variation in the response of common stock returns to the accident and they try to model this using variables to capture the liability exposure of the firms, the degree of their capacity that is nuclear, and whether the firm had new nuclear plants under construction. They find that the new nuclear capacity variable was significant in affecting the firm's stock returns during the periods of the accident and the report. It also might have been useful to consider a regulatory climate variable, such as Sherman used in chapter four, since it is possible that the varied response of common stock returns was due to the climate in particular states. For example, Massachusetts has opposed nuclear power for some time and an event such as Chernobyl could increase pressure on the utilities in that state even if it had no effects on utilities in other states.

Overall the book provides the reader with insights into the important issues regarding the regulation of public utilities. Those who are interested in a broad survey of developments in the area will find several chapters worthwhile. Researchers with interests in new work in public utilities and their regulation will find much to stimulate their thinking.

References

Olson, Mancur, 1965, *The Logic of Collective Action*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sherman, Roger, 1989, *The Regulation of Monopoly*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tullock, Gordon, 1967, 'The Welfare Costs of Tariffs, Monopolies, and Theft', *Western Economic Journal* 5, 224–232.

ROBERT E. McAULIFFE
Associate Professor of Economics, Babson College

Chung H. Lee and Ippei Yamazawa (eds.), *The Economic Development of Japan and Korea: A Parallel with Lessons*. New York, Westport, CT, London: Praeger, 1990. ISBN 0-27593-331-8.

As clearly shown by the establishment of diplomatic relations with Gorbachev's USSR, South Korea is emerging as a vital economic power now in this last decade of the century. However, compared with Japan's economic development, very little English literature is available about Korea. In Japan, where economic ties, as well as rivalry between the nations is keen, and about 600,000 Koreans are living in Japan with their special, permanent resident status, the number of books about the Korean economy is not small. However, if we limit our attention to scholarly analysis, the situation is much the same as with the English publications.

This timely book consists of an introduction by Chung H. Lee and Tuvia Blumenthal and then presents successsively six sets of parallel analyses about the economic development of Japan and Korea. The topics that are analyzed consist of (1) trade; (2) government; (3) imported technology; (4) financial systems and policies; (5) agriculture; and (6) education, respectively. The book is the result of a research project organized by the Resource Systems Institute, East-West Center, Honolulu, and the papers were presented at a conference held in April 1987.

As a consequence of its formal, symmetrical structure, this book reveals two important differences between the way the Japanese and Korean contributors analyze these topics. One difference is the time perspective adopted. The Japanese contributions provide historical overviews regressing back to the situation at the time of Meiji-Japan while their Korean counterparts seldom deal with the situation before the 1960s, and, certainly, not earlier than 1945. I admit this may be a natural result because of the different time spans of economic development represented by the two nations. However, the evident lack of frank discussion about the interrelations of the two neighboring nations (where at the core lies the legacy of Japanese colonial rule in Korea from 1910–45) gives the impression of a certain, reserved formality about confronting this challenging issue.

Another difference between the approaches of the Japanese and Korean writers has to do with the objectives of the analysis. In the Japanese contributions we encounter sincere effort to demystify of the prevailing model of the Japanese economy such as "Japan Inc." The most stimulating examples are Tajika/Yui's estimation of the policy effects on the cost of capital (Ch. 3) and Kohsaka's flat denial of the supposed effects of the low-interest rate policy (Ch. 7). Kohama's emphasis on the dynamism of the private sector that enabled the "catching-up product cycle style of industrialization" (Ch. 1) and Urata's analysis of the effects of imported technologies (Ch. 5) run in a similar vein. In contrast to the Japanese contributions, which focus on the examination of the already existing explanatory model, the Korean contributions are in search of a corresponding model for the Korean economy. Though Choi/Young Sae Lee (Ch. 4) and Kim/Sang Ho Lee (Ch. 6) complain about the frequent policy changes, and Un-Chan Chung (Ch. 8) suggests the near bankruptcy situations of the banks due to severe government control, the Korean economists generally approve of the positive effects of the leadership provided by the Korean government. Impressively enough, the attendance of President Park at the monthly meetings of economic review and of export promotion is mentioned twice by Chon Pyo Lee (Ch. 2) and Choi/Lee (Ch. 4). But it does not mean that Koreans are satisfied with the image of "Korea Inc." They are looking for "a more complex approach" to explain the "collaborative effort by the government and [the] private firms" (Choi/Lee).

Parallel concerns with agriculture and educattion and their respective impact on relations of social structure in both nations also provide still other, rich perspectives about the changes that accompany economic development. While Hara (Ch. 9) argues that agricultural policy in Japan has changed in only one century from exploitation to protection, Korean agricultural policy described by Young/Chung (Ch. 10) seems to have been caught in the policy dilemma between providing cheap food (low real wages) and protectionism. Though both nations are famous for their enthusiasm about education, Arai (Ch. 11) reveals the fact that Meiji-Japan took 30 years to raise the attendance ratio at elementary school up to 90 percent, and Choo (Ch. 12) suggests a kind of reluctance on the the part of Japanese colonial government to meet the demand for elementary education among Koreans. The former contains an interesting application of the rate-of-return approach to higher education in Japan. The latter describes the relations of the amazingly rapid educational expansion in Korea with its need for qualified manpower.

All in all, this book is successful in offering convincing lessons that are relevant to the present experiences of populous, developing countries that lack natural resources. The editor summarizes the lessons as follows: (1) the promotion of labor-intensive, manufacturing industries "with an orientation for international competitiveness and with technology borrowed from abroad where necessary" does promote economic development; and (2) the necessity of "a political leadership committed to economic development and a bureaucratic system that can implement its vision" are critical to promote economic development. However, a parallel analysis of the internal structure of industry which guarantees the ability of establishments to grow as well as adopt and refine technology should also be considered. As for the problem of political leadership, this reviewer must say that the mere efficiency of decision-making and its successful implementation is much too narrow a criterion on which to recommend a mighty, interventionist government policy.

KIICHIRO YAGI
Kyoto University

Ingo L. O. Schmidt and Jan B. Rittaler, *A Critical Evaluation of the Chicago School of Antitrust Analysis*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989. ISBN 9-02473-792-3.

While struggling with issues raised by the need to develop competition policy in Europe, Ingo Schmidt and Jan Rittaler turned for guidance to existing views about antitrust policy in the United States. Their observations of the "Chicago School of Antitrust Analysis," published in preliminary form in German in 1986, are reported in this slender volume which summarizes existing literature like a good German Dissertation. The book presents a critical portrait of the "School," and because Chicago has been so influential in the "law-and-economics" movement much of the criticism applies to it as well. Some assessments can be traced to differences in European and American settings, since policies suitable for America may not serve well in Europe. The book is nonetheless useful for briefly summarizing Chicago positions and indirectly bringing out