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1. The FG Paradigm has a long intellectual history (since the 1930s), born as a development model of late industrialization reflecting Japan’s industrial catch-up process (in the Meiji period) with the focus on the textile (woollen and cotton) industries. This thesis

2. In the postwar period, the FG Paradigm has evolved into a model to rationalize regional integrative development (with the cascading cross-border industrial diffusion) among East Asian economies rather than a model to explain the catch-up process of individual late industrializers. This thesis

3. While the FG paradigm is intuitively appealing and comforting as it stipulates harmonious regional development, many of its conceptual elements (including, the product cycle argument) do not stand well against vigorous scrutiny (economic logic and empirical verification). This thesis

4. Whereas Japan was the centre of integrative development of East Asia in the 2nd half of the 20th century, China came forward to replace Japan in the new millennium. China’s new model presents geo-economic implications that are much greater than the predecessor. This thesis

5. While it is difficult to determine to what extent the FG paradigm can be effectively applied to regions beyond East Asia, China’s ‘Belt and Road initiative’ could be regarded as the global application (externalization) of China’s domestic FG paradigm. This thesis

6. In the postwar period, the Flying Geese paradigm was interpreted in accordance with ‘non-political’ logic, i.e., neoclassical logic, even though much of East Asian development took place in the Cold War geopolitical context, including in particular the United States’ large military/development aid as well as its procurement.

7. East Asian development has much to do with the inter-linkages among Ethnic Chinese communities scattered in the region, rather than market logic of the FG paradigm.

8. Researchers tend to overestimate the contemporary performance of the Chinese economy (as the proportion of its value-added is very small), as well as the sustainability of its growth (at the cost of its environment hazard).

9. Robotics as a possible replacement of manual labour can challenge the conceptual framework of the product cycle theory which explains that manufacturers of consumer products that are at mature stages tend to seek offshore production. On the other hand, the greater cross-border mobility of labour – migrant workers – may challenge the conventional framework of product cycle theories with respect to offshore production.

10. Modern researchers have largely disregarded or dismissed the dialectic conception of the initial Flying Geese paradigm, i.e., the interplay between the homogenization (convergence) efforts made by late industrializers and the heterogenization (divergence) efforts made early industrializers. The lack of synchronization between the
two has tended to create something like a business cycle, and minority (heterodox) researchers recognize this and call it the ‘Akamatsu cycle (wave)’, something equivalent to the Kondrachiev cycle (wave).

11. The greenhouse production of bananas in Iceland – a humorous case of ‘factor intensity reversal’ – shakes the traditional concept of comparative advantage, and the modern model of the FG paradigm.