

BOOK REVIEWS

Cynthia Enloe (2007). *Globalization and Militarism: Feminist Make the Link*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC., 187 pp.

Author: Olivera Simic
PhD Candidate
Melbourne Law School
o.simic@pgrad.unimelb.edu.au

Written by one of the leading feminist scholars, Cynthia Enloe's latest book *Globalization and Militarism: Feminist Make the Link* offers a unique insight into the complex issues of globalization, militarism and international politics. The book fills in a gap in the literature related to gender, militarization, and globalization and casts a new light to these phenomena. Enloe, provocatively, draws a *feminist link* between globalization and militarism by exploring why and how the globalization of militarization and the militarization of globalization happens (p. 8). She discusses topics such as women's "cheap" labor, the U.S. invasion of Iraq, national security as a militarized male agenda, the global and gendered aspects of the Abu Ghraib scandal, and fashion as a political statement. She also uses these examples to illustrate, from the feminist perspective, the events occurring in global politics today which are often considered by the general public "trivial" and challenges us to recognize militarism in its various forms such as security, fashion or labor. Her feminist, international and political inquiry is motivated by a *feminist curiosity* which does *not* "take things for granted" but rather asks tough questions about the relationships of women to families, to men, to companies, to institutions, to the state, and to globalizing trends (p. 10). Enloe provides a fresh insight into militarism and globalization and looks beyond the impacts of global affairs on women, focusing on their causes. She employs and develops a *feminist curiosity* and a *feminist causal analysis* in order to discover how and why the world works the way it does (p. 12-18). With her new work, Enloe shows yet again that taking women's lives seriously in creating local and global policies is the key explanation of how world politics works. As she argues, women's lives are too often used for achievement of various global and militarized projects created by men.

In her inquiry, Enloe uses various examples and simple but provocative and sophisticated language to discuss how and why women are often used to sustain and assist the globalization of militarism. For example, she makes a link between globalized factory work, women's labor and militarism. She argues that the government's military and the militarized police have helped keep thousands of women who work in Nike and other global sweatshop companies unorganized and have thus ensured that their labor remains cheap (p. 33). Whenever women sweatshop

workers protest, governments call in the men from the police and army to confront them with shields and guns as they express their own manliness (p. 34). Thus, Enloe warns that, similar to the sneakers made in South Korea in 1970s, sneakers produced today in Indonesia may be *threaded with militarism* (p. 34).

Enloe also conducts a feminist analysis of international and national security and uses the example of the U.S. military invasion of Iraq to illustrate her analysis. She describes an investigation undertaken by a few prominent feminist scholars prior to the invasion that concluded that the U.S. military invasion of Iraq was in fact a contest between masculinities. According to them, military masculinities led by the Bush administration dismissed and made *less worthy and less credible* the findings of civilian UN inspectors *less committed to a demonstration of physical force*, and thus considered more *feminine*, who reported there was no evidence the Iraqi government had a program of developing weapons of mass destruction (p. 50). Thus, Enloe argues that investigating questions such as who holds what views of manliness, who wields them in political life and what consequences those views might have, are important feminist questions to be asked in the study of national and global security (p. 51). Yet, in order to ask these questions, one needs to develop a feminist curiosity and look through gender lenses at events that happen in the international political arena.

Furthermore, by using examples of wives of military men and women soldiers, she draws our attention to females who, by being part of highly military institutions such as armies, play a crucial yet invisible role in sustaining “national security”. According to Enloe these women have not received enough attention and she calls for more research into their lives to explore what roles they play, if any, in the globalization of militarism. She critically analyses the presence in the military of women who break traditionally masculinized domains and she raises discomfiting questions about the roles and privileges of men (p. 65). She rejects simplistic arguments that more women in the military means less masculinized armies, but offers insightful and unique explanations as to why government strategists would prefer some women to join the army. Rather than having a desire to *liberate women*, Enloe claims, such strategies are motivated by their desire to continue military operations at a time when they were *losing easy access to young male recruits* (p. 72). Regardless of the motivation of the governments, the fact is that women increasingly join the army with the expectation that they can pursue a military career on the same merits as men. However, what Enloe fails to explore is women's understanding of where the government strategists' desire to recruit more women comes from and how or if that understanding would change their decisions to join the army.

Enloe broadens her discussion on masculinities, femininities and militarism in her feminist analysis of torture inflicted on Iraqi men by the U.S. army and American women soldiers inside the Abu Ghraib prison. She suggests that wielding feminization and using feminized rituals to humiliate males inside Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo became a technique of prisoner humiliation (109). Enloe also draws a

link between military organizational culture and sexism and violence. While Enloe highlights causes and consequences of global militarization and its effects on women and men, she also gives various examples of individual and group actions being taken nowadays towards demilitarizing a global world. By naming several demilitarizing campaigns that have taken place in different corners of the world, Enloe sends a message that pushing a demilitarization process beyond tokenism requires *dismantling patriarchal structures* in the public realm, but also in the private sphere as well (135). She concludes by calling for the fostering of demilitarization through cooperative investigations, multiple skills, and the embrace of different perspectives (164). Indeed, Enloe's book could be seen as an example of an individual campaign and personal contribution to a global demilitarization processes.

In sum, Enloe in her latest book is urging women and men, particularly men in positions of power, to listen to women, and to use gender analyses in their work. She urges policy makers to consider how policies will affect men and which men especially; how they will affect women and which women in particular; and, finally, how certain policies affect relationships between men and women (p. 13). The book targets primarily policy makers, but it is of great importance to scholars, students, activists and everyone else interested in discovering a link between militarism and globalization through gender lenses. While Enloe answers the questions she raises, her book is limited in its scope of the few examples used in her illustrations. However, Enloe is aware that inquires she makes are only the beginning of a larger project that should be taken on and developed by feminists around the world.

Chris Brown and Ainley, Kirsten (2005). *Understanding International Relations*, Third Ed., Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 285 pp. + index.

Author: Gul M. Kurtoglu-Eskisar
Assistant Professor, International Relations
Dokuz Eylul University
gul.kurtoglu@deu.edu.tr

In its third edition, *Understanding International Relations*, now authored by Chris Brown with the collaboration of Kirsten Ainley, continues to provide “an overview of the current state of International Relations theory” (p. xii). Designed as a textbook on international relations for both undergraduate and graduate students alike, it aims to introduce the key theories and debates that dominate or have helped to shape the field. While undertaking this task, the book also takes a bold stand against those works that downplay the role of theory in understanding international relations, and “present . . . International Relations Lite as a kind of a-theoretical discourse, ‘current-affairs-with-a-twist’” (p. xii). Instead, it proposes to view the discipline from a theory-centric

approach while applying them to contemporary world events, where possible. As an extension of this self-imposed quest, the current edition also promises an expanded focus on globalization. To that end, a considerable portion of the book is dedicated to exploring its many facets, including the rapidly integrating world economy, the impact of terrorism, nationalism and religion, combined under “identity politics,” human rights and the asymmetrically rising US power in international politics.

Understanding International Relations consists of twelve chapters, each ending with a concluding section summarizing the key themes and concepts covered. In addition to the conclusion, each chapter also includes a ‘further reading’ section at the end with a list of up-to-date works the authors find interesting, noteworthy and/or relevant to studying the subjects tackled in each chapter. Although not explicit, the book roughly divides into three parts. The first part, comprising of Chapters 1-6, begins with an almost standard practice in IR theory textbooks, focusing on the meaning and role of theory in the field, followed by an outline of the history of International Relations as a discipline. Placing political realism, the dominant theory in the field, at its core, a general road map of the key arguments appearing throughout the book follows. Beginning with chapter 7, which also marks the beginning of the second section, the book starts to shift its focus and tackles the terrain not often covered by political realism, but by international political economy, including global governance and international regimes. In the third and final part, the book makes yet another shift from “the development of the discourse itself” into the current topics in IR. This is also when the book—perhaps unavoidably—adopts its most speculative tone.

As its chief author readily admits (p.xiii), *Understanding International Relations* is not meant to provide a surgically neutral approach to the discipline and its issues. In addition to an explicit aversion of neorealism and its underlying methodological underpinnings, the authors also express open disdain for concepts such as a “borderless world,” which they regard as “ridiculous” (p. 6, 164). While introducing a discipline that it claims to defy borders and cultures, the book itself ironically adopts an unapologetically British/Western approach to world events and theoretical issues, sometimes to the point of sounding colloquial: “passengers to the UK who land in private jets at Northolt Airport still have an easier time of it than the rest of us who use nearby Heathrow” (p. 164).

Nonetheless, the overall tone of the book remains undoubtedly scholarly and theory-centric, as promised at the beginning, which also proves its most outstanding strength. A particularly noteworthy quality of the book is its ability to offer a recognizable pattern of theories out of the tangled skein of complex concepts and arguments that otherwise freely floats in the literature. Another remarkable characteristic is the friendly and informal tone of the book, which is laden with candid suggestions, such as “if you want black and white, buy an old television, don’t be an IR theorist” (p. 15). Apart from serving to break the ice for students taking an IR course for the first

time, it also considerably increases the appeal of the book to undergraduates—a group it explicitly targets.

Meanwhile, along with these merits, a number of shortcomings also exist. For instance, the overall effort of the book to serve as a legend for all major theoretical debates in the field at times leaves too much out, at the risk of sounding simplistic, and contrasts with the adage the book has set for itself at the outset. As a consequence, some of the chapters in the book feel truncated (e.g. Chapter 3 on the general outline of the dominant theoretical debates, Chapter 8 on the introduction of international political economy and its key issues and theories, and Chapter 10 on the politics of nationalism, religion and ethnicity united under the title “The International Politics of Identity”). Also, the book's argument that US hegemony verges on imperial sounds dated in the face current developments, the snowballing economic crisis that the US is currently facing, compared in its scope and potential effects to that of the Great Depression of the 1930's by some experts. A stylistic shortcoming of the book is its tendency to verbosity and long-winded sentences, which may prove problematic to students who speak English as a second language.

Although the book targets both graduate and undergraduate students (p. xii), it is probably more useful for the graduates, or young scholars in need of a concise yet comprehensive handbook of IR theories, than undergraduates with little or no background on the field. With considerably wider scope than many other currently available textbooks on IR theory, *Understanding International Relations* can prove particularly invaluable to those graduate students or young scholars preparing for a comprehensive exam, or simply looking forward to expanding their knowledge of the field.

Paul Collier (2007): *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries are Failing and What Can Be Done About It*. Oxford University Press, 195pp. + Index.

Author: Borislava Manojlovic
PhD student, Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution
George Mason University

While over a billion people live in extreme poverty, defined as living on less than \$1 a day¹, celebrity and governments' mobilization in collecting money for the poorest has become more a matter of fashion than effective and goal-oriented action. Collier identifies about fifty-eight failing states that constitute this bottom billion, whose problems defy traditional approaches towards poverty reduction. The author uses

¹ See: http://www.netaid.org/global_poverty/global-poverty/

comparative analysis and quantitative methodology in explaining why there is no improvement for some of the poorest countries in the world, such as those in Africa, yet other countries, such as India and China, have managed to move from being underdeveloped to developing.

The central problem Collier discusses in his book is the absence of economic growth for the “bottom billion” which represents the biggest challenge to both the developing and developed world. In the first part of his book, Collier introduces the notion of traps, which represents his main argument explaining why development efforts fail in the poorest countries regardless of the money influx. In the second part of the book, he draws on the outcomes of his analysis to lay out instruments and proposals that should serve as an action plan for G8 and other developed countries to act upon.

He identifies four “traps” developing countries face, including conflict, dependence on primary commodity export, and being landlocked with bad neighbors and bad governance. Collier’s attachment to structural approaches in analyzing a country’s inclination to four poverty traps might be seen as deficient by some political scientists, as he sidelines the importance of possible socio-cultural, grievance-based and historical causes that lead to a country’s inclination to conflict, bad governance and subsequent poverty. The social dynamics of countries of the bottom billion is multi-faceted and it would be presumptuous to assume that international policy prescriptions based on generalized economic, geographic and political factors can serve as appropriate models of development across the bottom billion. As Collier clearly states, most of the countries of the bottom billion are African countries. Those countries are invariably multi-ethnic with communities with deeply entrenched value systems and cultural boundaries, which tend to be very difficult to change and are reinforced in times of competition over power and resources. Such primordial traits define community and individual identities in these countries. As elites emerge to struggle for power and resources, they construct claims and grievances while manipulating these boundaries, using ethnocentrism as a tool of mobilization to construct groups of support for their claims. According to Fearon and Laitin “the construction of ethnic antagonisms is the result of individual strategic action.”² Collier ignores such primordial and ethnographic factors, which are primary and central to the formation of conflicting communities, but these are the very factors with which external intervention and aid should appropriately interact to foster development. Upon launching structural intervention in a particular country, there are dominant behaviors and sentiments on the ground, such as cultural and traditional practices, that have to be considered. Interventions cannot work without positive interaction with indigenous values, traditions and norms that inform and shape communities. Thus to suggest that solutions to underdevelopment in the bottom

² James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin, “Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity,” in *International Organization* 54, 4 (Autumn 2000), pp. 845-877.

billion do not require generalized structural policy recommendations, but context-specific approaches relevant to varying local conditions.

Collier analyzes the cases of Angola, Uganda, Sierra Leone, Nigeria and Liberia to support his arguments on traps. He suggests the complexity of possible interventions and shows that each of these traps is not only a problem on its own, but in many ways, they overlap and reinforce each other to exacerbate their impact on the bottom billion. In the case of Nigeria, he mentions the abundance of oil and its huge revenues to the country which have not benefited the majority of Nigerians. Ironically also, the Niger Delta is a hot-spot for protracted and violent ethnic and inter-communal conflicts, e.g between two Ijaw community groups of Odimodi and Ogulagha over a piece of land on which Shell constructed a gas-gathering facility. But these same groups have had long standing conflicts over chieftaincy of the Ijaw community, implying strong historical disputes which the oil industry is now exacerbating. Thus, while revenues coming from extraction and export of primary commodities in those countries give incentive to corrupt politicians and crooks to seize power, there are also local dynamics in each of the bottom billion countries that require a more integrated and comprehensive approach to development to ensure that populations are not left without any benefits. This argument is particularly relevant to the countries where such revenues are a catalyst in financing and perpetuating civil wars and conflicts.

While Collier's analysis may largely apply to the majority of the countries in the bottom billion, recent developments in countries like Rwanda challenge the consistency of Collier's argument that being landlocked with "bad" neighbors is another trap for countries. Rwanda is landlocked with bad neighbors such as Uganda, Congo and Burundi, and despite the 1994 genocide, there is evident economic growth exceeding that of any country in the Great Lakes region, as well as a relatively stable political situation which points to good governance. This supports another point Collier's argument - that post conflict countries have less chance for incipient reforms to progress, but they have one advantage – the change is easier. Policy interventions should therefore differentiate between situations in the failing countries and treat post conflict situations as opportunities. The case of Rwanda again proves that a postconflict country under strong and reform-oriented leadership can have remarkable growth despite its landlocked position with bad neighbors.

When talking about solutions to the problems of the bottom billion, Collier offers instruments such as strengthening the indigenous reformers, international standard-setting and trade policy. He argues that military intervention and aid are both costly, "one in money and the other in political and soldiers' guts", and advocates for cheaper interventions like laws, international charters and trade policies. On the other hand, for the bottom billion it is necessary to come up with set of norms and codified behavior to pave the way for becoming market democracies. I would add that in multi-ethnic societies, communities should be empowered through education and

good leadership to develop internal capacities to exploit their cultural diversities, resources and strength towards transforming these traps into opportunities for development. Therefore, before launching development instruments and interventions, leaders of the developed world, as well as development agencies, should consider specific conditions, values and attitudes of the indigenous people that are crucial for the success of any reform.

This book is one of the most important recent works in the field of international development, conflict and international relations studies and it is a must-read for the future leaders and reformers from both the developing and developed world. Although Collier's structural and quantitative approach does not offer definite answers to the problems of the bottom billion, it can be very useful in synergy with qualitative context-specific research to ensure that all the issues are thoroughly examined and that solutions are applicable and comprehensive.

Colin Hay, Michael Lister and David Marsh (eds.) (2006). *The State: Theories and Issues*. Palgrave Macmillan, 295 pp.

Author: Sokol Lleshi
Lecturer in Political Science
University of Tirana
koli_ll@yahoo.com

As citizens of the state, we hardly interrogate or problematize the state taking its existence for granted. To political scientists, the concept of the state raises doubts regarding its validity in understanding politics. Even when political scientists make use of the concept of the state in their political analysis, the bulk of theoretical approaches on state theory come from what the editors of this volume call the "traditional triumvirate", namely: pluralism, elite theory, Marxism. The theoretically rich volume edited by Hay, Lister and Marsh provides quite a range of diverse theories of the state. Besides the "traditional triumvirate" theories, this volume presents approaches that challenge the mainstream theories of the state and problematize or debunk the concept of the state, such as Green theory of the state, feminism, or poststructuralism and Foucauldian poststructuralism in particular. Questioning the prevailing theories of the state by including non-mainstream approaches in a volume on theories of the state is not the authors' only overall aim. Rather than contending to be a sequel book on "the return of the state", this work seeks to foreground the conceptual relevance of the state in political analysis regarding the state as an "institutional contextualization of politics" (p. 10). Convinced of the centrality of the state, by drawing from the diverse theories and concepts presented in this volume, the authors bring forth their theoretical

contribution which is a novel understanding of the state. Claiming that the Weberian understanding of the modern state is no longer valid, the authors argue for the replacement of the modern state by the contemporary state. As to the effects of globalization on the state, the authors maintain the state being transformed rather than hollowed out. Their ultimate aim is providing a convergence of a theory of the state.

The authors rightfully and convincingly delineate the validity of the concept of the state in understanding politics, contrary to behaviorist or systemic-theory approaches to politics that do away with the notion of the state, construing politics primarily as dependent on the will of political actors alone regardless of institutional structures or context. Deploring the missing attempt to attest the centrality of the concept of the state, the authors provide such a defense. Considering the state as “institutional/historical contextualization”, the authors claim that using the state as a concept increases the understanding of politics and takes into account the limits that political actors encounter (p. 11). However, they seem to leave aside such a conceptualization of the state in the following chapters, focusing more on providing an ontology of what the contemporary state is, to the point of inadvertently raising the contemporary state to the level of a concept.

The first part of the book approaches the state by juxtaposing mainstream theories and non-mainstream theories and their offshoots. It remains quite valuable, theoretically and conceptually enhancing the analytical purchase on the state. Starting with the traditional triumvirate, the authors forcefully argue that pluralism, conceiving politics as an aggregation of competing interests and considering groups as the main actors in politics, and elite theory, as an inverse image of pluralism, both fail to interrogate or problematize the state. Furthermore, the pluralist and elite theory and their contemporary variants, such as governance, epistemic-community and policy-network approach, are considered as not having a theory of the state. While the Marxist theory, according to the authors, could be quite useful in understanding the continuity of the capitalist state. The institutional approach replacing the concept of the state with that of the institution hollows out a theory of the state. Henceforth, the authors have critically assessed the impossibility of mainstream theories to interrogate the state.

Whereas even the most salient theoretical approaches of contemporary pluralist and elite theory, such as governance and epistemic-community/policy network approach, do not problematize the state, the alternative theories of the state included in this part of the book do, providing a critique of the state. The Green theories of the state, reflecting a critical theory, and a Weberian lineage, see the state as permeated by instrumental reason, seeking domination and accumulation, constructing certain knowledge as ‘resource managerialism’, consider the state the central site of decision-making leading to the degradation of the environment. Acknowledging the diverse feminist approaches, and despite the essentialization of the state the authors correctly admit, the importance of feminist theories of the state is that they disclose “the gendered ...patriarchal character of state institutions, practices and policies” (p. 118).

Postructuralism and Foucauldian postructuralism reject the centrality of the state as a concept and as an abstract materiality, conceptualizing it in terms of agencies, practices, knowledges, discourses, embedded in power networks controlling, categorizing its subjects in their daily life (p. 167). Although the authors succeed in counter-posing alternative theories of the state that interrogate the state and challenge the mainstream theories enriching our understanding of the state, their attempt to establish a theoretical convergence between such diverse theoretical and methodological approaches to the state attenuates the issue of problematizing the state.

The second section of the volume, which represents the core of their arguments, shatters theoretical claims that the state, faced with the effects of globalization, is in decline and no longer the central actor. The authors, recognizing the limits placed by globalization on the state, do not view the state as passive, and globalization as an end process, which cannot be shaped by the state itself. Hence, the state has been transformed and changed rather than hollowed out, without losing its central role in the globalization process. The issue of dismissing the “decline of the state” and endorsing the transformation of the state in the globalization process is coupled with the clear intention of the authors to start delineating another conceptualization of the state, which they name the contemporary state, going beyond the Weberian modern state. Clearly stated, their incipient argument sees “a shift from the state exerting power through coercion, to a state acting as a coordinator or facilitator” (p. 256). Therefore, the state relies less on the monopoly of legitimate violence to discharge its functions and more on a coordinating, consenting and legitimating role enmeshed in a network of multi-level governance, where private or parastatal bodies act as agencies of the contemporary state having obtained the legitimacy of the state. Hay, Lister and Marsh quite vigorously assert that the state still remains the only actor to legitimize any curtailment of its powers.

Even though the authors provide a novel conceptualization of the state that challenges the Weberian understanding of the modern state, they do not shy away from espousing a theoretical position which legitimizes the (contemporary) state, rather than problematizing or interrogating the state as non-mainstream theories of the state accomplish. Striving to provide an *ontology* of the contemporary state based on a convergence between the contemporary mainstream and alternative theories of the state, the authors have in fact established a theory for the contemporary state, with certain pluralist undertones.

This edited volume remains a necessary and quite satisfying contribution to the literature on state theory for academics and students by going beyond the mainstream theories of the state, consequently expanding our theoretical understanding of the state and ambitiously beginning to unsettle the Weberian conceptualization of the modern state.