Table 8.1). Otherwise there seems very little that it can provide which cannot be obtained by simple trend analysis.

These essays are likely to be much more interesting for what they provide as a general perspective of Indian rural poverty and for the debate on the green revolution's effects. Pranab Bardhan provides a useful listing of the potentially disadvantageous processes (pp 77–78), but this seems to be refuted by the balance of argument and evidence elsewhere – particularly M.L. Dantwala (pp 116–118), Raisuddin Ahmed on Bangladesh, and Montek Ahluwalia's general statistical review.

Dr Ahluwalia concludes:

> (1) There is fairly strong evidence of an inverse relationship between agricultural income per head and the incidence of rural poverty, especially if account is taken of lagged effects; (2) there is no evidence that this relationship has weakened since the green revolution; and (3) reliance on growth alone will not bring about a large reduction in the incidence of poverty in the near future. These conclusions underscore the need for rural development programs aimed especially at the rural poor (p 73).

There is unfortunately little scope for his recommendation as long as India persists with its heavy emphasis on capital intensive, developed-country-type forms of industrial investment or the rich countries restrict the markets for Third World exports.

Green revolution

Agriculture and Equitable Growth: the Case of Punjab-Haryana provides an extremely valuable review of one of the most voluminous segments of rural development literature of the 25 years to 1982, even though the author's final conclusions may not entirely satisfy. (A recent complementary book is *Agriculture and the Development Process: a Study of Punjab* by D.P. Chaudri and A.K. Dasgupta, Croom Helm, 1985.)

John Westley's particular interest is to examine the green revolution development of the two states (with a combined population of around 30 million in the late 1970s) as evidence of 'the feasibility of equitable growth in the absence of fundamental land reforms and other basic changes in the structure of rural institutions [which] is particularly important for India' (p 3).

Through the 1960s and 1970s annual per capita domestic product grew at 3.1% in the Punjab and marginally below 3.0% in Haryana, as against 1.1% for India. Real wage rates of hired agricultural labourers showed no perceptible upward trend in the two states over the 20 years, but their overall employment increased more than threefold. There was some concentration in the ownership of land and other farm assets, but for small farmers this disadvantage was more than offset by their ability to apply the new technologies. The two states have, for some time, been much better placed than India as a whole with regard to the share of population below the official poverty level, with levels running at something over one-half of the national proportions in 1957–67. By the mid- to late-1970s it seems to have fallen to almost 40% of the national rate (Table 4 and our calculation from Table 36). Relative inequality may have increased, but the green revolution was not an experience causing mass misery.

Dr Westley stresses the advantages which the two states enjoy in soils, topography and other natural conditions and also those from the extensive investment in rural infrastructure. But one is left wondering how far he sustains his case that the Haryana–Punjab experience points sufficiently to an effective strategy for most of rural India or other developing areas. As he notes, the two states enjoyed what was in effect export-lead growth, following the major shift to more remunerative crop prices by the government of India in the mid-1960s, which enabled them to replace imports from the USA and Australia for the public foodgrain distribution system. Opportunities on a sufficient scale are not now so immediately available as they were for the comparatively small, combined populations in Harayana and the Punjab in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

None of this is to deny the case for greater emphasis on rural-oriented growth, but it should be made in terms of the more general Lipton–Mellor arguments, to which Dr Westley refers, rather than on the basis of what in some considerable degree appears to be a special case.

These six books seem to be a representative selection on non-Communist, Third World rural poverty. Their overall impression is pessimistic with so much to make better yet so little net progress and few practical solutions for significantly more rapid advance.

George Allen
Barnstaple, Devon, UK

[1]The 'indirect' effects of large-scale producers represent their envisaged part in promoting the inequalities outlined earlier in the quotation.

Mixing and matching food marketing systems

WORLD FOOD MARKETING SYSTEMS

edited by Erdener Kaynak

Butterworths, Borough Green, Sevenoaks, Kent, UK, 1986, 333 pp, £37.50

Food marketing, of course, embraces a considerable number of facets: its contribution to the economy; the dynamics of its change in a changing environment; structure, behaviour and performance parameters; the impact of government policies on the food sector; linkages with the agricultural sector; the domestic food sector in the international environment; the food sector and consumer welfare, food standards and nutrition; and the development of new products are just some examples of what might be explored. Consider this on a worldwide scale, not just for one country, and the potentially encyclopaedic na-

ture of a publication on world food marketing systems becomes apparent.

To produce a single volume of just over 300 pages on this topic requires either incredible powers of editorship, or the willingness to select just one or perhaps two themes and accept the fact that the title is slightly misleading.

Unfortunately, Erdener Kaynak – in editing what he claims is a 'pioneering study of the characteristics of food marketing systems around the world' (pvii) – has attempted to be all-embracing in bringing together 28 contributions of various aspects of food marketing from different geographical regions. Thirteen of these contributions are reprints or revised versions of earlier publications and readers of *Food Policy* over the past decade should find much that is familiar, as ten are reprints of articles which appeared in issues between 1977 to 1983.

Although many of the articles – both reprints and newly commissioned studies – are of interest in their own right, the wide scope and relatively large number of contributions chosen by the editor has inevitably led to a lack of focus, some degree of overlap and a very variable coverage of the very many themes which have a legitimate claim to be considered under the chosen title.

The editor has attempted to overcome the problem of focus by arranging the contributions around subthemes, but by choosing to divide the book into as many as 11 sections he has obscured his own intentions. There are several instances where his choice of chapter location seems puzzling. To give just one example, Hans Mittendorf's chapter on the 'Role of government in improving food market centres in less developed countries' appears in the section on 'Food marketing infrastructure' whereas it might equally well, or more appropriately, be placed in the section on 'Government food marketing policies and facilitating services', or perhaps even in the section on 'Developing efficient food marketing systems'.

Even with 11 subthemes, some sections include a peculiar mixture of articles. Thus Part V on 'Food marketing strategies, facilities and procedures' includes chapters on food marketing in Libya, a comparative study of urban food distribution systems in Latin America and the Middle East, Peter Timmer's 1980 article on food prices and food policy analysis in less developed countries, and an article on consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction with food products in Canada!

I trust that my criticisms of Kaynak's 'pioneering' study do not deter others from attempting to view food marketing issues from a global perspective. Food systems do change quite dramatically over time as conditions change, and policy makers and practitioners in developing countries in particular can learn a great deal from a careful comparative study of these changes in other areas of the world. The results of this type of approach can be quite rewarding, as I found to my own delight when preparing a paper on the assessment of food systems in relation to food safety in developing countries, and comparing these with the developed country situation.

L.D. Smith
Centre for Development Studies
University of Glasgow
Glasgow, UK

Prospects for trade performance in ASEAN and Australia

FOOD TRADE AND FOOD SECURITY IN ASEAN AND AUSTRALIA

by Anne Booth, Cristina C. David *et al*

ASEAN–Australia Joint Research Project, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia, 1986, 269 pp

During the past quarter of a century ASEAN countries have enjoyed sustained economic growth, structural change and the benefits of the green revolution, all of which have transformed their patterns of production, consumption and economic relationships. When allied to the complementarities of the ASEAN and Australian economies, this might well have stimulated a major expansion in trade – foodstuffs and fibres in exchange for tropical products, petroleum and labour intensive manufactures. Then why does the trade flow, though rising, still remain of comparatively small significance to both parties? Is it limited by inward-looking food security policies in ASEAN or by an unimaginative Australian attitude to regional trade? What are the prospects for a better performance? These questions are addressed in *Food Trade and Food Security in ASEAN and Australia*, a collection of papers which has been issued under the auspices of the ASEAN/Australia Joint Research Project.

Anne Booth and Syarifuddin Baharsyah open a series of five country studies with a systematic analysis of Indonesia's food economy and how it responded to the import substitution policies of the 1960s and the oil boom of the 1970s. The privileged treatment given to rice production and the neglect of cash crops is attributed to the government's anxiety to avoid the short-term gains of the oil boom being dissipated in an upsurge of food imports. Justifiable as this may have been, they believe that the changed circumstances of the 1980s call for new policies tailored to each region, and caution against costly attempts at self-sufficiency in non-rice food crops. In Malaysia, on the other hand, the motivations behind agricultural policies have been quite different. As S. Meyanathan and G. Sivalingam emphasize in a comprehensive country review, there are strong social and political factors underlying food security and investment programmes: rice and manufactures have been favoured primarily because of their importance as sources of employment for the Malay ethnic groups. Looking ahead, however, they foresee rice production being increasingly constrained by labour shortages and expect a rising