (Polanyi, 1944; Granovetter, 1985; Zukin and DiMaggio, 1990; Smelser and Swedberg, 1994; see also Dacin et al., 1999) and subsequently introduced into and appropriated by mainstream economic geography during the flexible specialization debate (see Storper, 1989; Florida, 1991; Dicken and Thrift, 1992; Grabher, 1993). It is true that mainstream economic geography has further enhanced the theoretical sophistication of both conceptual categories through major debates on industrial districts (Amin and Robins, 1990b; Asheim, 1992; 2000; Harrison, 1992; Markusen, 1996), spatial transfer of technologies (Gertler, 1995; 1997; 2001), organizational change (Dicken and Thrift, 1992; Yeung, 1994; 1998a; Schoenberger, 1997), institutionalism in urban and regional development (Amin and Thrift, 1992; 1994). But then it must be equally valid to argue that

economic-geographical studies of Asia during the 1990s have significantly advanced the “spatialization” of these conceptual categories through theorizing the complex interactions among business networks, ethnicity/culture, embeddedness, and historical specificity. This effort to theorize the spatial rudiments of networks and embeddedness is no less significant than that in debates on industrial districts and so on (see Table 1).

Second, economic-geographical studies of Asian diasporas and their worldwide webs in Europe and North America have made a significant inroad into the debate on *globalization*. In many ways, this body of literature contributes to enhancing economic geography’s growing visibility in social scientific debates on globalization. Once again, geographers have not been well represented among social theorists of globalization: one can literally think of only two geographers – Peter Dicken’s (1986; 1992; 1998; 2003) *Global Shift* and David Harvey’s (1989) *The Condition of Postmodernity* – who represent different kinds of geographical “take” on globalization and thereby attract different sorts of audiences as well. Economic geographers, however, have something significant to say about the geographical specificities of globalization in relations to its origins, processes, and outcomes (see Amin, 1997; 2001; 2002; Yeung, 1998b; 2002b; Kelly, 1999; Taylor et al., 2001). Put in this perspective, economic-geographical research into Asian diasporas and their global networks augments very well the key mission of mainstream economic geography to ground globalization processes in specific territorial ensembles and formations. This research in Asia helps not only to demystify the “faceless” representations of globalization by its ultra-supporters (e.g. Ohmae, 1990), but also to make aware the highly uneven geographical outcomes of processes associated with globalization. In our humble opinions, this geographical research into the “globalization of Asia” is worth as much intellectual capital as other equally worthy globalization research in economic geography into changing urban and regional governance

(Amin and Thrift, 1995; Storper, 1997; Brenner, 1999) and the organizations of economic activities (Dicken et al., 2001; Peck and Yeung, 2003).

Theories Wanted! An Intellectual Agenda for Economic Geographies of Asia

We are currently at a crossroad or a critical juncture in economic geography. To mainstream economic geographers, there are unprecedented opportunities to give up our longstanding Euro-American centric bias and develop theories that really make sense in an era of accelerated globalization (cf. McGee, 1991; Olds, 2001b; Yeung, 2001a). Although concerns over national security remain looming large especially after the September 11 tragedy, earlier warped provincialism can no longer block economic geographers who are actively engaged in the studies of the transformation of regional economies in Asia. Major funding agencies such as the NSF in the US, ESRC in the UK, and SSHRC in Canada have recently supported a growing number of research projects on Asia. Many leading universities in the US (Berkeley), the UK (Oxford), and Canada (Toronto and UBC) have actively recruited geographers working on Asia. On the other side of the Pacific, most of the Asian countries have re-articulated themselves actively and openly to take part in the theatre of global capital accumulation. Special attempts have been made by indigenous geographers in Asia to overcome linguistic and cultural barriers as they forge bilateral scholarly linkages and research collaborations. Intellectually, universalism as one of the defining features of the Enlightenment school of thought has given way to a more open-ended, plural, and contextually sensitive perspective of changing geographies in different world regions. Overall, the institutional setting that previously separated regional geography of Asia from mainstream economic geography in the Anglo-American countries has now undergone profound transformation in a direction favorable for the growth of new *global economic geographies*.

We are beginning to witness such a change in the directions of mainstream economic geography – more inclusive “quality control” in the academic production of knowledge and more intellectual activities organized outside the Anglo-America centers. It is now incumbent on economic geographers interested in Asia to make a real choice at this crossroad. We need to move on from area studies to engage more actively with mainstream theoretical (re)constructions and interrogations. In this sense, we urge for two intellectual movements. First, we must avoid uncritical applications of “Western” theories in mainstream economic geography as if these theories are universally true. We need to interrogate these theories critically through our detailed research into economic geographies of Asia. Through this process of critical engagement with mainstream theories, we will be able not only to contribute “back” to mainstream economic geography through our refinement and reconstruction of these theories, but also to understand the economic landscapes of Asia from a grounded perspective. Second, we must turn away from doing what may be termed “Asian economic geography” because such a parochial approach to economic geographies of Asia will lend us with little significant theoretical insights that might be useful in other geographical contexts. Rather, we must endeavor to develop *new* theories grounded in Asia for economic geography at large. In this sense, there should not be “mainstream” economic geography on the basis of geographical divides (the Anglo-American centers vs. the rest of the world). In moving towards this direction of more inclusive economic geography research, we can unleash the collective power of our discipline through such an emerging enterprise as *global economic geographies*.

Why is such an intellectual turn towards more inclusive global economic geographies necessary? As outlined briefly in Introduction, we believe two important concurrent trends warrant this turn. The first trend is inevitably related to *the globalization of knowledge and theories*. Here, we observe an interesting recent phenomenon of “reaching out to Asia” and

“growing out of Asia” among economic geographers worldwide. Economic geographers from major Anglo-American centers are increasingly “reaching out to Asia” so that Asia could be integrated into their theorization and comparative analyses. As argued below in the empirical realm, Asia is becoming too important to be ignored by economic geographers; it is of course also too important to be left to economic geographers only. This is exemplified by the recent work on flexibility, globalization, social capital, the cultural turn, the institutional turn, and now the relational turn in economic geography. There is growing interest among economic geographers to investigate territorial formations outside the Anglo-American contexts *not* as an anomaly or “other economic geography” from the perspective of Anglo-American economic geography, but instead as an original subject of inquiry in its own right.

This trend towards “reaching out to Asia” clearly does not represent a one-way flow in the globalization of knowledge and theories. Today, more economic geographers interested in Asia are themselves Asians who receive their academic training in the Anglo-American centers (e.g. both authors of this article). This two-way intellectual fertilization allows them to benefit from the best of both worlds, so to speak. On the one hand, their peculiar background and origins in Asia enable their work to be firmly grounded in the material realities of Asia. Their understanding of Asia is equivalent to “native-speak” that is difficult to be emulated by geographers from other regions. On the other hand, these geographers are well equipped with sophisticated theoretical ideas and rigorous methodological procedures to enhance their research into economic geographies of Asia. They are certainly capable of “growing out of Asia” in their theoretical work to make major contributions to global economic geographies.

What then in Asia attract these economic geographers such that Asia becomes a subject of inquiry? Our answer lies with the empirical trend towards rapid and dramatic transformations in the economic landscapes of Asia in more recent decades. Asia has become a new site for theory development and empirical analysis in economic geography. The

importance of this new site does not merely rest with its internal transformations. More importantly, Asia's importance for economic geography is predicated on its potential to facilitate the production of new theoretical insights and, in Slater's (1999) words, "counter discourses" that allow economic geographers to "theorize back" at our situated knowledge emanating from Europe and North America. As noted earlier, Japan came to the forefront of social scientific inquiry during the 1980s because of its technological and economic prowess. Together with insights from other newly industrialization economies (except Hong Kong), research into Japan's rapid post-Second World War economic development points to the role of the developmental state. From an economic-geographical perspective, this theorization allows economic geography to reconsider location theory and development of industrial districts in novel ways that otherwise are unlikely to be achieved single-handedly through research into the Anglo-American countries (see Markusen and Park, 1993; Park and Markusen, 1995). It allows for the attainment of the "trans-local" understanding and development that is so well described by Smith (2002).

The rise of China since the late 1970s represents another critical juncture in the historiography of economic geography. For decades, the transformation of the Chinese space-economy under socialist authoritarianism has often been considered to be an unique or peculiar case incompatible with the international norms and "templates". The peculiarity of the Chinese experience, plus the lack of necessary information for meaningful studies, had made it extremely difficult for fruitful communication between economic geography theorists and China geographers. In recent years, however, the Chinese space-economy has undergone profound structural and spatial transformations as the post-Mao regime changed its approach from rigid utopian socialism to market-oriented pragmatism, and from self-isolation to active participation in globalization. A fascinating mosaic of plan and market, state and private sectors, central authoritarianism and local corporatism has emerged to re-contour the

economic landscape. Given the fundamental importance of both the Chinese culture and its re-structured socialist institutional setting to the transformation of the Chinese space-economy, incorporating the Chinese case into theory development in mainstream economic geography seems to be just the right thing to do in the right place at the right time.

Recent institutional and economic processes in China not only invalidate our received wisdom of the geography of industrialization and economic transition, but also present themselves as fertile grounds for the development of new theories. First, economic geographers have been accustomed to industrialization occurring virtually hand-in-hand with rapid urbanization and industrial activities located within urban areas. The core geographical argument for this trend towards urban-biased industrialization is related to the Marshallian notion of agglomeration economies and more recently increasing returns to scale as demonstrated in the endogenous growth models (Martin and Sunley, 1998). This abstract theorization of industrialization and regional growth, however, ignores historical specificity and institutional rigidities that continue to exert very strong effects in the case of China. The post-reform pattern of industrialization in China is therefore underscored largely by a process known as “rural industrialization” whereby labor force is expected to stay in rural areas and industrial activities are brought to their doorsteps (Christerson and Lever-Tracy, 1997; Eng, 1997b; Lin, 1997; Chen, 1998; Marton, 2000). The enormous contributions of town and village enterprises to China’s gross industrial output and value added in manufacturing are just one such indicator of “rural industrialization”. This finding, of course, does not mean that urban-biased industrialization does not take place in China. But it does call for a reconceptualization of industrialization and urban/regional development in China not as a special case of geographical industrialization, but as an original subject of inquiry that potentially yields new theoretical insights.

Second, China's transitional economy allows for new theories of economic transition and organizational change that are just making a significant inroad into major social sciences such as sociology and economics. Sociologists such as Victor Nee (1989; 1991; 1992; 1996), Andrew Walder (1995; 1996), Nan Lin (1995; Lin and Bian, 1991), and Douglas Guthrie (1997; 2000) have worked on China's post-reform development and collectively developed what may be termed the "market transition theory" (see also Stark, 1996 in the case of East Europe). This theory has certainly reinvigorated sociological studies of changing social structures and economic organization in transitional economies. In economics, Barry Naughton (1991; 1992; 1995), Thomas Rawski (1994), Alwyn Young (2000), and others have also shown how conventional neoclassical economics fails to provide a valid theoretical model for explaining China's economic development (see also Amsden, 1991; Young, 1995). Alternative economic models are therefore called for that account for China's unprecedented economic transformations. Although we have not yet observed similar theoretical development and disciplinary impact in economic geography research into Asia, we have certainly noticed some highly novel conceptualizations arising from recent work on China (Hsing, 1998; Cartier, 2001; Olds, 2001a; Fan, 2002) and other countries in Southeast Asia (Kelly, 1997; 2001a; 2001b; Coe and Kelly, 2002).

In conclusion, we believe that theorizing economic geographies of Asia is clearly an unfinished intellectual project. In fact, we will go so far as to suggest that it simply marks the beginning of a new intellectual era for economic geography towards the development of global economic geographies. Economic geographies of Asia must not be a subject of theorization from the perspectives of only mainstream Anglo-American economic geography. But equally, it is too important to be left alone for Asian economic geographers only. Building on a growing body of economic geography research into Asia, we hope that this paper takes a further and, hopefully, significant step towards more genuine *theoretical*

dialogues among economic geographers with different regional interests. This modest aim cannot be achieved without more theoretical work grounded in the material realities of Asia and yet speaking to an audience well tuned into the transmission frequency of global economic geographies. In this sense, we fully concur with Barnes and Sheppard's (2000: 6; our emphasis) assessment of the future of economic geography: "There is a Chinese saying: 'May you live in interesting times.' Our argument is that they are here *now* in economic geography". Obviously, we can't agree more.

References

- Akamatsu, K. (1962), 'A theory of unbalanced growth in the world economy', *Westwirtschaftliches Archiv*, Vol.86, pp.196-215.
- Amin, Ash (1997), 'Placing globalization', *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol.14(2), pp.123-37.
- Amin, Ash (2001), 'Globalisation: geographical imaginations', in Neil Smelser and Paul B. Baltes (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*, Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, pp.1247-257.
- Amin, Ash (2002), 'Spatialities of globalisation', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol.34(3), pp.385-99.
- Amin, Ash and Robins, Kevin (1990a), 'The re-emergence of regional economies? The mythical geography of flexible accumulation', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Vol.8(1), pp.7-34.
- Amin, Ash and Robins, Kevin (1990b), 'Industrial districts and regional development: limits and possibilities', in F. Pyke, G. Becattini and W. Sengenberger (eds.), *Industrial Districts and Inter-Firm Cooperation in Italy*, Geneva: International Institute for Labour Studies, pp.185-220.
- Amin, Ash and Thrift, Nigel (1992), 'Neo-Marshallian nodes in global networks', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol.16(4), pp.571-87.
- Amin, Ash and Thrift, Nigel (eds.) (1994), *Globalization, Institutions, and Regional Development in Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Amin, Ash and Thrift, Nigel (1995), 'Institutional issues for the European regions: from markets and pans to socioeconomics and powers of association', *Economy and Society*, Vol.24, pp.41-66.
- Amin, Ash and Thrift, Nigel (2000), 'What kind of economic theory for what kind of economic geography?', *Antipode*, Vol.32(1), pp.4-9.

- Amsden, Alice (1989), *Asia's Next Giant: South Korea and Late Industrialization*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Amsden, Alice (1991), 'Diffusion of development: the late industrializing model and Greater Asia', *American Economic Review*, Vol.81(2), pp.282-6.
- Amsden, Alice (2001), *The Rise of "The Rest": Challenges to the West From Late-Industrializing Economies*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Angel, David P. (1994), *Restructuring for Innovation: The Remaking of the U.S. Semiconductor Industry*, New York: Guilford.
- Appadurai, Arjun (1999), 'Globalization and the research imagination', *International Social Science Journal*, Vol.51(2), pp.229-38.
- Armstrong, Warwick and McGee, Terry G. (1985), *Theatres of Accumulation: Studies in Asian and Latin American Urbanization*, London: Methuen.
- Asheim, Bjørn T. (1992), 'Flexible specialisation, industrial districts and small firms: a critical appraisal', in Huib Ernste and Verena Meier (eds.), *Regional Development and Contemporary Industrial Response: Extending Flexible Specialisation*, London: Belhaven Press, pp.45-63.
- Asheim, Bjørn T. (2000), 'Industrial districts: the contributions of Marshall and beyond', in Gordon L. Clark, Maryann A. Feldman, and Meric S. Gertler (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Economic Geography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.413-31.
- Barnes, Trevor J. (1996), *Logics of Dislocation: Models, Metaphors, and Meanings of Economic Space*, New York: Guilford.
- Barnes, Trevor J. (1999), 'Industrial geography, institutional economics and Innis', in Trevor J. Barnes and Meric S. Gertler (eds.), *The New Industrial Geography: Regions, Regulation and Institutions*, London: Routledge, pp.1-22.
- Barnes, Trevor J. (2000), 'Inventing Anglo-American economic geography, 1889-1960', in Eric Sheppard and Trevor J. Barnes (eds.), *A Companion to Economic Geography*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp.11-26.
- Barnes, Trevor J. (2001a), 'Rethorizing economic geography: from the quantitative revolution to the 'cultural turn'', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol.91(3), pp.546-65.
- Barnes, Trevor J. (2001b), 'Lives lived and lives told: biographies of the quantitative revolution', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Vol.19, pp.409-29.
- Barnes, Trevor J. (2001c), 'In the beginning was economic geography – a science studies approach to disciplinary history', *Progress in Human Geography* Vol.25(4), pp.521-544.

- Barnes, Trevor J. and Curry, Michael (1983), 'Towards a contextualist approach to geographical knowledge', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, Vol.8, pp.467-82.
- Barnes, Trevor J. and Sheppard, Eric (2000), 'Introduction: the art of economic geography', in Eric Sheppard and Trevor J. Barnes (eds.), *A Companion to Economic Geography*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp.1-8.
- Berger, Suzanne and Dore, Ronald (eds.) (1996), *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Bernard, Mitchell and Ravenhill, John (1995), 'Beyond product cycles and flying geese: regionalisation, hierarchy and industrialisation in East Asia', *World Politics*, Vol.47(2), pp.171-209.
- Brenner, Neil (1999), 'Globalization as reterritorialisation: the European re-scaling of urban governance in the European Union', *Urban Studies*, Vol.36(3), pp.431-51.
- Brohman, John (1996), 'Postwar development in the Asian NICs: does the neoliberal model fit reality?', *Economic Geography*, Vol.72(2), pp.107-30.
- Brown, Michael (ed.) (2000), *The Rise of China*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bryson, John, Henry, Nick, Keeble, David and Martin, Ron (eds.) (1999), *The Economic Geography Reader: Producing and Consuming Global Capitalism*, Chichester: John Wiley.
- Cartier, Carolyn (2001), *Globalizing South China*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cartier, Carolyn (2002), 'Origins and evolution of a geographical idea: The macroregion in China', *Modern China*, Vol.28(1), pp.79-143.
- Chen, Weixing (1998), 'The political economy of rural industrialization in China: village conglomerates in Shandong Province', *Modern China*, Vol.24(1), pp.73-96.
- Christerson, Brad and Lever-Tracy, Constance (1997), 'The Third China? Emerging industrial districts in rural China', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol.21(4), pp.569-588.
- Clark, Gordon L., Feldman, Maryann A. and Gertler, Meric S. (eds.) (2000), *The Oxford Handbook of Economic Geography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clark, Gordon L. and Kim, Won Bae (eds.) (1995), *Asian NIEs in the Global Economy*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Clegg, Stewart R. and Redding, S. Gordon (eds.) (1990), *Capitalism in Contrasting Cultures*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Coe, Neil M. and Kelly, Philip F. (2002), 'Languages of labour: representational strategies in Singapore's labour control regime', *Political Geography*, Vol.21(3), pp.341-71.

- Dacin, M.T., Ventresca, M.J. and Beal, B.D. (1999), 'The embeddedness of organizations: dialogue and directions', *Journal of Management*, Vol.25(3), pp.317-56.
- Dicken, Peter (1986), *Global Shift: Industrial Change in a Turbulent World*, London: Harper & Row.
- Dicken, Peter (1992a), 'Europe 1992 and strategic change in the international automobile industry', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol.24(1), pp.11-32.
- Dicken, Peter (1992b), *Global Shift: The Internationalization of Economic Activity*, Second Edition, London: Paul Chapman.
- Dicken, Peter (1998), *Global Shift: Transforming the World Economy*, Third Edition, London: Paul Chapman.
- Dicken, Peter (2003), *Global Shift*, Fourth Edition, London: Sage.
- Dicken, Peter, Kelly, Philip, Olds, Kris and Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (2001), 'Chains and networks, territories and scales: towards an analytical framework for the global economy', *Global Networks*, Vol.1(2), pp.89-112.
- Dicken, Peter and Thrift, Nigel (1992), 'The organization of production and the production of organization: why business enterprises matter in the study of geographical industrialization', *Transactions, Institute of British Geographer*, New Series, Vol.17, pp.279-91.
- Dicken, Peter and Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (1999), 'Investing in the future: East and Southeast Asian firms in the global economy', in Olds, Kris, Dicken, Peter, Kelly, Philip, Kong, Lily and Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (eds.), *Globalisation and the Asia-Pacific: Contested Territories*, London: Routledge, pp.107-28.
- Douglass, Mike (1994), 'The "developmental state" and the NIEs of Asia', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol.26, pp.543-66.
- Dwyer, Dennis J. (ed.) (1972), *The City as a Centre of Change in Asia*, Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Edgington, David W. and Hayter, Roger (2000), 'Foreign direct investment and the flying geese model: Japanese electronics firms in the Asia Pacific', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol.32.
- Eng, Irene (1997a), 'Flexible production in late industrialization: the case of Hong Kong', *Economic Geography*, Vol.73(1), pp.26-43.
- Eng, Irene (1997b), 'The rise of manufacturing towns: externally driven industrialization and urban development in the Pearl River Delta of China', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol.21(4), pp.554-68.

- Ettlinger, Nancy (1999), 'Local trajectories in the global economy', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol.23(3), pp.335-57.
- Ettlinger, Nancy (2001), 'A relational perspective in economic geography: connecting competitiveness with diversity and difference', *Antipode*, Vol.33(2), pp.216-27.
- Evans, Peter (1995), *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fan, Cindy C. (2002), 'The elite, the natives, and the outsiders: Migration and labor market segmentation in urban China', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol.91(1), pp.103-24.
- Fan, Cindy C, Ma, Laurence J C, Pannell, Clifton C, and Tan, K C. (2002), 'China geography in North America', in G L Gaile, C J Willmott (eds.), *Geography in America at the Dawn of the 21st Century*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Florida, Richard (1991), 'The new industrial revolution', *Futures*, Vol.23(6), pp.559-76.
- Florida, Richard and Kenney, Martin (1990), *The Breakthrough Illusion*, New York: Basic Books.
- Frank, Andre Gunder (1998), *ReORIENT: Global Economy in the Asian Age*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Frobel, Folker, Heinrichs, Jurgen, and Kreye, Otto (1980), *The New International Division of Labour*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gereffi, Gary and Wyman, Donald L. (eds.) (1990), *Manufacturing Miracles: Paths of Industrialization in Latin America and East Asia*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gertler, Meric S. (1988), 'The limits to flexibility: comments on the post-Fordist vision of production', *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers*, New Series, Vol.13, pp.419-32.
- Gertler, Meric S. (1992), 'Flexibility revisited: districts, nation-states, and the forces of production', *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers*, New Series, Vol.17, pp.259-78.
- Gertler, Meric S. (1995), "'Being there": proximity, organization, and culture in the development and adoption of advanced manufacturing technologies', *Economic Geography*, Vol.71(1), pp.1-26.
- Gertler, Meric S. (1997), 'Between the global and the local: the spatial limits to productive capital', in Kevin Cox, (ed.), *Spaces of Globalization: Reasserting the Power of the Local*, New York: Guildford, pp.45-63.
- Gertler, Meric S. (2001), 'Best practice? Geography, learning and the institutional limits to strong convergence', *Journal of Economic Geography*, Vol.1(1), pp.5-26.

- Gertz, Bill (2000), *The China Threat: How the People's Republic Targets America*, Washington, DC: Regnery Pub.
- Ginsburg, Norton S. and Brush, John E. (1958), *The Pattern of Asia*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Goodhart, Charles and Xu, Chenggang (1996), *The Rise of China as an Economic Power*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Institute for International Development, Harvard University.
- Grabher, Gernot (ed.) (1993), *The Embedded Firm: The Socio-Economics of Industrial Networks*, London: Routledge.
- Granovetter, Mark (1985), 'Economic action, and social structure: the problem of embeddedness', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.91(3), pp.481-510.
- Guthrie, Douglas (1997), 'Between markets and politics: organizational responses to reform in China', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.102(5), pp.1258-304.
- Guthrie, Douglas (2000), 'Understanding China's transition to capitalism', *Sociological Forum*, Vol.15(4), pp.727-49.
- Haggard, Stephen (1990), *Pathways from the Periphery: The Politics of Growth in the Newly Industrializing Countries*, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Hamilton, Gary G. and Biggart, Nicole Woolsey (1988), 'Market, culture, and authority: a comparative analysis of management and organization in the Far East', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.94, S52-S94.
- Harrison, Bennett (1992), 'Industrial districts: old wine in new bottles?', *Regional Studies*, Vol.26(5), pp.469-83.
- Hart, Gillian (1998), 'Multiple trajectories: a critique of industrial restructuring and the new institutionalism', *Antipode*, Vol.30(4), pp.333-56.
- Hart-Landsberg, Martin and Burkett, Paul (1998), 'Contradictions of capitalist industrialization in East Asia: a critique of "flying geese" theories of development', *Economic Geography*, Vol.74(2), pp.87-110.
- Harvey, David (1989), *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hatch, Walter and Yamamura, Kozo (1996), *Asia in Japan's Embrace: Building a Regional Production Alliance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Henderson, Jeffrey (1986a), 'The new international division of labour and American semiconductor production in South-East Asia', in C. Dixon, D. Drakakis-Smith, and D. Watts (eds.), *Multinational Corporations and the Third World*, Boulder: Westview Press, pp.91-117.

- Henderson, Jeffrey (1986b), 'The new international division of labour and urban development in the contemporary world-system', in David Drakakis-Smith (ed.), *Urbanization in the Developing World*, London: Croom Helm, pp.63-81.
- Henderson, Jeffrey (1989), *The Globalisation of High Technology Production*, London: Routledge.
- Henderson, Jeffrey (1993), 'The role of the state in the economic transformation of East Asia', in Chris Dixon and David Drakakis-Smith (eds.), *Economic and Social Development in Pacific Asia*, London: Routledge, pp.85-114.
- Hsing, You-tien (1998), *Making Capitalism in China: The Taiwan Connection*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hsu, Jinn-Yuh and Saxenian, AnnaLee (2000), 'The limits of guanxi capitalism: transnational collaboration between Taiwan and the USA', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol.32(11), pp.1991-2005.
- Hudson, B. (1977), 'The new geography and the new imperialism: 1870-1918', *Antipode*, Vol.9(2), pp.12-19.
- Johnson, Chalmer (1982), *MITI and the Japanese Economic Miracle*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Johnston, Ron J. (1997), *Geography and Geographers: Anglo-American Human Geography Since 1945*, Fifth Edition, London: Arnold.
- Katzenstein, Peter and Shiraishi, Takashi (eds.) (1996), *Network Power: Japan and Asia*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kelly, Philip F. (1999), 'The geographies and politics of globalization', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol.23(3), pp.379-400.
- Kelly, Philip F. (2001a), 'The political economy of local labor control in the Philippines', *Economic Geography*, Vol.77(1), pp.1-22.
- Kelly, Philip F. (2001b), 'Metaphors of meltdown: political representations of economic space in the Asian financial crisis', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Vol.19, pp.719-42.
- Kelly, Philip F., Olds, Kris and Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (2001), 'Introduction: geographical perspectives on the Asian economic crisis', *Geoforum*, Vol.32(1), pp.vii-xiii.
- Krugman, Paul (1994), 'The myth of Asia miracle', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.73(6), pp.62-78.
- Krugman, Paul (1998), 'Asia: What went wrong?', *Fortune*, Vol.137(4), p.32.
- Lee, Roger and Wills, Jane (eds.) (1997), *Geographies of Economies*, London: Arnold.

- Leeming, Frank (1980), 'On Chinese geography', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol.4(2), pp.218-237.
- Leung, Chi-kin (1993), 'Personal contacts, subcontracting linkages, and development in the Hong Kong-Zhujiang Delta region', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol.83(2), pp.272-302.
- Ley, David (1999), 'Myths and meaning of immigration and the Metropolis', *Canadian Geographer*, Vol.43(1), pp.2-19.
- Lin, George C.S. (1997), *Red Capitalism in South China: Growth and Development of the Pearl River Delta*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Lin, George C.S. (2002a), 'Transnationalism and the geography of sub-ethnicity in Hong Kong', *Urban Geography*, Vol. 23, forthcoming.
- Lin, George C.S. (2002b), 'Changing discourses in China geography: A narrative evaluation', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol. 34, forthcoming.
- Lin, Nan (1995), 'Local market socialism: local corporatism in action in rural China', *Theory and Society*, Vol.24(3), pp.301-54.
- Lin, Nan and Bian, Yanjie (1991), 'Getting ahead in urban China', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.97(3), pp.657-88.
- Lösch, August (1954) *The Economics of Location*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- McGee, Terry G. (1967), *The Southeast Asian City*, London: Bell.
- McGee, Terry G. (1971), *The Urbanization Process in the Third World: Explorations in Search of a Theory*, London: Bell.
- McGee, Terry G. (1991), 'Eurocentrism in Geography – the case of Asian urbanization', *Canadian Geographer*, Vol.35(4), pp.332-44.
- McGee, Terry G. and Yeung, Yue-man (1977), *Hawkers in Southeast Asian Cities: Planning for the Bazaar Economy*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
- Ma, Laurence J. C. and Cartier, Carolyn (eds.) (2002), *The Chinese Diaspora: Space, Place, Mobility and Identity*, Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Markusen, Ann (1996), 'Sticky places in slippery space: a typology of industrial districts', *Economic Geography*, Vol.72(3), pp.293-313.
- Markusen, Ann and Park, Sam Ock (1993), 'The state as industrial locator and district builder: the case of Changwon, South Korea', *Economic Geography*, Vol.69(2), pp.157-81.
- Martin, Ron and Sunley, Peter (1998), 'Slow convergence? The new endogenous growth theory and regional development', *Economic Geography*, Vol.74(3), pp.201-27.

- Marton, Andrew M. (2000), *China's Spatial Economic Development: Regional Transformation in the Lower Yangzi Delta*, London: Routledge.
- Massey, Doreen (1984), *Spatial Division of Labour: Social Structures and the Geography of Production*, London: Macmillan.
- Massey, Doreen and Meegan, Richard (1989), 'Spatial division of labour in Britain', in Derek Gregory and Rex Walford (eds.), *Horizons in Human Geography*, London: Macmillan, pp.244-57.
- Mitchell, Katharyne (1995), 'Flexible circulation in the Pacific Rim: capitalism in cultural context', *Economic Geography*, Vol.71(4), pp.364-82.
- Murphey, Rhoads (1953), *Shanghai: Key to Modern China*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Murphey, Rhoads (1977), *The Outsiders: The Western Experience in India and China*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Naughton, Barry (1991), 'Why has economic reform led to inflation', *American Economic Review*, Vol.81(2), pp.207-211.
- Naughton, Barry (1994), 'China's reforms: structural and welfare aspects; Chinese innovation and privatization from below', *American Economic Review*, Vol.84(2), pp.266-70.
- Naughton, Barry (1995), *Growing Out of the Plan: Chinese Economic Reform, 1978-1993*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nee, Victor (1989), 'A theory of market transition: from redistribution to markets in state socialism', *American Sociological Review*, Vol.54, pp.663-81.
- Nee, Victor (1991), 'Social inequalities in reforming state socialism: between redistribution and markets in China', *American Sociological Review*, Vol.56, pp.267-82.
- Nee, Victor (1992), 'Organizational dynamics of market transition: hybrid forms, property rights and mixed economy in China', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol.37(1), pp.1-27.
- Nee, Victor (1996), 'The emergence of a market society: changing mechanisms of stratification in China', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.101, pp.908-49.
- Ohmae, Kenichi (1990), *The Borderless World: Power and Strategy in the Interlinked Economy*, London: Collins.
- Olds, Kris (2001a), *Globalization and Urban Change: Capital, Culture and Pacific Rim Mega Projects*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Olds, Kris (2001b), 'Practices for 'process geographies': a view from within and outside the periphery', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Vol.19(2), pp.127-36.

- Olds, Kris and Poon, Jessie (2002), 'Theories and discourses of economic geography', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol.34(3), pp.379-83.
- Olds, Kris and Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (1999), '(Re)shaping "Chinese" business networks in a globalising era', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Vol.17(5), pp.535-55.
- Oshima, Harry T. (1987), *Economic Growth in Monsoon Asia: A Comparative Survey*, Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Park, Bae-Gyoon (1998), 'Where do tigers sleep at night? The state's role in housing policy in South Korea and Singapore', *Economic Geography*, Vol.74(3), pp.272-88.
- Park, Sam Ock and Markusen, Ann (1995), 'Generalizing new industrial districts: a theoretical agenda and an application from a non-Western economy', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol.27(1), pp.81-104.
- Patchell, Jerry (1993a), 'From production systems to learning systems – lessons from Japan', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol.25(6), pp.797-815.
- Patchell, Jerry (1993b), 'Composing robot production systems – Japan as a flexible manufacturing system', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol.25(7), pp.923-44.
- Peck, Jamie A. and Wills, Jane (eds.) (2001), 'Debating economic geography: (more than) responses to Amin and Thrift', *Antipode*, Vol.33(2), pp.147-227.
- Peck, Jamie and Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (eds.) (2003), *Global Connections*, London: Sage.
- Piore, Michael J. and Sabel, Charles F. (1984), *The Second Industrial Divide: Possibilities for Prosperity*, New York: Basic Books.
- Polanyi, Karl (1944), *The Great Transformation*, New York: Holt, Rinehart.
- Potter, Rob (2001), 'Geography and development: "core and periphery"?', *Area*, Vol.33(4), pp.422-27.
- Radelet, Steven and Sachs, Jeffrey D. (1998), 'The East Asian financial crisis: diagnosis, remedies, prospects', *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, No.1, pp.1-90.
- Rawski, Thomas G. (1994), 'Chinese industrial reform: accomplishments, prospects, and implications', *American Economic Review*, Vol.84(2), pp.271-75.
- Redding, S. Gordon (1990), *The Spirit of Chinese Capitalism*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Reich, Robert B. (1991), *The Work of Nations: Preparing Ourselves for 21st Century Capitalism*, New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, Edward W. (1978), *Orientalism*, London: Routledge.

- Schoenberger, Erica (1997), *The Cultural Crisis of the Firm*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Scott, Allen J. (1988), *New Industrial Spaces: Flexible Production, Organisation and Regional Development in North America and Western Europe*, London: Pion.
- Scott, Allen J. (2000), 'Economic geography: the great half-century', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol.24(4), pp.483-504.
- Shaw, Martin (2000), *Theory of the Global State: Globality as Unfinished Revolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sheppard, Eric and Barnes, Trevor J. (eds.) (2000), *A Companion to Economic Geography*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sidaway, James D. (1997), 'The production of British geography', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, Vol.22(4), pp.488-504.
- Skinner, G. William (1964), 'Marketing and social structure in rural China (Part I)', *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol.24, pp.3-44.
- Skinner, G. William (1965a), 'Marketing and social structure in rural China (Part II)', *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol.25, pp.195-228.
- Skinner, G. William (1965b), 'Marketing and social structure in rural China (Part III)', *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol.25, pp.363-400.
- Slater, David (1999), 'Situating geopolitical representations: inside/outside and the power of imperial interventions', in Doreen Massey, John Allen and Philip Sarre (eds.), *Human Geography Today*, Cambridge: Polity, pp.62-84.
- Smart, Josephine, and Smart, Alan (1991), 'Personal relations and divergent economies: A case study of Hong Kong investment in China', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol.15 (2), pp.216-233.
- Smelser, Neil and Swedberg, Richard (eds.) (1994), *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Smith, Adrian (2002), 'Trans-locals, critical area studies and geography's Others, or why "development" should not be geography's organising framework: a response to Potter', *Area*, Vol.34.
- Spate, Oskar H. K. and Learmonth, A. T. A. (1967), *India and Pakistan: A General and Regional Geography*, London: Methuen.
- Spencer, Joseph E. (1954), *Asia, East by South: A Cultural Geography*, New York: Wiley.
- Spencer, Joseph E. (1973), *Oriental Asia: Themes Toward a Geography*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Stark, David (1996), 'Recombinant property in East European capitalism', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.101(4), pp.993-1027.
- Stark, David and Bruszt, L. (2001), 'One way or multiple paths: For a comparative sociology of East European capitalism', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.106(4), pp.1129-1137.
- Storper, Michael (1989), 'The transition to flexible specialization: the division of labour, external economies, and crossing of industrial divides', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol.13, pp.273-305.
- Storper, Michael (1997), *The Regional World: Territorial Development in a Global Economy*, New York: Guilford Press.
- Storper, Michael and Scott, Allen J. (eds.) (1992), *Pathways to Industrialization and Regional Development*, London: Routledge.
- Storper, Michael and Walker, Michael (1989), *The Capitalist Imperative: Territory, Technology and Industrial Growth*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Taylor, Peter J. (1996), 'Embedded statism and the social sciences: opening up to new spaces', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol.28, pp.1917-28.
- Taylor, Peter J., Watts, Michael J. and Johnston, Ron J. (2001), 'Geography/globalization', *GaWC Research Bulletin*, No.41, Department of Geography, Loughborough University.
- Thrift, Nigel and Olds, Kris (1996), 'Refiguring the economic in economic geography', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol.20(3), pp.311-337.
- Thrift, Nigel and Walling, D. (2000), 'Geography in the United Kingdom 1996-2000', *Geographical Journal*, Vol.166(2), pp.96-124.
- Tyson, Laura D'Andrea (1993), *Who's Bashing Whom? Trade Conflicts in High-Technology Industries*, Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.
- Vogel, Ezra F. (1979), *Japan as Number One: Lessons for America*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vogel, Ezra F. (1989), *One Step Ahead in China: Guangdong Under Reform*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wade, Robert (1990), *Governing the Market: Economic Theory and the Role of Government in East Asian Industrialization*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wade, Robert and Veneroso, Frank (1998), 'The Asian crisis: the high debt model versus the Wall Street-Treasury-IMF complex', *New Left Review*, No.228, pp.3-23.
- Walder, Andrew G. (1995), 'Local governments as industrial firms: an organizational analysis of China's transitional economy', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.101(2), pp.263-301.

- Walder, Andrew G. (1996), 'Markets and inequality in transitional economies: towards testable theories', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol.102(4), pp.1060-73.
- Walker, Richard and Storper, Michael (1981), 'Capital and industrial location', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol.5(4), pp.473-509.
- Wheatley, Paul (1971), *The Pivot of the Four Quarters: A Preliminary Enquiry into the Origins and Character of the Ancient Chinese City*, Chicago: Aldine Pub.
- Whitley, Richard (1992), *Business Systems in East Asia: Firms, Markets and Societies*, London: Sage.
- Whitley, Richard (1999), *Divergent Capitalisms: The Social Structuring and Change of Business Systems*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wills, Jane and Lee, Roger (1997), 'Introduction', in Roger Lee and Jane Wills (eds) *Geographies of Economies*, London: Arnold, pp.xv-xviii.
- Womack, James P., Jones, Daniel T. and Roos, Daniel (1990), *The Machines That Changed the World*, New York: Rawson Associates.
- Woo-Cumings, Meredith (eds.) (1999), *The Developmental State*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- World Bank (1993), *The East Asian Miracle*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yang, Mayfair M. H. (1994), *Gifts, Favors and Banquets: The Art of Social Relationships in China*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Yeoh, Brenda S.A. and Chang, Tou Chuang (2001), 'Globalising Singapore: debating transnational flows in the city', *Urban Studies*, Vol.38(7), pp.1025-1044.
- Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (1994), 'Critical reviews of geographical perspectives on business organisations and the organisation of production: towards a network approach', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol.18(4), pp.460-90.
- Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (1997), 'Business networks and transnational corporations: a study of Hong Kong firms in the ASEAN region', *Economic Geography*, Vol.73(1), pp.1-25.
- Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (1998a), 'The social-spatial constitution of business organisations: a geographical perspective', *Organization*, Vol.5(1), pp.101-28.
- Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (1998b), 'Capital, state and space: contesting the borderless world', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, Vol.23(3), pp.291-309.
- Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (1998c), *Transnational Corporations and Business Networks: Hong Kong Firms in the ASEAN Region*, London: Routledge.

- Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (1999), 'Regulating investment abroad? The political economy of the regionalisation of Singaporean firms', *Antipode*, Vol.31(3), pp.245-73.
- Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (2000), 'Organising "the firm" in industrial geography I: networks, institutions and regional development', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol.24(2), pp.301-15.
- Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (2001a), 'Redressing the geographical bias in social science knowledge', *Environment and Planning A*, Vol.33(1), pp.2-9.
- Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (2001b), 'Regulating "the firm" and socio-cultural practices in industrial geography II', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol.25(2), pp.293-302.
- Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (2002a), 'Doing what kind of economic geography?', *Journal of Economic Geography*, Vol.2(2), pp.250-52.
- Yeung, Henry Wai-chung (2002b), 'The limits to globalization theory: a geographical perspective on global economic change', *Economic Geography*, Vol.78(3).
- Young, Alwyn (1995), 'The tyranny of numbers – confronting the statistical realities of the East Asian growth experience', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol.110(3), pp.641-80.
- Young, Alwyn (2000), 'The razor's edge: Distortions and incremental reform in the People's Republic of China', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol.115(4), pp.1091-1135.
- Zhou, Yu (1998), 'Beyond ethnic enclaves: location strategies of Chinese producer service firms in Los Angeles', *Economic Geography*, Vol.74(3), pp.228-51.
- Zhou, Yu and Tseng, Yen-Fen (2001), 'Regrounding the "Ungrounded Empires": localization as the geographical catalyst for transnationalism', *Global Networks*, Vol.1(2), pp.131-54.
- Zukin, Sharon and DiMaggio, Paul (eds.) (1990), *Structures of Capital: The Social Organisation of the Economy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

TABLE 1. Leading Theoretical Perspectives in Economic Geography and Their Historical Geographies

Theoretical Perspectives	Period of Prominence	Key Authors	Geographical Specificities of Research
1. Location theory and behavioral location model	1960s-1970s	Brian Berry Peter Haggett Peter Dicken F.E.I. Hamilton	USA UK
2. Spatial divisions of labor	1980s	Doreen Massey	UK
3. Flexible specialization and new industrial spaces	1980s-1990s	Allen Scott Michael Storper David Harvey Meric Gertler	USA Italy Germany
4. Networks and embeddedness	1990s-	Nigel Thrift Peter Dicken Gernot Grabher Phil Cooke Ash Amin	UK Europe
5. Regional agglomerations and clusters	mid 1990s-	Michael Storper Allen Scott Anders Malmberg Peter Maskell	USA UK Europe
6. Regulation theory and governance	mid 1990s-	Jamie Peck Adam Tickell Erik Swyngedouw	France UK Europe
7. Cultural economies	mid 1990s-	Nigel Thrift Ash Amin Erica Schoenberger Linda McDowell Trevor Barnes J-K Gibson-Graham Roger Lee Jane Wills	UK USA and Canada (to a lesser extent)