

for Constructive Engagement deserve the reader's indulgence. Brown examines the issue of intervention in international relations in a historical framework. For him, it is difficult to legitimise intervention because "Intervention is always an act of power...and the powerless are understandably reluctant to legitimise it". (p.155) While delineating the adaptive capabilities of Realism and Neo-Realism, Jack Donnelly sensitises us to their inherent analytic handicaps vis-à-vis the state or globalisation.

Even though the issues raised in the 'new agenda' are not altogether new, the treatment of the themes is refreshingly insightful. To the extent that the contributors to this volume attempt to map out the emergent issues in the field of international relations, it marks a significant addition to the available literature. The collective endeavour to relate the current developments within the discipline to the process of globalisation is praiseworthy. It confronts the long-held assumptions in the field of international relations about the separateness of domestic and international political analysis. Expectedly, it takes cognisance of the fact that international actors and agenda are interacting with domestic agents in qualitatively different ways given the increasing porosity of state borders. The editor's accomplishment lies in the analytical coupling of nation-state and globalisation without positing them as diametrically opposed realities. Students of international relations are bound to benefit immensely from the volume, and the book should definitely find a place in their personal collections.

**APARAJITA GANGOPADHYAY**

*Aparajita Gangopadhyay is Lecturer at the Centre for Latin American Studies at Goa University, India.*

---

**Alexander Cooley**, *Logics of Hierarchy: The Organization of Empires, States, and Military Occupations* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2005, 191 pp., \$35.00/£18.50 hbk.).

This is an excellent and much needed contribution to the study of hierarchy in international relations. While a number of IR scholars have been reintroducing the notion of hierarchy through debates about empire, and particularly through the contested notion of a 'US empire', there have been too few contributions directly dealing with the issue of hierarchy as an organisational form. Cooley's book does a real service to IR by introducing an analytic scheme derived from the institutionalist literature on the economic organisation of firms, which provides a fruitful way of analyzing political hierarchies. Cooley also intends the book as a challenge to the two prevalent forms of hierarchical analysis in IR, realist power-based theories and constructivist theories, as well as moving

beyond the commonly used distinction between 'formal' and 'informal' empires, which is often used in the literature on imperialism.

In two chapters, Cooley summarises his main theoretical points, in terms of the basic organisational logic of institutional forms of hierarchy and the causal effects of these forms. Cooley outlines two basic hierarchical forms: a unitary form (U-form) and a multidivisional form (M-form). The U-Form comprises the functional differentiation of institutions, which is essentially a top-down form of organisation. In political terms, the U-form is analogous to a centralised state with its different functional departments of government. The main problem with U-forms is the development of 'departmentalism', where the managers of the functional units are more interested in the future of their particular department than with the overall goals of the organisation as a whole. However, as a highly centralised hierarchical form, the U-form tends to create a high level of harmonisation in the peripheral political unit, characterised by state-building processes.

The M-form comprises a territorial differentiation of institutions, where regional branches have similar functions, and each branch sets strategic objectives for their own geographic regions with the oversight of the core. In political terms, they can be seen in the common organisation of European empires. The main disadvantage concerns the 'principal agent problem': that due to their relative autonomy from the core, peripheral institutions tend towards self-interested behaviour. The M-form tends to lead to patrimonial peripheries, where quasi-independent peripheries are often at institutional odds with the core.

A third chapter deals with outcomes after the deterioration of hierarchal arrangements, pointing to important variations on peripheral polities when hierarchies end. The U-form typically displays a breakdown in the previous institutional structures, as the leftover institutions of strong vertical organisations are much weakened. In terms of M-forms, the remaining institutions tend to be path dependent, showing a real robustness even after the end of the hierarchical organisation. Overall, Cooley argues that peripheral polities mainly organised by U-forms tend to be the least prepared for independence. All of these findings are borne out in useful case illustrations, mainly involving the Central Asian states, as well as a chapter looking at the disintegration of the former Yugoslavia, the legacy of Japanese imperialism in South Korea, and the present US military occupation of Iraq.

All of this provides a highly interesting analysis of the ends of imperial and state structures, but it remains slightly distant from the traditional concerns of IR. In fact, some may find the overall analysis of the book more geared towards comparative politics than to (especially North American) IR. However, the final chapter does an excellent job of providing some inroads into a number of problems of hierarchy in international relations, including non-state actors and non-state processes. It is this chapter that might be of most interest to IR scholars, and it certainly left me wanting more. While slightly tentative, it shows the applicability of the organisational models to other areas of international relations, and it provides an opening to scholars working in these areas.

The key analytic gap in the book, acknowledged by the author, is in terms of the origins and collapse of hierarchal forms. While this does not impinge on the overall insights of the book, the aspect of temporality is lacking, especially in terms of examining the robustness of hierarchical organisational forms over time: a key example would be in terms of how prone each organisational form is to collapse. Though partially covered in the account of the breakdown of Yugoslavia, it would have been interesting to have seen more detail. Overall, while the book provides a compelling application of the 'new' institutionalism, it could possibly be furthered by the introduction of *historical* institutionalism. This also might be an area where constructivist scholarship, much criticised by the author, could play an important factor: e.g. in terms of the impact of ideas in forming the choice of particular institutional solutions.

Despite these criticisms, this is an excellent book, which provides real insights into an important subject. Even if one disagrees with some of the methods involved, the insights generated are clear, and the book certainly sets an interesting future research agenda.

**BRYAN MABEE**

*Bryan Mabee is Senior Lecturer in International Relations at  
Oxford Brookes University.*

---

## CONFLICT AND PEACE STUDIES

**Tamara Coffman Wittes (ed.)**, *How Israelis and Palestinians Negotiate: A Cross-Cultural Analysis of the Oslo Peace Process* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2005, 172 pp., \$14.95/£9.50 pbk., \$40.00/£25.95hbk.).

In the classic text on negotiation, *Getting to Yes*, would-be negotiators are urged to separate "people from the problem." But what if the people are the problem? Wittes' comparative study of Israeli and Palestinian negotiating styles in the United States Institute of Peace's (USIP) cross-cultural negotiation series presents an answer. The elusive effect of culture, particularly political culture, on negotiations is treated at various levels of analysis: the leaders, their advisors, the negotiating teams' structure, and the role of ethnonational identities. The book's essays by William Quandt, Omar Dajani, Aharon Kleiman, and Tamara Wittes offer critical and useful examinations of culture as an "intervening variable" that played a role in the Oslo peace process.

An introduction by Wittes lays the conceptual parameters for the examination of culture in negotiations. Wittes distances herself from the more constitutive definition of culture used by Raymond Cohen, the inaugurator of the USIP's cross-cultural series, which views culture as