

dealt with and perceived as a local question, which falls under the government's prerogatives. However, it is more of a global governance concern as its cumulative effect is global in environmental terms. In this regard, the author shows how human manipulation of fresh water through damming, diversion and draining has placed stress on the world's rivers and that urgent solutions are needed to address this environmental problem (ch. 3).

Conca identifies four distinct 'global proto-norms' building the base for the governance of water, namely International River Diplomacy, Integrated Water Resources Management, Watershed Democracy and Water Marketisation (respectively chs 4–7). Each of these norms influences watershed governance. In particular, the author seeks to see how these are effective in creating new approaches to water law and policy. His analysis is highly based on social movement theories. Water has undoubtedly become a source of contentious politics and social controversy on a global scale, and the management of water conflicts is one of the biggest challenges in the effort to achieve effective global environmental governance.

Brazil and South Africa are respectively used as case studies to explain how these proto-norms have shaped the governance of water (chs 8 and 9). The need for international relations scholars to work on new formal and informal regimes is also well addressed in this book (see in particular ch. 11) but this would require a change in values regarding territoriality, authority and knowledge that is not really discussed in this book. Overall, this book constitutes a wonderful base for a new research agenda in global environmental politics and global governance.

Jeremy Allouche

(Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Lausanne)

Logics of Hierarchy: The Organization of Empires, States and Military Occupations by **Alexander Cooley**. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 2005. 191pp., £18.50, ISBN 0 8014 4386 2

Logics of Hierarchy offers an innovative approach to understanding hierarchies in world politics.

Drawing on management theory, Cooley argues that organisational hierarchies can be governed in either a unitary form (U-form) or multi-divisional form (M-form) (p. 5). U-form hierarchies organise their peripheries according to 'distinct administrative functions' (such as agriculture, finance etc.) whereas M-form hierarchies govern their subordinates according to geography or products. In M-form hierarchies, therefore, the individual units enjoy relative autonomy and cover a range of sectors enabling them to perform whole tasks – be that manufacturing a particular product or governing a particular territory. Cooley argues that employing an organisational approach, which holds that organisations behave in certain ways because of their material structure rather than because of factors such as identity or culture, permits the study of previously disparate phenomena associated with the politics of hierarchy and demonstrates this by focusing in particular on the Soviet and Yugoslav 'empires'. The volume is organised thematically, first making the case for the place of management theory in international relations before considering how it helps to explain the formation and perpetuation of hierarchies, and its legacies.

Overall, the volume makes two central claims. Firstly, that understanding hierarchy through the prism of U-form and M-form structures permits rationalist explanations of phenomena that constructivists have argued are beyond rationalism. Thus, whereas constructivists claim that NGOs are very different to corporations because of their different identities and normative commitments, Cooley argues that M-form international NGOs operate almost identically to M-form multinational corporations when it comes to competing for contracts and other related activities. This cannot be explained by constructivism, he argues, but only by the logics produced by organisational form. Secondly, Cooley claims that his theory has predictive capabilities. That is, because U-form and M-form hierarchies condition behaviour, correctly identifying the type of hierarchy enables analysts to predict future behaviour.

This is an interesting and important book that mounts a significant challenge to constructivist accounts of institutional behaviour. Critics will no

doubt question whether hierarchy can be dissolved into two types, whether Cooley has established the causal links between hierarchy type and behaviour and whether the same phenomena could not be just as well explained by reference to cultural factors. Moreover, this reviewer remained a little doubtful about the precise nature of the problem that this theory attempts to redress. Overall, though, this is a very valuable and path-breaking book.

Alex J. Bellamy
(The University of Queensland)

Human Rights and Capitalism: A Multidisciplinary Perspective on Globalisation by **Janet Dine and Andrew Fagan (eds)**. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2006. 372pp., £79.95, ISBN 1 84542 268 6

As with most edited volumes, the chapters in *Human Rights and Capitalism* are a little uneven, and approach the volume's central theme from such a diverse range of perspectives that it is hard to imagine a single reader who would find them all of equal interest and utility. Although this is an edited volume where nearly all the authors are domiciled at the University of Essex, where one of the editors is the Deputy Director of the Human Rights Centre, their approaches are widely divergent (which in itself is no criticism, of course). The chapters range from a number of differently focused conceptual chapters (ranging from a discussion of the philosophical relation between human rights and capitalism, to a nuanced study of the possibility of ethical shopping), through a series of issue-based contributions (encompassing intellectual property, development, health, reparations and corporate codes of conduct) and finishes with two chapters focusing on Latin America. There is little apparent argument about why the volume should include two (perfectly acceptable and well-written) case studies of Latin America, rather than some other geographic regions or countries, and in this sense, this is exemplary of the 'edited volume syndrome' that this volume (perhaps unwittingly) typifies. Likewise the first section on conceptual debates, while raising a number of interesting topics includes chapters

with widely differing registers of analysis. This is not to suggest that any of the chapters are awful or misconceived; rather that, like many edited volumes, the overarching editorial logic of a 'multidisciplinary perspective' leaves one with the appearance of a mosaic of chapters which, while in some cases they do refer to each other in passing, do not really seem to be talking to each other. Here, I am afraid that the editors have done their contributors a slight disservice by not constructing an argumentative introduction, which could have drawn the disparate chapters into a wider project. Rather, the introduction merely offers a series of well-informed summaries of the chapters but does little to develop an analytical context in which the reader could set the various contributions. Therefore, while each chapter will be of considerable interest to various researchers, the volume itself is likely to be more of a reference purchase. However, given its price and publication only in hardback, perhaps this is what is intended.

Christopher May
(Lancaster University)

Designing Government: From Instruments to Governance by **Pearl Eliadis, Margaret M. Hill and Michael Howlett**. London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005. 454pp., £24.95, ISBN 0773528458

This volume is centrally concerned with the well-established issue of analysing decision-making and implementation through examining policy tools and instruments (such as law, regulation, taxation, subsidies, grants and so on). The basic premise of this field of inquiry is to explore how governments choose between different possible tools, how these are then used and to what effect to achieve a desired outcome.

Such concerns bring within the book's orbit issues of how these decisions could be improved to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of such choices, as well as improving the sustainability, legitimacy and accountability of such decisions and tools in the face of phenomena that challenge the capacity for governmental action, such as governance and globalisation. In order to examine this in a sufficiently coherent, cross-disciplinary,