Change in the other instances is more of increased complexity than transformation. Despite the claims of the “hollowing out” and “retreat” of the state in the face of globalization, statehood has achieved a legal and ideological sanctity that it did not have in the past (71). Neither is territoriality disappearing. Borders remain more important today than ever before, making nonsense of the assertions of a “borderless” world. The freedom of movement within the European Union is an exception rather than a global fact.

Aside from the question of conquest, sovereignty remains a cornerstone of the system of states, and international law has experienced complexity, novelty, and some obsolence in some areas (176). Diplomacy also has become more complex with the increased prominence of nongovernmental organizations and individuals, and in trade there has been novelty in the change from the lawlessness and conflict of the mercantilist era to a regulated and peaceful system exemplified by the rules of the World Trade Organization (208, 236). Colonialism is the only case of an international institution that has become obsolete (274). War as an institution has undergone obsolence in certain areas of the world, re-institutionalization through use of “smart weapons” consistent with the classical principles of limited war, and de-institutionalization from the period of World War I to the many internal conflicts of the post-1945 period (298–99).

Holsti’s inclusion of statehood as an institution raises some difficulties. States are more actors than institutions, and what is contained in statehood seems sufficiently covered by sovereignty and territoriality.

Nevertheless, Taming the Sovereigns brings a unique perspective to the study of change that is central to current debates in international relations. In his use of institutions to examine change, he links to and informs such diverse debates as globalization, nonstate actors, and war. By combining a lucid theoretical analysis with a wealth of empirical data, Holsti has provided an argument that scholars of international politics as well as students will find thought provoking.

MUTUMA RUTEERE
University of Nebraska–Lincoln
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Publication Date: December 2003
Michael Ignatieff provides a thoughtful, informed, and balanced analysis of the issues of whether, when, and to what degree civil liberties and due process of law may justifi-ably be restricted during efforts to protect a nation from terrorist threats. This book’s greatest strength is that it seeks a balance, rather than only arguing either the pure civil libertarian position that rights should never be restricted or the strictly realist view that when public safety is at risk, “anything goes.” Ignatieff achieves a persuasive balance between the two positions, due in large part to his view as an historian, and The Lesser Evil reviews earlier struggles with terrorism and seeks to draw lessons for today from czarist Russia in the late 1800s; from Weimar Germany; from more recent counterterrorist efforts in Argentina, Colombia, and Peru; and from the ongoing crises in Northern Ireland and Israel and Palestine.

The author accepts that in the face of serious terrorist threats, some restrictions on civil liberties and due process are the lesser evil and are therefore justified. However, he places some of the more extreme measures, such as torture, “beyond the pale.” Most of his analysis is devoted to a detailed discussion of the appropriate process through which decisions to restrict rights should be taken. In summary, he calls for governments to adopt emergency measures only as a last resort, to publicly justify them, to submit them to judicial review, and to limit their duration. These measures, plus public discussion, he says, will assure that the actions are “tested under adversarial review.” Reviewing the record of liberal democracies faced with terrorist threats, Ignatieff ruefully concludes that they “consistently overreact” and do not follow the processes that he recommends, often “strengthening secret government.”

Ignatieff views deliberate attacks on noncombatants by terrorists as never justified, even during armed revolts against egregious repression. Such rebels, he says, must employ violence only as a last resort and must obey the laws of war during their struggle. Terrorists argue that the oppressed can often win victory only if they can attack civilians. To prevent this cycle of oppression, rebellion, and terrorism from building, Ignatieff calls for assuring that the oppressed always have political channels open for the redress of their grievances. A purely military counterterrorist strategy, he says, will fail. The key dilemma in this approach, he admits, is how to “address injustice politically, without legitimizing terrorists.”

Ignatieff is a writer by profession as well as an historian, and his book benefits from his professional writing skills. Its logical flow is clear, and the work can be read easily by any college student or educated adult. The book is aimed at the general “informed public.” It can profitably be read in tandem with Alan Dershowitz’s Why Terrorism Works, allowing readers to grasp the difficulties of the civil-liberties/counterterrorism dilemmas by noting that the two authors, both seeking balanced analyses, do not agree on how best to deal with some of these dilemmas, such as whether to use torture in the classic “ticking bomb” situation.

WILLIAM A. DOUGLAS
Georgetown University

Vreeland, James Raymond
The IMF and Economic Development
New York: Cambridge University Press
Publication Date: March 2003

Studies on the effect of International Monetary Fund (IMF) agreements and concomitant policy conditionality on the economic growth of developing countries have provided heretofore mixed results. All too frequently, these studies are more polemical than social scientific. Several prior studies suffer from endemic selection bias because they only consider countries that have undergone IMF programs. These countries are more likely to be already experiencing economic difficulties. Hence, these studies often concluded that countries under IMF programs performed worse than countries who were not engaged in an IMF program. The problem with such a conclusion, however, is that it is necessary to control for any preexisting economic difficulties to avoid mistaking the direction of causation. Most studies that attempted to correct for selection bias did so assuming that latent factors were not systematically involved in determining the rationale for a government to enter into an agreement.

In overcoming the shortcomings of prior work, James Vreeland—of Yale University—has written the most important book on the effects of programs on the economic growth experiences of developing countries. In terms of scope, method, and policy implications, this text advances our understanding of IMF programs and the motivations of sovereign states to have their policy choices circumscribed by binding agreements with the IMF. Vreeland addresses the problem of selection bias through a surprisingly simple angle of first asking why governments enter into IMF programs. This question concerns domestic politics; he asks the political scientist’s question before asking the economist’s question.

The author constructs formal models to show when it is in the interests of domestic actors to agree to enter an IMF program. His use of these models demonstrates that executives frequently consent to IMF policy conditions in order to, for example, placate foreign investors or counteract domestic veto players. Agreeing to IMF programs involves “sovereignty costs” that executives take into account when determining when to negotiate a program with the Fund. In chapter 4, Vreeland tests this political model of selection and finds that, indeed, governments often turn to the Fund not solely out of economic concerns; developing country
governments regularly turn to the Fund for political reasons.

The answer to the question implied by the title of his book is found in chapter 5, where, now having addressed the selection problem, Vreeland uses a Heckman selection model to demonstrate that latent political factors affect the likelihood that a government will accede to IMF policy conditions. In answering the core question of the text, the author finds that governments that enter into IMF agreements do so at the cost of economic growth. Vreeland's results reveal that, on average, countries participating in Fund programs have a lower rate of growth than those that do not participate. Moreover, the distribution of the deadweight cost is uneven and largely to the detriment of domestic labor.

The policy implications for the Fund and developing country relations are clear, and Vreeland explores them briefly in the concluding chapter. Some readers will be disappointed that he avoids making extreme prescriptions—either orthodox liberal or radical—regarding policy implications. That Vreeland did not use his robust evidence to advance an overt political agenda makes his book more significant.

JONATHAN R. STRAND
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
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The Communitarian Reader is edited by Amitai Etzioni, Andrew Volmert, and Elanit Rothschild, three names of great ability in communitarian studies. Their core assumption is based on a social philosophy that requires shared formulations of the good. Communitarians see social institutions and policies as affected by tradition and, hence, by values passed from generation to generation. Communitarians emphasize the special moral obligations that people have to their families, communities, and societies. Societies have multiple and not wholly compatible needs and values in common. A good society is based on a carefully crafted balance between liberty and social order. Communitarians, unlike their liberal cohorts, observe that the relationship between liberty and social order is not a zero-sum situation and that this relationship is mutually supportive up to a point. Responsive communitarians stress that individuals within can be more reason-able and productive than isolated individuals. Communitarians maintain that there are four core elements of their moral infrastructure: families, schools, communities, and the community of communities. These core values are arranged like Chinese nesting boxes, one within the other. But one should not assume that good beginnings always ensure positive outcomes or growth. Human nature, communitarians note, is such that even if children are reared in families dedicated to moral education and children "graduating" from strong and dedicated schools, these youngsters still are not sufficiently equipped for a communitarian society. If left to their own devices, individuals gradually lose much of their commitments to these values, unless these values are continually enforced. Communities need more encompassing webs that are formed and reinforced in public gathering places. Communitarians have argued that rather than dumping people into the marketplace, institutions can empower individuals to help one another attend to some of their social needs.

In a time with questions of local versus global allegiance, concerns for what is an appropriate moral focus, and arguments for how to instill "proper" values into children, the issues raised in this excellent and thought-provoking reader are critical to ponder and discuss. Americans still argue the value of liberal thought in regard to the body politics, and this book provides a useful and important alternative to that view of human associations. This book can be read with profit by all segments of the public and university communities.

PAUL KRIESE
Indiana University East
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Pamela Edwards, an assistant professor of modern British history in the Maxwell School at Syracuse University, has done an admirable job of rescuing the thought of Samuel Taylor Coleridge from critics past and present who categorize Coleridge within the rival "cants" of his age. Edwards's analysis of the political works (1795–1830) makes the case that Coleridge is a truly independent (even Socratic) thinker who challenged "the petty groupthink" of every slogan, party, and faction of his day (23).

Although it will seem proleptic to some, Edwards must show that Coleridge's defense of property is not at odds with a more organic moralism by showing that the poet's synthetic account of political life makes him a dynamic philosopher of liberty. The early modern language of liberty need not be at war with the language of virtù(e). According to Edwards, Coleridge's thought may have developed throughout his life, but it is a complicated matrix that bespeaks of a deep and consistent statesman's science.

In Edwards's careful and scholarly hands, the writings of Coleridge allow readers to see the extreme difficulty of understanding a great mind. Unlike his contemporaries, Coleridge refused to reduce his political reflections to this or that "half-truth." And unlike most critics of Coleridge—past and present—Edwards refuses to reduce his thought to any one of its multiple facets. For example, history, nature, law, science, morality, and commercialism are all "parallel discourses" that act on human beings, and all must be balanced in the effort to understand the possibilities for true human freedom. Because Edwards does not seize on any one fragment of Coleridge's thought, his "attempt" to reconcile moral freedom with social and political justice is clarified in a more precise way than in previous scholarship.

The argument of The Statesman's Science as a whole is also an example of the deep influence in contemporary political thought of the so-called Cambridge School. Edwards's entire interpretation of Coleridge is deeply wedded to current Pocockian assumptions about historiography and political theory. If Edwards's articulation of Coleridge is correct, the poet offers an idea of modern liberalism that is neither Lockean nor communitarian. In this light, Coleridge's science of the statesman is a viable candidate for the—so far elusive—alternative to the stultifying atomism that many perceive as the bane of modern political life. Unlike many scholars who use this Pocockian paradigm, however, Edwards also is aware that it, too, has become a kind of "rigid orthodoxy as stultifying" as previous paradigms (6). But the question still remains whether Coleridge's "attempt" to synthesize the "parallel discourses" of his day advances our understanding of political life or if it merely advances the questions and challenges of Pocock.

RAFAEL MAJOR
Ashland University

Kim, Sung Ho
Max Weber's Politics of Civil Society
New York: Cambridge University Press
224 pp., $60.00, ISBN 052182057X
Publication Date: June 2004

Making Max Weber’s political thought appear in a lively new way, Sung Ho Kim—of Yonsei University in Seoul, Korea—challenges traditional interpretations that stress the nationalistic and authoritarian side of Weber and introduces readers to
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