

Lawrence Freedman (ed.), *Military Intervention in European Conflicts* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1994), 195 pp., £12.99 pbk ISBN 0 631 19406 1.

Professor Freedman and his co-authors have produced a timely book. Recent progress in Balkan events notwithstanding, the debate concerning intervention by major European powers in the affairs of their neighbours will not go away. There are many lessons to learn from how the former Yugoslav situation has been handled, *Military Intervention* shows us how we got to where we are now and which issues will still remain contentious. This work in particular provides, unlike most of the interventionist study genre which tends to focus on US and British intentions, a solid *comparative* compendium; producing for an English-speaking audience good perspectives on German, Dutch, Russian and French attitudes to intervention. This is important and serves to highlight the genuine and legitimate differences between participants and goes a long way to explaining why the issue of what to do with the whole Balkan question has been so complex, tortuous and emotionally-charged. In the process of evaluation a useful chronical of events and initiatives has been produced. Booth, Sharp and Gow provide a good, wide frame picture placing the Balkan imbroglio in the wider framework of international 'duty and prudence' and the accompanying moral context weighing-up the pros and cons of intervention, as a principle of international affairs and then in the specific context of Balkan circumstance.

MYLES L. C. ROBERTSON  
*EUROPA-Programmet, Oslo*

Adrian Guelke, *The Age of Terrorism and the International Political System* (London, Tauris, 1995), ix + 230 pp., £39.50 ISBN 1 85043 952 4.

In the preface to this book Guelke warns the reader of the contentious nature of his work. Any academic manuscript which sets out with the deliberate aim of calling into question the received wisdom of established experts on a particular subject is bound to court controversy. What Guelke says is not all that new: that terrorism is a form of low level conflict; that instances of state terror are largely ignored in the voluminous literature on terrorism that has come out of government think tanks, universities and research institutes in Western Europe and the United States in favour of studies of activities of terrorist organizations operating in states in these two regions; that terrorism is far more prevalent and results in a far higher number of deaths in the Third World. What Guelke does do, however, is to combine many of these insights in a wide ranging critique of the assumptions of realist orthodoxy about terrorism and the liberal state from both a theoretical as well as an empirical perspective exposing the degree of ethnocentrism present in the study of terrorism. What Guelke also does is to deconstruct the ends-means nexus of terrorist actions. He argues that terrorism is perceived as being inherently more threatening in the West because of the strength of the state in *de jure* and *de facto* terms. Third World states in comparison exist, in many cases, only as legal rather than sovereign entities and are therefore more vulnerable to acts of terrorism. In consequence terrorism has acquired a more legitimate status, particularly in instances where groups are engaging in terrorist acts of political violence in order to change political systems and territorial boundaries relatively unchanged since the collapse of colonialism. It is a brave thesis to advance for a man who survived an assassination attempt by Loyalist Paramilitaries acting on behalf of South African Security Forces whilst teaching in Northern Ireland. I therefore congratulate Guelke for achieving greater conceptual clarity in a subject which is unduly parsimonious and will add this important work to my reading list on terrorism. If I have a criticism of Guelke it is perhaps that he did not attempt to be wide-ranging enough. The bibliography for this book was particularly limited. There is an equally large literature on political violence and military strategy involving small guerilla bands which could have provided further reference points and avenues for study.

GERALD XAVIER MIRFIN  
*University of Wolverhampton*

Stanley Hoffman, *The European Sisyphus: Essays on Europe, 1964–1994* (Oxford, Westview, 1995), x + 326 pp., £51.95 ISBN 0 8133 2380 0, £13.50 pbk ISBN 0 8133 2381 9.

*European Sisyphus* is Stanley Hoffman's fifth book of essays. There have been two on international relations theory, one on American foreign policy, and one on French politics. Now, finally, there is

© Political Studies Association, 1996

one on European integration and foreign policy, another field to which Hoffman has made seminal contributions. These thirteen essays span the history of the European Community and include classics from the period before its recent *relance*, yet nearly half date from the past five years. Hoffman, more than any other post-war writer on European politics, captures the complex, contingent context in which important political decisions were made. Only now is mainstream international relations theory rediscovering Hoffman's enduring insight, namely that when policy is made under circumstances of uncertainty, as it so often is, historical particularities – culture, ideology, local institutions and distinctive political personalities – can assume considerable, even decisive, importance. Although easily stated, this insight poses a difficult challenge for social science. Lacking the rich contextual understanding and distinctively ironic insight that suffuse this book, more parsimonious explanations often seem thin, unable to capture the ambiguities and compromises inherent in the Sisyphean labours of politics. This is not to imply, however, that Hoffman's essays lack either precision or falsifiability. No reader of a classic like *Obstinate or Obsolete* or *Fragments in the Here and Now* can overlook or mistake its central thrust, while Hoffman's introduction states with uncommon honesty where and why certain of his predictions and explanations were disconfirmed. Hoffman belongs to the youngest of several generations of emigrés who rejuvenated postwar international relations and European studies in the US. Reading these essays as a whole, it becomes clear that Hoffman, for all his mastery of indigenous history and culture, views Europe from a distinctly transatlantic perspective. At the centre of his analysis of European foreign policy lies the subtle, yet sweeping influence of US policies and power, to which European statesmen reacted in varied and distinctive ways. To take only one example: in Hoffman's reading, neither Jean Monnet nor his nemesis, General de Gaulle, would have played the role they did absent the United States, which the former emulated and the latter defied. This personal perspective, at once within and outside Europe, gives Hoffman's essays their unique sensibility. In this, the essays mirror the man.

ANDREW MORAVCSIK  
Harvard University

Martin Holland (foreword by Sir Leon Brittan), *European Union Common Foreign Policy: from EPC to CFSP Joint Action and South Africa* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1995), xxii + 277 pp., £45.00 ISBN 0 333 61768 1.

Martin Holland has contributed much to our understanding of European foreign policy cooperation, particularly as directed toward – or, until recently, against – South Africa. Though a difficult and often technical subject, as the acronym-laden subtitle of this book suggests, the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) has emerged as a decisive point of contention among politicians and publicists debating the future trajectory of European integration. In this useful book, Holland places contemporary debates over CFSP in a twenty-year context of less formal, but substantively similar foreign policy coordination under the European Political Cooperation (EPC) mechanism. Holland's case study of the EC's observation of South African elections, one of the first CFSP actions, offers a timely assessment of the new procedure. His conclusion: *Plus ça change ...* Joint action remains hampered by unanimity voting, the lack of legal commitment, and idiosyncratic national implementation. Most analysts of European foreign policy cooperation, most recently the Commission itself, reach similar conclusions. Having observed that current European foreign policy cooperation remains limited, the analyst is faced with a choice between two, generally (if not inevitably) divergent paths. He or she might proceed as the dispassionate social scientist, seeking to assess alternative explanations for the current unwillingness to act. Alternatively, he or she might proceed as the engaged practitioner, proposing a set of institutions that, if adopted, would impel governments to pursue a more active policy. Holland chooses the latter path, criticizing current institutions and practices as 'insufficient', 'incoherent' and 'disappointing', and portraying the EC as a system in need of further fundamental reform. Proposing improvements in the institutions of European foreign policy cooperation is a laudable task, but one that leads Holland to circumvent the most important analytic issue underlying this policy recommendation. The current public debate over Europe has raised the question whether current levels of foreign policy coordination are actually suboptimal. Is cooperation constrained by

© Political Studies Association, 1996